Public Works (1896) Department.

G.O., No. 1299W

DATED 22/4/96

[Despatch Abstract.]

Taluq offices at Tiruchengodu & Tiruppattur, Salem Dt —
Estimates for constructing a first class —
Sanctioned

[P. W. 28.
900—15-8-90.]

G.O. | No | Department

FURTHER PAPERS.

| No. | Department. | Date. | G.O. | No. | Department. | Date. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

---

No. 1299 W., 22nd April 18

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS.

# PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.

## Buildings and Roads. Civil Works.

READ—the following papers :—

From the Superintending Engineer, IV Circle, dated 26th September 1895, No 366 W.
From the " " IV " " 4th February 1896, No. 53 W.
From Lieutenant-Colonel Smart, R.E., Superintending Engineer, on Special duty, Tanjore, dated 4th March 1896, No. 97.
From the Superintending Engineer, IV Circle, dated 7th March 1896, No. 103 W.

ORDER—No. 1299 W., dated 22nd April 1896.

The Superintending Engineer, IV Circle, submits revised estimates amounting respectively to Rs. 43,600 and Rs. 45,000 for constructing first-class Taluk offices at Tiruchengódu and Tiruppattúr in the Salem district, showing excesses of Rs. 9,940 and Rs. 8,400 over the original estimates of Rs. 33,660 and Rs. 36,600 sanctioned in G.O. No. 367 W., dated 9th February 1893.

2. The extra outlay in each case is made up as follows :—

*Tiruchengódu Taluk Office.*

| | RS. |
|---|---|
| Tendered rates in excess of estimate ... ... ... ... | 2,918 |
| Substitution of Mangalore tile roofing for ordinary tiles ... | 4,246 |
| Provision of a masonry compound wall ... ... ... ... | 3,980 |
| Other petty items ... ... ... ... ... ... ... | 739 |
| Total ... | 11,883 |
| *Deduct*—savings on original estimate ... ... ... ... | 1,943 |
| Net excess ... | 9,940 |

*Tiruppattúr Taluk Office.*

| | |
|---|---|
| Tendered rates in excess of estimate ... ... ... ... | 1,796 |
| Substitution of Mangalore tile roofing for ordinary tiles ... | 6,138 |
| Wire-fence and gate ... ... ... ... ... ... | 770 |
| Other petty items ... ... ... ... ... ... ... | 505 |
| Total ... | 9,209 |
| *Deduct*—savings on original estimate ... ... ... ... | 809 |
| Net excess ... | 8,400 |

3. The estimates as first prepared by the Public Works Department amounted to,—Tiruchengódu Rs. 38,280, and Tiruppattúr Rs. 40,980; and in submitting them to Government, the Board of Revenue in its Resolution No. 6977, dated 28th October 1892, commented on the high cost of the compound walls provided in each estimate, viz., Rs. 4,197 and Rs. 3,982, respectively. In G.O. No. 5574, Revenue, dated 19th December 1892, the substitution of barbed wire-fencing for the boundary walls was

suggested, and in G.O. No. 367 W., dated 9th February 1893, the provision for the walls was struck out, the estimates were sanctioned for Rs. 33,660 and Rs. 36,600 respectively, and the Superintending Engineer was directed to submit supplemental estimates for enclosing each of the offices with a barbed wire-fence.

4. The supplemental estimates thus called for were never submitted, but in the case of Tiruppattúr the revised estimate now under consideration makes provision for a plain wire-fence in accordance with G.O. No. 1762 W., dated 13th July 1894. As regards Tiruchengódu it appears that the then Superintending Engineer, Lieutenant-Colonel Smart, when on tour, gave verbal instructions to the Sub-divisional officer to proceed with the construction of the masonry wall, thus overlooking G.O. No. 367 W., dated 9th February 1893, the result being an expenditure of Rs. 3,980 against an outlay of Rs. 1,000 at the most for a wire-fence. Lieutenant-Colonel Smart's explanation is unsatisfactory.

5. With respect to the large excess caused by the substitution of Mangalore tiled roofing for ordinary flat and pan tiles, Lieutenant-Colonel Smart explains that he worked out the rates and ascertained that the former description of roof was as cheap or nearly as cheap as the latter, in which case the deviation would have been within his powers of sanction, but the fact remains that the deviation has caused large additional outlay in each case. The Government does not condemn Lieutenant-Colonel Smart's desire to provide an improved description of roof for these public buildings, but it must object to a Superintending Engineer ordering deviations in sanctioned estimates which are beyond his powers. The obvious course in such cases is to obtain sanction prior to execution. The Superintending Engineer now in charge of the Circle cannot be held responsible for the excess outlay which came to his notice only on receipt of the revised estimates, when it was too late to stop any of the work.

6. With these remarks the revised estimates are sanctioned as follows :—

Provincial Civil Buildings.
Original Works.

| | | RS. |
|---|---|---|
| Constructing a first-class Taluk cutcherry at Tiruchengódu (Register No. 9 W. of 1895–96). | ... | 43,600 |
| Constructing a first-class Taluk cutcherry at Tiruppattúr (Register No. 10 W. of 1895–96). | ... | 45,000 |

(True Extract.)

(Signed) D. McNEIL CAMPBELL, Colonel, R.E.,
Joint Secy. to Govt., P.W.D.

To the Superintending Engineer, IV Circle, with 32 enclosures.
,, Lieutenant-Colonel A. W. Smart, R.E., Superintending Engineer, on Special duty.
,, the Examiner, Public Works Accounts.
,, the Revenue Department.

Exd. T. K. Narayana Aiyangar,
Spare Copies

BUILDINGS AND ROADS.
CIVIL WORKS.

# Govt. of {1896} Madras.

## PUBLIC WORKS.

*Dated April, 22nd.*

*Recd.* *Encl.*

---

**G.O. No. 1299 W., 22nd Apr. 1896.**

---

**APRIL.**

---

### Taluk Offices

Sanctioning, with remarks, revised estimates amounting respectively to Rupees 43,600 and Rs. 45,000 for constructing first-class — at Tiruchengódu and Tiruppattúr in the Salem district.

---

X/

(1)

No. 1299 W of 22nd April 1896

# PROCEEDINGS OF THE MADRAS GOVERNMENT.

B. R.

READ the following

Letter from the S.E. IV Circle (H.E. No. 366 W d/ 26 September 95/
— do — do — ( " " 53 W d/ 4 Feby 96/
— do - from Lt. Col: Smart R.E., S.E. on special duty, Tanjore ( " " 97 d/ 4 March 96/
— do from the S.E. IV Circle ( " " 103 W d/ 7 " " /

A.S.H.
29.3.96

The Supdg. Engineer IV Circle submits revised estimates amounting respectively to Rs. 43,600 & Rs. 45,000 for constructing first class taluk offic[e] at Tiruchengod and Tirupatur in the Salem District, shewing excesses of Rs. 9,940 & Rs. 8,400 over the original estimates of Rs. 33,660 & Rs. 36,600 sanctioned in G.O. No. 367 W dated 9 February 1893.

2. The extra outlay in each case is made up as follows:-

Tiruchengod taluk office.

| | |
|---|---|
| Tendered rates in excess of estimate . . . | Rs. 2,918 |
| Substitution of mangalore tiles roofing for ordinary tiles . . . . . . . . . . . . | 4,246 |
| Provision of a masonry compound wall . . | 3,980 |
| Other petty items . . . . . . . . . . . . | 739 |
| Total Rs. | 11,883 |
| Deduct savings on original estimate . . | 1,943 |
| Net excess Rs. | 9,940 |

(40—1,000—21-4-94.)

## Tirupatur taluk office.

| | |
|---|---|
| Tendered rates in excess of estimate .. | Rs 1796 |
| Substitution of mangalore tile roofing for ordinary tiles . . . . . . . . | .. 6138 |
| Wire fence and gate . . . . . . . | 770 |
| Other petty items . . . . . . | .. 505 |
| Total | Rs 9209 |
| Deduct savings on original estimate | " 809 |
| Net excess | Rs 8,400 |

3. The estimates as first prepared by the Public Works Dept amounted to, Tiruchengod, Rs 38,280, and Tirupatur, Rs 40,980, and in submitting them to Government, the Board of Revenue in its Resolution No 6977 dated 28 October 1892 commented on the high cost of the compound walls provided in each estimate viz Rs 4197 & Rs 3982 respectively. In G.O. No 5574, Revenue, dated 19 December 1892, the substitution of barbed wire fencing for the boundary walls was suggested, and in G.O. No 367 W dated 9 February 1893, the provision for the walls was struck out, the estimates were sanctioned for Rs 33,660 and Rs 36,600 respectively, and the Supt Engineer was directed to submit supplemental estimates for enclosing each of the offices with a barbed wire fence.

? Were no reminders sent ?

4. The supplemental estimates thus called for were never submitted, but in the case of Tirupatur, the revised estimate now under consideration makes provision for a plain wire fence in accordance with G.O. No 1762 W dated 13 July 1894. As regards Tiruchengod it appears that the then Supt Engineer, Lieut: Col: Smart, when on tour, gave verbal instructions to the Sub Divisional officer to proceed with the construction of the masonry wall, thus overlooking G.O. No 367 W dated 9 February 1893, the result being an expenditure of Rs 3,980 against an outlay of Rs 1000 at the most for a wire fence. Lieut Col: Smart's explanation ~~cannot be regarded as~~ is unsatisfactory.

5. With respect to the large excesses caused by the substitution of mangalore tiled roofing for ordinary flat and pan tiles, Lieut Col Smart

explains that he worked at the rates and ascertained that the former description of roof was as cheap or nearly as cheap as the latter, in which case the deviation would have been within his powers of sanction, but the fact remains that the deviation has caused large additional outlay in each case. The Government does not condemn Lt. Colonel Smart's desire to provide an improved description of roof for these public buildings, but it must object to a Supdg Engineer ordering deviations in sanctioned estimates which are beyond his powers. The obvious course in such cases is to obtain sanction prior to execution, while the contrary procedure has been adopted in the case of the present estimates. The Supdg Engineer now in charge of the Circle cannot be held responsible for the excess outlay

which came to his notice only on receipt of the revised estimates, when it was too late to stop any of the work.

6. With these remarks the revised estimates are sanctioned as follows:—

Provincial Civil Buildings.

Original Works.

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Constructing a first class taluk cutcherry at Tiruchengode . . . . . . | Rs. 43,000 | Register No. 9 W of 189 |
| Do — at Tirupatur . . . . . | " 45,000 | " " 10 W of 1896. |

ASA 23.3.

21/3/96

S. E. IV Circle with 2 enclosures.
Lt. Col. A. W. Smart R.E. Supdg Engr. on special duty.
Ex. P. W. Accts
Revenue dept.

Exd

G

Revised estimates for taluk offices at Tiruchengode & Tirupatur.

---

Print soon

E

T.
B
U.R.C.

The Secy to Government, Rev Dept
for favour of remarks.

---

Sd

S.H.M. 30/3/96

R.S. 23/3
H.E. 25/3 } R 30/3

P. W. Department

No 1299 W of 22nd April 1896

Note for His Excellency the Governor:—

Plans and estimates are usually submitted through the Civil Department concerned, and as they do not come direct to this office from Superintending Engineers, reminders are not usually sent.

To enable this office to know what is being done in such cases, a Circular was issued a few months ago, directing Superintending Engineers to report to this office as soon as a plan and estimate are sent on through the departmental officer concerned.

2/4/96
W

In such cases, reminders should be sent. Any practice which prevents this being done is a bad one, and should be altered.

A.E.H.
15.4.96

Cu

CHOB.
2.4.96

H.E.

Revised estimates for taluk offices at Tiruchengod & Tirupattur

12/9/94

[illegible]

G.O. to issue – an office order issued with reference to H's remark

W

H.E. 2/4.

offices with a barbed wire fence.

4. The supplemental estimates thus called for were never submitted, but in the case of Tirupattur the revised estimate now under consideration makes provision for a plain wire fence in accordance with G.O. No. 1762 W dated 13 July 1894. As regards Tiruchengod, however, in spite of the definite instructions contained in G.O. No. 367 W dated 9 February 1893, the then Supdg Engineer, Lieut. Col: Smart R.E., directed the Subdivisional officer to proceed with the construction of the masonry wall, which has now cost Rs 3980, against an outlay of Rs 1000 at the most for a wire fence, thus involving Government in extra expense to the extent of about Rs 3000/-. Lieut. Col. Smart is only able to say that he must have overlooked the Government order, or that it is possible that the excavations had already been completed and material for the concrete collected, and his explanation must be regarded as unsatisfactory.

5. With respect to the large excesses caused by the

substitution of mangalore tiled roofing for ordinary flat and pan tiles, Lieut: Colonel Smart explains that he worked out the rates and ascertained that the former description of roof was as cheap or nearly as cheap as the latter,× but the fact remains that the deviation has caused large additional outlay in each case. The Govt. does not condemn Lieut: Col: Smart's desire to provide an improved description of roof for these public buildings, but it must object to a Superintending Engineer ordering deviations in sanctioned estimates which are beyond his powers. The obvious course in such cases is to obtain sanction prior to execution, while the contrary procedure has been adopted in the case of the present estimates. The Supdg Engineer now in charge of the Circle cannot be held responsible for the excess outlay which came to his notice only on receipt of the revised estimates, when it was too late to stop any of the work.

6. With these remarks the revised estimates are sanctioned

× In that case the deviation must have been within the powers of sanction

as follows:—

Provincial Civil Buildings.
Original Works.

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Constructing a first class taluk cutcherry at Tiruchengode . . . . . . | Rs 43,600. | Register No | W of 1895-96. |
| Do ——— at Tirupatur . . . | " 45,000 | " " | W of 1895-96. |

S. E IV Circle, with 32 enclos.
Lt. Col. A. W. Smart R.E. Supdg. Engr. on special duty
Ex. P. W. A.

Rev Dept.

H.E.

3

Revised estimates for taluk offices at Tiruchengod & Tirupatur

The Secy to Govt Rev. Dept for perusal of connected minutes –

[Note of the Chief Engineer P.W.D]

Memo
read 7403

The undersigned has the honor to observe in regard to both estimates that the deviation in roofing, by substituting flat and pan tiles for Mangalore tiles, was made under the orders of the Supdg Engineer IV circle and that, as regards the Tiruchengod office, the substitution of a masonry compound wall for wire fencing was made under the same authority. But in para 2 of G.O. 367 W dated 9th Feby 1893 a supplemental estimate for enclosing both these offices with barbed wire fencing was specially called for. The barbed wire was subsequently altered to plain wire in accordance with G.O. No 1762 W dated 13th July 1894: but it is not clear why a masonry wall is proposed instead of a wire fence – and as the revised estimates have not been signed by the Collector of the District they can not in their present form be passed –

5/1/96 CWMS

## Public Works Department.

Current No. 7403

Letter No. 336/W

Dated 26th September 1895

From the Supdg Engineer IV Circle.

### TECHNICAL NOTE.

Name of work Constructing first class Taluq offices at Tiruchengod & Tirupatur, in the Salem District.

The ~~[illegible]~~ S.E. IV Circle submits for the sanction of Govt. two revised estimates, amounting to Rs 43,600 & 45,000 for constructing first-class taluq offices at Tiruchengod & Tirupatur respectively in the Salem District in lieu of the estimates, amounting to Rs 33,660 & 36,600 sanctioned in G.O. No. 367 W dated 9th Feby. 1893.

Taluq office at Tiruchengod. The excess of Rs 9,940 or 22.8% over the original sanction of Rs 33,660 is due to the following causes:–

(a) Due to extra depth of concrete & benching work to suit the nature of soil —— Rs 253
(b) Due to tendered rates in excess of estimated rates & to petty alterations in schedule of quantities to suit dimensions since ordered by Govt. } 2,918
(c) To deviation in the description of roofing from flat & pan tiles to Mangalore tiles with planked ceiling —— } 4,246

B. forward Rs 7417

(d) To provision of a masonry compound wall ——— 3980

(e) To workshop charges for doors, windows, record racks &c. including carriage to site — } ~~250~~ 250

(f) To other petty items such as zinc sheeting to valleys, constructing shed for materials &c. ——— } 236

Total Rs 11,883

Deduct saving due to revised schedule of quantities for doors & windows ——— Rs 645

- do - to items of painting — 17

- do - to deviation in the design for latrine, as ordered in G.O. No. 1709 W dated 9th July 1894 ——— 248

- do - to contingencies & petty supervision ——— 1,033

Total savings Rs 1,943

Total excess over estimate (11883-1943)

= Rs 9,940.

Taluq office at Tirupatur. The excess of Rs 8400 or 22·95 % over the original sanction is due to the following items :-

(a) To tendered rates in excess of sanctioned estimated rates Rs 1,796

(b) To deviation in roofing from flat & pan tiles to Mangalore tiles with ceiling planks } 6,138

(c) To provision of gate & wire fence 770

(d) To workshop charges on record racks, doors &c. ——— 250

(e) To other petty items including contingencies &c. ——— 255

Total Rs 9,209

Deduct savings effected by modifications in doors, windows, latrine floor &c. ——— } 809

127 C

~~Note for the Chief Engineer~~

~~The undersigned begs to observe~~ that the authority for the deviation ~~the~~ in roofing in both the estimates respectively ~~from~~ flat & pan tiles to Mangalore tiles with planked ceiling & for a masonry compound wall in lieu of wire fencing in the estimate for Tiruchengode office alone, are stated to have been made under the orders of the SE IV Circle, but in para 2 of G.O. No. 367 W dated 9th Feby 93 a supplemental estimate was specially called for enclosing these two offices with barbed wire fence & since altered to plain wire, vide G.O. No. 1762 W dated 13th July 1894. The necessity for a masonry wall is therefore not apparent though it is stated to have been deviated under the verbal orders of the SE.

23.XII-95

The revised estimates have not been countersigned by the Collector of the Dist.

---

Encloss: 27.

4 Revised estimates
2 Genl. Abstracts.
2 Comparative Statemts.
2 Reports
4 Copies of letters
2 Copies of Tenders
1 Data Sheet (Revd.)
4 origl. estimates
1 Do - Gl. Abstract
2 Do Reports
1 Data Sheet (Origl.)
1 Plan of Compound wall & wire fencing
1 Site plan -

27

Separately sent

× original Subsup with C No. 6853 Sent to DW 26-9-95

No. 386/W

Supg. Engineer's office, 4 Circle,
Coimbatore 26th September 1895.

From,

J. Hannan Esq.,
Supg. Engineer, 4 Circle,

To,

The Chief Engineer,
P. W. Department.

Sir,

I have the honor to submit for sanction of Government revised Estimates amounting to Rs 43,600 and Rs 45,000 for constructing a first class Taluq office at Tiruchengode and Tirupatur respectively in the Salem District.

2. The Excesses of Rs 9,940 and Rs 8,400 over the original Estimates of Rs 33,660 and Rs 36,600 sanctioned in G.O. No. 367 W, dated 9th February 1893 are due to the following:-

Tiruchengode Taluq office

(1) Extra depth of Concrete and benching rock to suit the nature of soil ——— Rs 253

(2) Tendered rates ——— " ~~2,874~~ 2,812 2,918

~~3127~~ 3,171 3,065

B.F. Rs ~~3127~~ 3065

(3) Substitution of Mangalore
Tiles and plank ceiling
in place of ordinary tiling — " — 4,241
(4) Compound wall ——— " — 3,980
(5) Workshops' Conveyance and
fixing charges for Record
racks ——— " — ~~250~~ 312

Total Rs — 11,598

Deduct savings effected by
Subsequent modification in
the Standard Designs and
by the savings in the items
of Contingencies & Petty supervision — " — 1658

Net Excess Rs 9,940

## Tirupatur Taluk office

(1) Tendered rates ——— Rs 1,747
(2) Substitution of Mangalore
Tiles in place of ordinary
tiling ——— " — 6,133
(3) Gate and wire fencing
the Compound ——— " — 770
(4) Workshop charges &ca
for record racks ——— " — 250

C.O. — 8,900

B.F. Rs 8,900

(5) Omission of certain items in the
Original Estimate ——— " 204

Total Rs — 9,104

Deduct savings effected by
subsequent modification in
the Standard Designs ——— 704

Net Excess Rs 8,400

3. Authority for deviation from sanctioned Estimates is stated in the reports and the comparative statements accompanying the revised Estimates.

I have the honor to be,
Sir,
Your most obedt. servant,

Supg. Engineer, 4 Circle.

P. W. CURRENT No. 7403

From

The Supg. Engineer,
4th Circle.

Rd 1-10-95.
Enc 32 (+2 plans)

Dated 26th }
Despd " } September 1895.

No. 367 W d/ 9-2-93

No. 366/W

Enclos: 27.

First Class Taluq Office
at Tiruchengode & Tirupatur
in Salem District.

Submits for sanction of Government revised estimates &ca amounting to Rs 43,600 & 45,000 for constructing a ——

J/

---

C/

No. 127 C d/ 9—1—1896
P. W. D.

Memorandum.

Letter from the Supty Engineer IV Circle No. 366 W d/ 26 Septr/95

The undersigned has the honor to observe in regard to both estimates that the deviation in the roofing, by substituting flat and pan tiles for Mangalore tiles, was made under the orders of the Supty Engineer IV Circle and that, as regards the Tiruchengode office, the substitution of a masonry compound wall for wire fencing was made under the same authority. But in para 2 of G.O. No. 367 W dated 9 February 1893 a supplemental estimate for enclosing both these offices with barbed wire fencing was specially called for.

The barbed wire was subsequently altered to plain wire in accordance with G.O. No. 1762 W dated 13 July 1894: but it is not clear why a masonry wall is proposed instead of a wire fence. and as the revised estimates have not been signed by the Collector of the District they cannot in their present form be passed.

EW

No 127 C d/ 9th January 1896

T
B

CWB
1/1 96

The S. E. IV Circle
with 32 enclos.

11/1

---

No 908.
31st August 1893

From,

Lieutt. J. Cormac
Sub Division Officer
Salem.

To,

The Executive Engineer
Salem Division
Salem.

Sir,

I have the honor to inform you that on the 7th July 1893, the Supg: Engineer inspected the work at the Trichengode Taluq Cutcherry, and then gave verbal orders that the Compound wall be gone on with, of rough stone in chunam.

On the following day, I gave written orders in the order book on the work to the two Contractors then engaged upon the work, to execute the work on the compound wall, at Schedule rates, of 12 Rs per

per 100 cft; the Contractors, under my orders commenced the work. I was then in charge of the division.—

× × × ×

SUPG. ENGINEER'S OFFICE P.W.D.
9-S-L
7 JAN 95
Enclo. 4
FOURTH CIRCLE.

I have &c

(Signed) J. Cormac
Sub Division Officer

(True Extract Copy)

Executive Engineer 25-12-94

D.L.
25/12

O.W. 218
1308/96

---

No. 1372 S 11th August 1893.

To.

The Sub Division Officer
Salem Sub division
Salem.

Ref: his No 773 of 2nd August 1894

I find no orders from Supg: Engineer regarding the Compound wall. Please quote them or state if they were given verbally.

2. As this compound wall is easy it should be given to the same man who does the building of the Cutcherry itself, so please call for tenders for the whole together.

(Signed) G. E. Manson
Ex: Engineer

(True Copy)

25-12-94
Executive Engineer

D.L. 25/12

SUPG. ENGINEER'S OFFICE P.W.D.
No. 9.S.L.
7 JAN. 95
3
FOURTH CIRCLE.

Dis 5.7
1305/96

---

No. 834

From

The Sub Division Officer
Salem

To

The Executive Engineer
Salem Division.

Dated 12th August 1893.

Ref: your No 1372/11-8-93 requesting to quote the No. of the order as to the construction of compound wall Talug Cutcherry Tiruchengode

—

Sir,

I have the honor to state that the Supg: Engineer gave verbal orders on the spot, to go on with the compound wall of the Talug Cutcherry Tiruchengode and that it should be built of rubble masonry.

The contractors then at work on

on the building, were accordingly directed
to proceed with the work.—
× × ×

I have &c

SUPG. ENGINEER'S OFFICE
No. 9
7 JAN 95
FOURTH CIRCLE

(Signed) J. Cormac
Sub Division Officer

(True ^Extract^ Copy)

Gopalakrishna Swami 25-12-94.
Executive Engineer

D.R.
25/12

Ps 16
1305/56

---

No 773.

From

Lieutt J Cormac
Sub Division Officer
Salem Division

To

The Executive Engineer
Salem Division

Enclo: 2 P.W: Agreements

Dated 2nd August 1893.

I have the honor to submit two piecework agreements for the compound wall of the Taluq Cutcherry Tiruchengod & to state that the Supg: Engineer directed the work ~~to~~ be put in hand the compound wall is not included in the estimate.

I have &c

(Signed) J. Cormac
Sub Division Officer

(True Copy)

25-12-94 Gopalakrishna Swami
Executive Engineer

D.R.
25/12

SUPDG. ENGINEER'S OFFICE
No. 9 S.E.
7 JAN. 95
Enclo. 1
FOURTH CIRCLE.

Rs 1895
1305

Executive Engineer's Office, Salem Division,
Salem, 25th December 1894.

No. 618 S.E.

FROM M.R.Ry. Rai Bahadur
S. Gopalakrishnier, Avergal, B.C.E.,
Executive Engineer,
Salem Division.

TO
The Superintending Engineer,
Fourth Circle,
COIMBATORE.

Sir,

Enclosures. 10.

- 4 Copies of letter
- 1 Comparative Statement
- 1 General Abstract
- 1 Detailed Estimate
- 2 Original Estimates
- 1 Report.

With reference to your No. ~~539~~ 369 S.E., dated 3d December 8th November 1894, I have the honour to State that the B. Form of Progress Report was sent to you on the 12th December 1894.

2. The estimate is corrected with reference to your order to place rafters at 2 ft. intervals from centre to Centre and herewith submitted.

3. No written authority of the Superintending Engineer is forthcoming for the Construction of the Compound wall. But a perusal of the papers enclosed will shew that the authority was given verbally on the 7th July 1893.

I have the honour to be
Sir
Your most obt. Servt.

25-12
G Gopalakrishnan
Executive Engineer.

D.L.
25/12

300—22-8-94.

**P. W. D.**

FROM
THE EXECUTIVE ENGINEER,
SALEM DIVISION.

SUPG. E. P.W.D.
No. 9 S.L
7 JAN. 95
Enclo 10
FOURTH CIRCLE.

To
The Superintending Engineer,
Fourth Circle,
*Coimbatore.*

Dated 25th
Despatched Do } December 1894.
Received

No. 618 Sh.

Enclosures. 10.

SUBJECT.

Tiruchengode Taluq Cutchery
—
Resubmits estimate for —

PW E.C.
1305/96

THE VICTORIA PRESS—SALEM.

---

Tiruchengode Overseer's Office
14th February 1895.

No. 34.

From,
The Overseer P.W.D.
Tiruchengode.

To,
The Sub Dn.l Officer,
Salem Sub Dn.

Sir,

With reference to your endt. No. 149 dated 11. 2. 95 I beg to report that the construction of the compound wall to the Taluq Cutchery, Tiruchengode, was under the direct charge of Mr. J. Cormac the then Sub Dn.l Officer.

I took charge of the work after Mr. Cormac's departure when the work was done more than half.

I beg to report that I do not know any thing regarding the verbal orders of the Suptg. Engineer regarding the Commencement of the work.

The order Book is herewith forwarded as directed together with all the enclosures referred to in the memo. under reply.

I beg to remain &ca.
Sd/ G. S. Krishnasami
Overseer P.W.D.
14. Feb. 95.

107 SL
4-MAR 95
2

(True copy)

1.3.95
Executive Engineer.

P.W.E.3
1305/96
4/3

---

Under the orders of the Supg. Engineer the compound wall of the taluq cutchery may now be commenced: it will be of rough stone in Chunam 1½ ft. thick and 4 ft. high: weep holes will be left at intervals of 6 ft: each weep hole being 6 inches square.

Mortar to be used in future to be 1½ sand to 1 lime.

That portion of the wall where all the drainage from the hills enters need not be built until further orders.

Sd/ J. Cormac.
8/July/93. S.D.O.

The weep holes are to be in the rubble masonry.

Intd. J.C.

(True extracts)

1.3.95
Executive Engineer.

1/3

107 S.L

P.W.E. 2
1305/56

Executive Engineer's Office, Salem Division,

Salem 4th March 1895.

No. 86. S.E.

FROM M.R.Ry. S. Gopalakrishnier Avgls Rai Bahadur, B.C.E.,
Executive Engineer,
Salem Division.

To
The Superintending Engineer,
Fourth Circle,
COIMBATORE.

Sir,

Enclosures. 2

With reference to your no. 33/S.L dated 31st January 95, I have the honour to inform you that the construction of the Compound wall was commenced in July 1893 and Completed with the exception of the Coping in April 94. Lieut. J. Cormac was in direct charge of the building till September 1893, when Overseer G. S. Kishnasamy Iyer took charge of it. Copies of letters of the former who, it appears, was also the Divisional officer

Officer at the time of Col. Smart's inspection were already sent to you with my No. 618, dated 25th Decr 94. I now send copy of the written orders which he says in his letter No. 908/31.8.93. he gave in the order book on the work. Overseer G. S. Kishnasamy Iyer says he knows nothing about the verbal orders of Col. Smart & copy of his letter No. 34 dated 14th Febry 95 is herewith sent. There are no others to give any further explanation on the subject.

I have the honour to be,
Sir,
Your most obt. Servt.,

1.3.95
Executive Engineer

D.R.
4/3

300—22-8-94.

# P. W. D.

FROM
THE EXECUTIVE ENGINEER,
SALEM DIVISION. 1080L

107 SL
4-MAR 95
~~1-1~~
1-2

TO
The Superintending Engineer,
Fourth Circle,
*Coimbatore.*

Dated 1st } March 1895
Despatched }
Received }

No. 86. S.E.

Enclosures. 26

PWE.1
1305/56

SUBJECT.

Compound wall of the Taluq cutchery at Trichengode.

Submits further report on the ——.

THE VICTORIA PRESS:—SALEM.

---

No 53/W.

Supg Engrs Office 4th Circle
Coimbatore, 4th February 1896

From
J. Hannan Esqr
Supg Engineer 4th Circle

To
The Chief Engineer
P.W. Department
Madras

Enc: 19
4. Revised Estimates
2 Gl. Abstracts.
2. Comp. Statement
2 Reports
4 Copies of Letters
2. Do of Tenders
1 Data sheet
2. Orgl. letters with their enclosures.

Sir,

With reference to your memorandum No 127.C. dated 9th January 1896, I have the honor to resubmit the revised estimates amounting to Rs: 43,600 and Rs: 45,000 for constructing first class Taluk Offices at Trichengode and Tirupatur respectively in the Salem District, duly countersigned by the Collector.

2. It is evident from the records of this Office that the deviation in the roofing was ordered by Col: Smart. R.E. while in charge of the circle. Vide his notes of Inspection dated 6th July 1893. Trichengode Cutchery. "In revising estimate provision should be made for Mangalore tiled roof instead of ordinary tiles with 1/2" boarding screwed to below rafters". Besides

Col: Smart R.E.

Col: Smart. R.E. issued a Circular No. $\frac{269}{C}$ dated 27th July 1893, directing that "in future all estimates for new tiled roofs should provide for Mangalore drip kind tiles with 1/2" jungle wood planking screwed below rafters", and that "in a few cases where the carriage from a Railway station would be very costly, ordinary tiled roofs may be allowed for". Accordingly Mangalore tiles were ordered to be used for the Tirupatur Cutchery in this office No. $\frac{255}{S.E}$ dated 15th August 1893.

3. As regards substitution of masonry compound wall for wire fencing in the Tiruchengode office, no orders appear to have been issued from this office, but Lieut: J. Cormac who was then in charge of the Division write to say that he was, on the 7th July 1893, asked by Col: Smart. R.E. to proceed with the construction of the masonry compound wall.

4. I also beg to submit the following original letters from the Executive Engineer offering explanation for the above deviations for perusal and return.

No. $\frac{618}{S.E}$ dated 25th December 1894 and No. $\frac{86}{S.E}$ dated 1st March 1895 with enclosures.

I have the honor to be
Sir
Your most obedient Servt.

Hannan

Supg. Engineer 4th Circle

From,
The Supdg. Engineer
4th Circle

No. 127 C/- 9-1-96
3253 C of 2-10-92
33678 C of 20-7-93

Dated 4th }
Rd } February 1896

No 53/W.

Enc: 19

First Class Taluq Offices at Trichengode and Tripatur – Resubmits revised Estimates for Constructing –

P. W. CURRENT No. 1305

Enclos 20
Recd: 8.2.96

---

Cur. 1305

DW

Draft memo. submitted with reference to your note attached –

With regard to your question as to whether the unauthorised expenditure should not have been noticed in C.I. office, I have made inquiries & have ascertained that C.I. office have no means of telling whether expenditure is being incurred on items not included in a sanctioned estimate. Work vouchers are not now sent to C.I. office. It is only when expenditure is incurred in excess of grant, or in excess of an estimate that an objection is raised.

The expenditure on the Tiruchengode cutchery having exceeded the estimate the C.I. office at once included the item in the O.I. Statement. In the

---

Cd/28th Feby 1896 P.W.D.

Memorandum.

, No. 53 W., dated 4th February 1896.

The information supplied by the Suptg. Engineer is insufficient, and the Chief Engineer is still unable to submit for the sanction of Government the revised estimates for first class taluk offices at Tiruchengod and Tirupatur.

2. The original estimates for the two buildings as submitted by the Superintending Engineer, IV Cirle in October 1892 amounted respectively to Rs. 38,280 and Rs. 40,980, and in forwarding the estimates to Government the Board of Revenue remarked on the high cost of the proposed compound walls, viz, Rs. 4,197 for the first building and Rs. 3,982 for the second. In G.O. No. 5574 Revenue Department, d/ 19th December 1892, it was observed that wire fencing was preferable to a compound wall, and accordingly in the P.W. Department (G.O. No. 367 W., d/ 9th February 1893) the provision for a wall in each case was struck out, the Suptg. Engineer was directed to x submit supplemental estimates for x wire fencing, and the estimates were sanctioned for the reduced amounts,

viz,

Case of Trespatur, the outlay had not exceeded the estimate, & no objection was raised.

Cq

21.2.96.

Cuml
21.2.96

---

1305

Dw

Am doubting whether the estimates can now be sanctioned.

Cq

5/2/96.

Not at present. In T's note it is stated that the provision of a compound wall, in building as it would now appear — or the verbal orders of the Supdg Engineer entailed an excess of Rs 3980. He makes no deduction for savings on account of omitting the wire fence. He should look into this and state what the net excess is.

It seems strange that no one apparently should have noticed this large expenditure, while being incurred.

3

:ly reduced by omitting the pro:vision of masonry compound walls & sanctioned ~~and sanc:~~ ~~[illegible]~~ in G.O. No. 369 W dated 9th Febr 93, with the remarks that supplemental estimates for barbed wire fencing should be submitted. This description of fencing was subsequently altered to plain wire with reference to G.O. No. 1962 W dated 13. July 1894.

The supplemental estim:ates

Minute at [illegible]

estimates called for were never submitted, but only the accom:panying revised estimates in which provision has again been made for a masonry wall for Tiruchengod office, on the verbal orders of the SE & wire fencing for the Tirupatur office in accordance to para 2 of the sanctioning G.O. under reference. Consequently there is no excess whatever by the provision of a masonry com:pound wall in lieu of wire fencing for the Tiruchengod office, as the latter was never sanctioned as a supplemental ~~office~~, therefore the excess of Rs 3980 as pointed out in my note should really be treated as a supplemental estimate for constructing the compound wall round the Taluq office.

12 Feb 96.

---

1142 C

1305

I.
Can you estimate what
[illegible] be the cost
[illegible]
of wire fencing ([illegible])
the difference between
the Rs 3980 [illegible]
[illegible] the excess [illegible]
of building
compound wall

Thus/ Rs 800 for wire fencing with 5 lines of plain wire including posts & wooden gate &c. complete or say Rs 1000 the most against Rs 3980 for walling

1142 C

1305

I

with refce to D.O. note please submit a statement showing net excess for providing compound wall instead of wire fencing

10/2

Lmw vide reply attached etc

Tho

---

[illegible]

estimates called for were never submitted, but only the accom-panying revised estimates in which provision has again been made for a masonry wall for Tiruchengod office, on the verbal orders of the S E & wire fencing for the Tirupatur office in accordance to para 2 of the sanctioning G.O. under reference. Consequently there is no excess whatever by the provision of a masonry com-pound wall in lieu of wire fencing for the Tiruchengod office, as the latter was never sanctioned as a supplemental ~~office~~, therefore the excess of Rs 3980 as pointed out in my note should really be treated as a supplemental estimate for constructing the compound wall around the Taluq office.

Tho.

12 Feby 96.

---

No. 1142 C d/28 Feby 1896 P.W.D.

Memorandum.

From the Suptg. Engineer, IV Circle, No. 53 W., dated 4th February 1896.

The information supplied by the Suptg. Engineer is insufficient, and the Chief Engineer is still unable to submit for the sanction of Government the revised estimates for first class taluk offices at Tiruchengod and Tirupatur.

2. The original estimates for the two buildings as submitted by the Superintending Engineer, IV Cirle in October 1892 amounted respectively to Rs. 38,280 and Rs. 40,980, and in forwarding the estimates to Government the Board of Revenue remarked on the high cost of the proposed compound walls, viz, Rs. 4,197 for the first building and Rs. 3,982 for the second. In G.O. No. 5574 Revenue Department, d/ 19th December 1892, it was observed that wire fencing was preferable to a compound wall, and accordingly in the P.W. Department (G.O. No. 367 W., d/ 9th February 1893) the provision for a wall in each case was struck out, the Suptg. Engineer was directed to submit supplemental estimates for wire fencing, and the estimates were sanctioned for the reduced amounts,

viz,

viz, Rs.33,660 for Tiruchengod and Rs. 36,600 for Tirupatur. The supplemental estimates called for were never submitted, and it now transpires that on the 7th July 1893, the then Suptg. Engineer, Lt.Col.Smart issued verbal orders to the subdivisional officer, Lt. J.Cormac, to proceed with the construction of the compound wall in the case of the Tiruchengod cutcherry. On the 25th December 1894, the Executive Engineer, Salem Division reported to the Suptg. Engineer that orders for this important deviation were given verbally, but he appears to have taken no steps then to submit a revised estimate, as though the matter was of no consequence. The wall is now estimated to cost Rs.3980 and the cost of a wire fence, complete with posts wooden gates &c., would probably not have exceeded Rs.1000, so that the provision of the former has involved an extra expenditure to Govt. of Rs. 2980. Lt.Col.Smart's action was in direct contravention of the orders of Government and if he had reasons for considering a wall preferable to wire fencing in the case of the Tiruchengod cutcherry, he should have laid them before Government, and obtained prior sanction to the deviation. He will now be requested to explain his action in the matter.

3. As regards the roof, the excess due to the substitution of Mangalore for ordinary tiles is Rs.4246 in the case of Tiruchengod and Rs.6138 in the case of the Tirupatur cutcherry. In the former case, Lt.Col.Smart on 6th July 1893 ordered provision to be made for Mangalore tiles in the revised estimate, and in the case of Tirupatur, the same officer ordered Mangalore tiles to be used on 15th August 1893. In each case the deviation was beyond the Superintending Engineer's powers under Code para 61(e) Chapter III, vol. I, and before ordering it he should have obtained the sanction of Government to do so. Lieut. Colonel Smart will now be requested to explain why he thus exceeded his powers. The present Suptg. Engineer will also be requested to explain how he permitted these unauthorised works to proceed without reference to superior authority.

21/2/96

E.W.

DESPATCHED
28 FEB 96

S.E. IV Circle.

Lt.Col. A.W. Smart, R.E., Suptg. Engr.

21.2.96

No. 1142 C d/ 28th Feby.
1896

2/

My dear Brother!

If there is any further reference required with regard to the ~~the~~ compound wall case will you look up the following point — Was there not a G.O. forbidding the use of barbed wire, as dangerous to cattle? Unless the wire is barbed it is of very little use in keeping out cattle.

2|3

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS.

Public Works Department,
Irrigation Branch,
~~MADRAS.~~

~~Chepâk,~~ ........ ~~189~~

My dear Bartlow,

The order forbidding barbed wire was passed when I was at the College and it ~~was~~ is quite possible that there was previous correspondence on the subject. Unless wire is barbed it will not keep out cattle; this may have been one of the reasons that led me to give the order for a wall

---

I believe this was one of the points discussed by me with Cormack. Did he receive the G.O. ~~for~~ ordering the wire instead of wall, before I gave him the order to go on with the wall?

When Evans reported in Dec. that ~~the~~ I had given order for the compound wall how much of the work had been already done?

The more I think over the case the more I feel that I had reason on my side in ordering the wall to go on, but I cannot recall the line of argument that influenced me.

Yours sincerely

8/3/96

Please let me know if further explanation is considered necessary, as in that case I will ascertain Cormac's whereabouts & write to him.

Yours sincerely
C W Smart.

12/3/96

W.
Forwarders in continuation of previous papers on this subject.

CH 89
13.3.96

2/3

---

pleted. The papers show ~~that~~ the wall was commenced in July 1873, that when Lieut Cormac retired in Sept 93. it was more than half completed, & that it was fully completed except coping. in April 1894.

Ces
9.3.96.

W.
Lt Col: Smart's d.o. dated 8.3.96 has been answered according to the substance of the above note: but this will not be likely to help him in any way.

CWMS
9.3.96

W
Forwarders
CWMS
12.3.96.

Dul
Mr Hannan's reply to the memo. has since been received & is put up (Cir 2461). It must apparently be accepted – Sanction to the revised estimate is now awaited. The Tinchengod catchment has long been on the O.S. Statement, & the G. of I. recently drew attention to the great delay that has occurred in sanctioning a revised estimate –

Ces
12.3.96

Struck
to
CWMS

As regards Hinchinga
it appears that the then
Supt. Insp. Lt. Col. Meade
when on tour gave verbal
instructions to the Military
Officer to proceed with the
construction of the Mess
works then outstanding
367 W 9 Feb 1883
G. O. No ~~[illegible]~~ dated ~~15th May~~
the result being an expenditure
of Rs 3980 against an
outlay of Rs 1000 on the
[illegible] for a wire fence.
Lt Colonel Meade's explanation
cannot be regarded as
satisfactory.

21/3/86

There seems to be no explanation as to why tendered rates in excess of those sanctioned were accepted without revised estimate being at once submitted.

16/3/95

W

No explanation on this point was asked for in the two memoranda which went to the Supdg. Engr in connection with the revised estimates.

As regards the Tiruchengod office, the S.E. submitted the tender for approval in June 94. and it was then+ pointed out that as the tender exceeded the amount of the sanctioned estimate, the latter would require revision. It was also pointed out that the tender should provide

+ Vide No. 449 D.S. 25-6-94 [illegible] para 3.

for the supply of Cabinet tiles, which the S.E. stated it was intended to use — no revised tender ~~was~~ appears to have been submitted, although the one then sent up was not definitely approved.

No tender or contract documents appear to have been submitted in the case of the Tirupatur taluk office. When the S.E. was recently asked to explain a similar omission in the case of the Tirupatur Head Asst. Collr's office, he replied to the effect that the work had been given out on a piece work agreement, & that therefore the submission of contract documents was unnecessary. It is possible that a similar arrangement was made with regard to the Tirupatur Taluk Office.

C

20/3/26.

---

The only thing that can be done is to send in the usual intimation explaining the circumstances of the case and it may be necessary to say that "Ch: Engrs explanation is not satisfactory" as it was oversight in both the cases but perhaps it may be better not to make any further comments on his action.

16/3/26

S.A.W.

Col: Smart - who will be here for an hour or so - would like to have a copy of his inspection notes, while he was in charge of IV circle, which refer to the [illegible] Cutcherry work in Scheme IVa - on which there is an explanation required regarding the substitution of a Mangalore roof for an ordinary tiled roof, and also he would like to see the G.O. forbidding masonry walls to such buildings - Should there be any delay in getting these documents they may be sent to him afterwards at the Elphinstone Hotel.

C.W.B.
2.9.96

Dw

The only inspection notes by Col. Smart which relate to the Tiruchengode cutcherry, are those placed on the top of the file - a copy has been made for transmission to him.

The G.O. directing

the substitution of wire
fencing for compound
walls is No. 367 W of
9.2.93, a spare copy
of which is put up. —

No. 2978 C of 20.7.93
(marked with red tape)
also relates to the Tiruchengod
cutchery. — If desired, a
copy of this will be made
for Col. S., but it hardly
seems necessary —

I think not

No notes of inspection
relating to the Tiruppatur
Cutchery can be traced.

Cn
2/3/96

To be sent the inspection notes to
the S.O. about wire fencing.

2.3.96 Done
Cn
2/3/96

---

Case 2349

Dir

Tiruchengod & Tiruppatur
taluk cutcherries. —

Col. Smart's official
letter giving the explanation
called for has been received,
& is submitted. — The reply
of the S.E. IV Circle to memo
No. 1142 C of 28.2.96 must
apparently be awaited. —

As regards Col.
Smart's D/O letter &
the G.O. prohibiting the
use of barbed wire
for fences is submitted —
Please see G.O. No. 1762 W
of 13.7.94 — The order
states that when wire
fencing is provided, it
should be of plain, not
barbed wire — This
does not justify the
substitution of a wall
for a wire fence.

Col. Smart's order
to provide a wall for
the Tiruchengod cutchery
moreover was given in
July 1893, while the G.O.

prohibiting the use of barbed wire was issued a year later.

In his official letter Col. Stuart states that so far as he recollects, he never saw G.O. No. 5574 Rev. of 19.12.92, in which the provision of wire fences instead of walls for the two cutcherries was suggested. The Rev. G.O. was however printed with the P.W. Pros. sanctioning the estimate (No. 367W of 9.2.93) in which the provision for the walls was struck out & supplemental estimates for wire fences were called for.

In the D/O, Col Stuart inquires whether he received the G.O. before the order to go on with the wall was given. The G.O. was issued in July 1893, while the order for the wall was given by him in July 1893.

When the E.E. reported in Dec. 94 that Col. Stuart had given the order for the wall, the wall had long been com-

---

2461

W

His Excy. inquires whether reminders were sent in connection with X the call for supplemental estimates for wire fences for the Tirupatur & Tiruchengode taluk offices.

I find that para 2 of G.O. No. 367W of 9.2.93 was entered in the list of calls maintained in the office, but that reminders were not sent. The clerk who made the entry in the register is dead, & his successor is on leave. The clerk who is now in charge of the books is unable to explain why reminders were not sent. The explanation probably is X that plans & estimates for civil buildings are usually submitted through the civil Dept. concerned, & as they do not come direct to this office from Engineers, reminders are not usually sent.

To enable this know what

is being done in such cases, a circular was issued a few months ago, directing S.Es to report to this office as soon as a plan & estimate are sent on through the departmental officers concerned. X

CH
31-3-96.

the [illegible] from X to X must be sent to [illegible] A. H. C. [illegible]

1/4/96

CWS 2.4.96

---

No. 97

Office of Superintendin
Cauvery Completion Estim
Madras dated 4th March /9

From

A. W. Smart Lt Col RE
Superintending Engineer
on Special duty
Tanjore

To,

The Chief Engineer
P.W.D.
Madras

Sir,

With reference to your memo No. 1142 C dated 28th February, I have the honour to state that, as far I recollect, I never saw G.O. No. 5574 dated 19th December 1892, or if I did, I must have overlooked it when I gave the order for the construction of the Compound wall round the Tiruchengod Cutcherry. I remember quite well discussing the question on the spot with Lt Cormac and coming to the decision that the work of constructing the wall should go on. It is possible that the excavations had already been completed and material for the concrete collected. I regret that I should have made a mistake in this matter.

x 367 w 9.2.93

With regard to the substitution of mangalore tiles for ordinary I have the honor to state that I worked out the rates and ascertained that the Mangalore tile roof was as cheap or nearly as cheap as the other, because the timbers may be placed further apart, the rafters 2'-6" and the reepers 1 ft from centre to centre. The only extra cost was the planking required to be screwed below the rafters in the case of the mangalore tiles and I proposed to use mango or other country wood instead of teak planking as the cost would thereby be reduced by about one half. I am unable to account for the large excesses without seeing the estimates and plans. The deviation was one that appeared to me within my powers, and is of a kind frequently made, I believe, by Superintending Engineers. I would wish to point out that in Salem good ordinary tiles are very difficult to obtain and that bad tiles invariably disintegrate after a time and make leaky roofs. The use of Mangalore

-tiles

tiles in such cases, even though a litt more expensive in the first instance is in my opinion, wise economy.

I have the honor to be
Sir,
Your most obedient Servan

Lt. Col. R.E.

Superintending Engineer
on Special Dut

P. W. CURRENT No.

From

A. W. Smart Lt Col. RE
Superintending Engineer
on special duty
Tanjore

To,

The Chief Engineer
P. W. D
Madras

Dated 4th }
Despd }  March/96
Recd }

No. 97

Acc: 7.3.96

Taluk offices in [illegible] and [illegible] taluks

Forwarding explanation for certain unauthorized works done in the — in excess of the Estimates.

---

No. 103/W.

Supg. Engineer's office

7th Ma

From,

J. Hannan, Esq,
Supg. Engineer, 4 Circle,

To,

The Chief Engineer,
P. W. Department.

Sir,

C no 2349/96.

With reference to the concluding lin of your Memorandum No. 1142 C, dated 28 ultimo, enquiring why I allowed the un-authorised deviations in the Cutcherrie to be proceeded with, I have the honor to report that I was not aware of the deviations until the revised Estimates were submitted and it was then too late to stop the works. The Compound walls were then completed and the Mangalore tiles at site.

I have the honor to be,
Sir,
Your most obedt. servant,

Hannan

Supg. Engineer, 4 Circle.

t,

The Supg. Engr,
4th Circle.

Recd: 10.3.96

No. 1733 W d/ 21-6-90
" 600 C " 10-2-93
" 994 C " 3-3-93
" 1849 C " 24-4-93
" 2678 C " 20-7-93
" 367 W " 9-2-93
" 449 D " 25-6-94
" 1762 W " 13-7-94
" 2151 W " 31-8-94
" 127 C " 9-1-96
" 1142 C " 28-2-96

ted 7th
d 9th } March 1896

No. 103/W.

Taluk offices at Tiruchengodu

Explain the circumstances under which the unauthorised deviations were allowed to be proceeded with in the ——