

Public Works (1898) Department.

G.O., No.

1910 W

DATED

29 July 88

[Despatch Abstract.]

Amie St Clair's bungalow at Hospet

The removal of the roof &
pendants of the building known as the — in the
Bellary P.H., sanctioned with Rs. 1000.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

0.25 222 11/23/79

BACK PAPERS.

FURTHER PAPERS.

No.	Date.
old building, which is said to be unsafe as it stands - The walls, which are of great thickness, are to be allowed to stand. It is proposed to renew the application, which is approved by the Collector.	2328A 14-8-96 1812W 18-6-96 2252C 15-5-96 2032C 22-11-96 1870C 7-4-96 646W 21-2-96 2846W 8-11-94 1151D 13-10-94 589D 14-7-94 2217C 16-6-94 1266C 19-3-94 2367W 13-9-93 602W 3-3-91
As 9.7.98. The building is due to the the last. When underlined, a its low walls will be very unsightly. With the better to remove it altogether if the materials can be utilized to pay the cost of doing so in full.	11.7.98
To the S.E. III cases G. H. P. O.	

Copy of letter from the Executive
Engineers Bellary Division to the Collector
of Bellary dated 30.1.98 N^o 913.

In the premises of the Head Asst^t Collector's bungalow newly constructed at Hospett, there is an old building by name, "Honorable St. Clair's bungalow" or the old Head Asst^t Collector's residence.

2. My Sub Divisional Officer informs me that it is unfit for human habitation, and as there is no likelihood of its ever being occupied again, the fallen portions of the roof and walls should be removed to avoid any accident to the Servants of the Head Asst^y Collector.

3. The Head Asst. Collector who was consulted by me on the subject, is of opinion that the building is unsafe as it stands and is never likely to be again inhabited and observes that there is no objection to its being dismantled entirely as long as its archeological interest is not diminished.

I do not understand what he means
by "its archeological interest." There
is none that I know of which can
recommend its preservation. I
therefore propose to obtain sanction
of Government under Code Volume
I Chapter I para 20 to level it to
the ground but before doing so, I
have the honour to request you
will be good enough to inform me
if you have any objection to this
being done.

(Copy)

(Signed) H. E. Clerk
Exec. Engineer
Bellary Dist.

Dis ²⁰³³
19.5.98.

Bellary Collector's Office
Dated 19th May 1898.

From

E. A. Elwin Esquire
Ag Collector of
Bellary.

To

The Executive Engineer
Bellary Dist.

Sir,

In reply to your letter No
⁹¹³
_{30.1.98} I have the honour to inform
you that I have been unable to
discover that the building at
Hospett known as the Honourable
St. Clair's Bungalow possess any
archaeological interest and that
I have no objection to its being
dismantled. With reference to your
remark that the fallen portions
of the roof and walls should be
removed to avoid any accident
to the servants of the Head Asst
Collector, I ought perhaps to mention
that Mr Lloyd, Ag Head Assistant
Collector now on privilege leave

leave, reports in his letter dis-
468
6.2.98 that no servants will go into
the building, as they think it haunted.

I have &c &c
(Signed) J. T. Lever
For Ag Collector.

No 3976 of 28.5.98 Enc. 1.

Copy together with copy
of this office letter to which this is
reply forwarded to the Superin-
tending Engineer 3rd Circle for favour
of necessary action. The Executive
Engineer proposes to remove the roof
and pandals, but to leave the
masonry walls which are of great
thickness, standing.

(Signed) A. E. Clerk
Exec. Engineer
Bellary Div.

(Copies)

W. B. Baddley

Lieut Col RE,
Suptg Engineer III Circle

25/6/98

053/
533/50

No. 9974

Superintending Engineer's Office,

3RD CIRCLE.

Bellary 25 June 1898.

FROM

Lieut Col RE, Esq.,

SUPERINTENDING ENGINEER,

IIIrd CIRCLE,

BELLARY.

TO

THE

Chief Engineer
P. W. D.

M. A. D. S.

Sir,

Enclosures.

In submitting herewith
Copy of Endorsement No. 3976 dated
28.5.98 with its enclosure received
from the offices in charge of
Bellary Division I have the honour
to request that you will be good
enough to approve of the Exec. Engi-
neers proposal to remove the roof
& pandals of "Honourable St. Clair's
Bungalaw" or the old Head Assistant
Collector's residence and to leave
the masonry walls standing.

I have the honour to be

Sir

Your most obedt servant

W. B. Baddley

Lieut Col RE,
Suptg Engineer III Circle

053/
21/6

From
The Superintending Engineer,
IIIrd Circle,
Bellary.

To

The

Dated

Received

189 .

Enclosures.

No.

Subject.

Rev Secy
P.W.D. Cuv 5339

To Under Secretary

The Draft order below
proposes sanction the re-
moval of the roof and panels
of the old Head Asst Collector's
residence at Hospet, and if econ-
omical, to demolish the walls as well. The
building has been condemned
as unfit for occupation and
is stated to be unsafe as it
stands. ~~It is not to be~~
and The Collector sees no
objection to the building
being dismantled entirely.
There is therefore no objection
in the P.W.D. to the draft
order issuing.

RS
13-7-98

Secy
16/7/98

There is no objection in
this dept.

S. H.

19/7/98

S. H. Ho

12/7/98

W

For orders.

whether daily allowance
in accordance with the
rules may be recom-
mended for the sanction
of God.

It is thought that the
claims should be subject
to regular audit, and
be supported by proper
journals. Unless such
journals were kept at
the time, there might
be a difficulty in this
matter.

There is moreover, no
explanation of the delay
in preparing the claims.
His Excellency may,
possibly, wish to know
the reason.

L.S.

5 Mar. 98

to inform that the
claims must be supported
by journals in proper form.
A more explanation given
of the delay in submitting
them. The claims will then
be recommended for sanction
of Govt. In view of the fact
that delay which has
already

occurred, this refce
shall be disputed if
proved. It shall be
stated explicitly to what
extent expense the
Delta Exp. has been
by reason of this turning
Intr. & why

W. J. S.

C. No 3222

orders. W. J. S.
In his office letter
of 18th Feb 98 Flag B
the Examiner reports that
conveyance allowance is
inadmissible, but that
"daily allowance" may be
granted under Art 1154
2d sec. Two essential
conditions have to be
complied with.

- (1) a movement of over
5 miles. vide Art 1157. &
- (2) there must be "actual
travelling expenses."
vide Art 1086. i.e.
cost of "locomotion" - vide
Art 15.

The journals submitted
do not show that the
Surveyor moved more
more than 5 miles on any
one day for which he
claims travelling
allowance. The column
"miles travelled each day"
is blank throughout.

Under these circum-
stances, the claims
seem inadmissible
under the Travelling
Allowance Rules.

Cases of this kind
are usually met by

extra pay. There see
no reason why the travel
allowance rules sh-
ld be restricted to ever. If

C.S. 12
18 April 92

The 5 miles limit is
from headquarters of
one for 1st division
5 miles from H. Q.
for field work more
a road for 10 days.

In the absence of any
upward as to where
in H. Q. has a limit
many miles he has been
doubt. I think he
had better ask for
sanction to a
fixed monthly
allowance of Rs 15
less remission if the
Govt can sanction

W. A. L. S.
On looking down at it

this case. It seems
clear that the Examin-
erian understood the
rules in regard to the
rule of travelling allowance
Delta Supts. engaged
on survey duties and
that if so, not only is the
present claim barred,
but the sanctions already
given were ultra vires.

Delta Supts. ~~under~~ come
under Item 31 of Appendix
22 C.S.R. and under
Art 1133 (a) are not entitled
to travelling allowance
of any kind. Even as
"Surveyors" their claim
would be barred. They ^{would}
then fall into Item 33.
The pay of both classes of
officers is supposed to
be fixed "so as to com-
pensate them for the
cost of ordinary services
within their respective
jurisdiction." vide
Art 1133 (a) C.S.R.

C.S.
6 May 92

Please see also G.O. 1173 W
d/8 April 92 H. A. S.
C.S.

(1) I don't see why of
this class Delta
with under them
I append 22. The
real fact is that
discretion in the
matter & as it has
been T. A. to
Delta Sup. before
as a special case.
they do so again.

(2) I suppose there is
no way of increasing
his pay.

LWS

6-5-51

(1) Delta Supts: are
already classed as "Petty Estab-
lishments". Please see pp 40-
54 of the Provincial Budget.

(2) There is no objection to
increasing the man's
pay during the period
of his employment on
Survey work. N.B. Drayton