

Public Works (1898) Department.

G.O., No.

280 W

✓
DATED 3 February 1898

[Despatch Abstract.]

Outlay: Authorising the Engineer, with remarks,
to admit the — of Rs 154-13-2 incurred in erecting
a paudal in front of the Taluk Cutcherry at Bhavani,
Coimbatore Dist.

3228

[illegible]

BACK PAPERS.

FURTHER PAPERS.

No.	Date.
3157	11-11-97

constructed by professional
engineers. The Govt will
admit the charge in
the P.W. accounts.

Cy
28.1.98

note. The charge of Rs 154-13-2
was brought forward in the
correspondence printed with
S.O. No. 3157 W of 11-11-97, but
its admission was not specifically
authorized. It is proposed now
to pass it, to remove a long standing
and objection.

Para 2 of the foregoing despatch
expresses what was apparently the
intention of Govt. in passing the
order of 11-11-97.

Cy
28.1.98

11-11-97

No.	Date.
3157	11-11-97

S.S. IV
24/1/98

Letter from A. A. G. Meale Esq. Executive
Engineer Coimbatore Division to the Supy.
Engineer 4th Circle, dated 10th January 1898
No. 101.

With reference to G.O. No. 3157 W dated
11th November 1897 on the construction of
foundations round public buildings, I
have the honor to request you will be
good enough to obtain the sanction
of Government to authorize the Examiner
to admit of the outlay of Rs 154-13-2 in-
curred in erecting a foundation in front
of the Taluk Cutcherry at Bhavani.
The collector in his No. 600 dated 22nd
July 1897, a copy of which was forwarded
to you with this office No. 807 dated 1st
March 1897, pointed out that the charge
should be borne by this Department
and that he had no provision in his
budget to meet the outlay.

No. 22
W

Copy submitted to the Chief
Engineer Public Works Department
with a request that he will be good
enough to obtain orders of Government

authorising the Examiners to admit
the outlay of Rs 154.13.2.

2. To avoid frequent references
of this nature it is suggested that
the Examiners be authorised to
pass all charges incurred on
pandals constructed with the
approval of the Executive Engineer.

Camp Kollegal
18th January 1898

Edmund
Superintending Engineer
4th Circle.

BUILDINGS AND ROADS.
CIVIL WORKS.

Government {1897} of Madras.
PUBLIC WORKS.

Recd.

Enclosures

1897.

Regd.

Spare copies

G.O., No. 3157 W., 11th November 1897.

NOVEMBER.

Construction of Pandals round Public Buildings

Cancelling certain rulings on the subject of the — used as offices and their repair,
and directing that any questions that may arise be left to the judgment of the parties
concerned.

No. 3157 W., 11TH NOVEMBER 1897.

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS.
PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.

Buildings and Roads.
Civil Works.

READ—again the following papers:—

G.O., No. 1124 W., dated 11th May 1895.
" " 339 W., " 27th November 1896.

READ—also the following papers:—

From J. HANNAN, Esq., Superintending Engineer, IV Circle, to the Chief Engineer, Public Works Department, dated 5th March 1897, No. 124/W.

I have the honour to bring to your notice that at the request of the Collector, the Executive Engineer, Coimbatore division, has erected a pandal in front of the taluk cutcherry at Bhavani at a cost of Rs. 154-13-2 during the month of March 1896 on a sanctioned estimate of Rs. 170.

2. In his letter, No. 64 D./A., dated 9th January 1897, the Examiner of Public Works Accounts objects to this and states that, if the pandal in question is not a fixture, the cost of its construction should be borne by the department occupying the building. The Executive Engineer has accordingly been instructed to recover the cost from the Revenue Department as the pandal is of a temporary nature.

3. I would, however, point out that I cannot find any Government order supporting the objections raised by the Examiner to recover the cost of erecting the temporary pandal at the taluk cutcherry from the Revenue Department, except G.O., No. 617 W., dated 19th February 1896, which refers only to buildings used as residences and does not seem to apply to *public buildings in charge of this department occupied as offices*. I presume that G.O., No. 1124 W., dated 11th May 1895, implies that when a temporary pandal is permitted by the Executive Engineer of the division, it should be constructed by him in a satisfactory manner, and I cannot see that any useful object is gained or served by recovering the cost of such pandals from the department concerned.

4. I would also point out that, under G.O., No. 1228 W., dated 18th May 1894, the Revenue Department are not permitted to carry out any repairs or alterations to public buildings in charge of this department, and therefore it appears to be contrary to those orders to permit them to construct or maintain temporary pandals. Further, it appears to me that it will be most objectionable to allow other departments to erect pandals as the necessity of obtaining permission of the Executive Engineer will be lost sight of, and G.O., No. 1124 W., dated 11th May 1895, will become a dead letter.

5. As there may be considerable demands for the erection of similar temporary pandals, I would venture to refer the question to Government for decision as to (1) whether this department should undertake the construction of temporary pandals to public offices in their charge on the requisition of the department occupying them, and if so, how the cost of such pandals is to be adjusted; (2) whether the construction of such pandals be entrusted to the departmental officers concerned after obtaining sanction from the Executive Engineer of the division (*vide* G.O., No. 1124 W., dated 11th May 1895); or (3) whether the construction of pandals should not be entirely disallowed as suggested in this office No. 261 W., dated 30th May 1896, embodied in G.O., No. 3356 W., dated 23rd November 1896, authorizing the construction of ryots' sheds in taluk offices in lieu of temporary pandals.

No. 3157 W., 11TH NOVEMBER 1897.

Office-note from the Examiner, Public Works Accounts, dated Madras, 3rd April 1897, No. 1097 D./A.

[Your office-note, No. 1777 C. of 29th March 1897.]

Please see G.O., No. 3395 W., dated 27th November 1896, according to which, if the pandal is not a fixture, this department should refrain from repairing it. The pandal in question is not, apparently, a fixture and its cost should therefore be borne by the department concerned.

2. The departments concerned should, I think, construct or repair pandals at their own cost with the permission of Executive Engineer as required by G.O., No. 1124 W., dated 11th May 1895, as such work does not require any professional supervision (G.O., No. 1228 W. of 18th May 1894).

ORDER—No. 3157 W., dated 11th November 1897.

G.O., No. 1124 W., dated 11th May 1895, ruled, with respect to the construction of pandals round public buildings used as offices, that each case should be decided on its merits by the Executive Engineer concerned, and in paragraph 2 of G.O., No. 3395 W., dated 27th November 1896, it was declared that if a pandal is not a fixture, this department should refrain from repairing it. His Excellency the Governor in Council considers that it is unnecessary to lay down any hard-and-fast rules to govern the questions as to whether or not a pandal should be put up, and as to which department should erect it and pay for its construction. The rulings quoted will accordingly be cancelled, and any questions that may arise will be left to the judgment of the parties concerned.

(True Extract.)

(Signed) W. B. DEWINTON,
Ag. Secretary to Government.

To all Superintending Engineers.
" the Consulting Architect to Government.
" the Examiner, Public Works Accounts.
" the Public Department.
" the Revenue Department.
" the Local and Municipal Department.
" the Judicial Department.
" the Ecclesiastical Department.