Public Works (1899) Department.

G.O., No. 2483 W

DATED 20 September 1899.

[Despatch Abstract.]

Rent - Approving the proposal of the S.E II Circle that the recovery of ——— from Asst. Supdt. K. Venkataratnam Pantulu, Clerk, who occupied a thatched shed in the Lock compound at Cowtaram, Krishna Eastern Dn., be effected from the date on which he was informed of his liability to payment -

[P. W. 2 — 2,000—29-3-99.]

Indexed. 28/9

BACK PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.	G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

FURTHER PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.	G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

Public Works (1899) Department.

CURRENT No. 6557

WR/B

No: 2493 W3 20-8-99

D.S.# 11.9.99

From The Examiner P.W. Accounts Madras & Coorg

Order

The proposal in para 4 of the Suptg. Engineer's letter is approved.

No. 983 A/A

Put. 14/8

Dated 10th August 1899.

Received 11-8-99

Registered

Enclosures Plans-nil, Others-2 } Total 2

Spare copies.

Note - The Suptg. Engineer's letter flagged J fully explains this case. The Examiner is of opinion that as the shed in question cannot be regarded as a "Govt. building", the rules in Chap X, Vol I of the P.W. Code, will not apply to it. The Suptg. Engineer's proposal to recover rent for the shed only from the date

SUBJECT.

Thatched Shed for Sub Divisional Clerk at Cowlaram Kistna Eastern Division — Informs that the Suptg. Eng's proposal regarding date from which recovery of rent for the — shed may be accepted.

R 14/9

Sent as para 17/8/99

on R 15/8 D 14/9 O 28395

BACK PAPERS.

No.	Date.
On which the occupant was informed either directly or indirectly of his liability to pay rent may accordingly be approved.	
3332C	3-8-99

FURTHER PAPERS.

No.	Date.

To
The Supdg. Engr., II Circle
& Examr, P.W. Accts.

SUPG. ENGINEER'S OFFICE
No. 399 Tr
15 JUL 99
P. W. D.
SECOND CIRCLE.

Review petition

4th July 1899.
Yelleswaram
Godavery district.

No D

EXAMINER
P. W. ACCOUNTS
6 AUG 1899

To
The Superintending Engineer
2d Circle. Bezwada.

Most honored Sir

I. I beg to bring to your notice that according to your endorsement No 1640 K.E. dt 21.5.99 on Kis. Exctr & Executive Engineer's No 175 dt 25.5.98 the Executive Engineer West Godavery has been demanding from me the rent at the rate of Rs 1-4-0 per month for the occupation of the Govt. shed at Tartaram Lock compound for (91) ninety one months. I am at present on sick leave drawing only half of my pay which is scarcely enough even to meet medical charges.

2. I earnestly beg your honor to reconsider and cancel the order No 1649 K.E. dt 31.5.98 for recovering the rent for the thatched shed retrospectively for the reasons noted below:-

(a) There was never an understanding at first and at the commencement of my occupation of the shed, that I the occupant of the shed in question should pay a house rent.

(b) I was obliged to live at the shed for the convenience of government work.

(c) That the recovery of house rent from me after 10 years above passed is unjust and invalid

(d) Though I had been the occupant of the shed for such a long time as 7 years and 7 months there was not a word to the effect that I had to pay

PWS1
L223/99
655/99

to pay house rent.

(e) If I had been informed at the commencement of the occupation of the shed at first I would certainly have left the shed and occupied a more decent quarters in a village commanding better conveniences or I would have constructed a hut at my own cost, in the same way as the then S. D. O. Mr. N. Rajagopala Iyengar owned.

(f) During my occupation of the hut I was put to a great many inconveniences and expenses instead of any real saving. Lodging in such a lonely place, gave an opportunity for thieves to break open into that hut and to steel my property. Besides this loss I had to incur expenditure for conveyance of my children to school and sometimes by employing a separate teacher, which items of expenditure I could very easily have avoided, had I been residing in the village itself. In short I was made to live in that hut for the convenience of office work with great many inconveniences to myself.

(g) If it was originally intended that I should pay rent; an intimation of this should have been given to me at least after I occupied it. On the other hand after I vacated the hut nearly 2 years ago and after my transfer to Kistna Eastern Dn. Office, a Dn. Buckingham canal Dn. + Kis. Western Dn. Office, a proposal has been started to recover house rent from me; for a hut which I came to occupy Ten years (10) ago.

3. I most respectfully beg and request your honor that my case may be reconsidered as an exceptional one and the large amount of Rs 113-12-0 ordered to be recovered from me for (91) ninety one months may be cancelled.

I beg to remain
most honored Sir
your most obedient Servt.
K. Venkataratnam Pantulu
clerk Kistna Western Dn. Office
on leave at yeleswaram
C/o. Forest Ranger Upper
yeleswaram
(Godavary Dist.)

Superintending Engineer's Office, II Circle,
Bezwada, 20th July 1899.

No. 3597

EXAMINER,
P. W. ACCOUNTS.
5 AUG 1899

From

Captain W. M. Ellis R.E.
Superintending Engineer,
II Circle,

To

The Chief Engineer
Public Works Department.

Sir,

Enclosures. /
Petition.

I have herewith the honor to forward a petition from K. Venkataratnam Pantulu a clerk in the Public Works Department IV class 3rd grade drawing a monthly pay of Rs. 30/.

2. The facts of the case are :—

This clerk when Sub Division Clerk Cowtaram Sub Division Kistna Eastern Division occupied a thatched shed in the Lock compound at Cowtaram with the knowledge of the Sub Division officer from November 1889 to May 1897 without paying any rent or any rent being claimed — There is no doubt that the clerk occupied it under the bonafide belief that rent-free occupation was permitted — Subsequently other Sub Division clerks similarly occupied the building —

3. The matter was brought to notice by the Examiner in May 1898 who requested that the rent should be fixed and recovery made from the period of construction.
The rent has subsequently been fixed at Rs 1-4-0 monthly.
The claims up to the end of May 1898 are
(a) K. Venkataratnam Pantulu 91 months
(b) C. Subbarow Naidu 8½ months
(c) M. Ramaswamy Naidu 3½ months
I do not think the recovery of these arrears under the circumstances to be legal and in the case of K. Venkataratnam Pantulu the recovery for 91 months after such an interval of time would in my opinion be altogether unjustifiable.

4. The issue of orders by Government in the matter is requested and I recommend that rent be only recovered from the date on which the occupant was informed either directly or indirectly of his liability to payment.

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

Captain R. E.
Superintending Engineer,
Circle.

Vol 5/8

Public Works (1899) Department.

EXAMINER,
P. W. ACCOUNTS.
5 AUG. 1899
No.

CURRENT No. 6023

H/3

B

From The Superintending Engineer
Second Circle

No. 3332 cdy 3/8/99

~~Order~~

To
C

No. 359 W

For favour of remarks.

Dated 20. July 1899.
Received
Registered 24.7.99
Enclosures one Plans & others 3 Add.
Spare copies

SUBJECT.

K. Venkatratnam Pantulu, Clerk IV class 2nd Grade — Forwards the petition of — and recommends that the rent for the occupation of thatched house at Cocanada be recovered only from the date on which the occupant was informed of his liability to payment.

Pl 82
6557/99

No. 983 A/A dated 10th August 1899.

To

W.

As the shed in question evidently cannot be regarded as a "Government -- building" the rules in chapter X volume I of the P.W.D.Code will not apply to it, and the Superintending Engineer's proposal may therefore be accepted.

A. R

Offg: C.

OLL 333 12/4

Ry 10/8/99

BACK PAPERS.

No.	Date.

FURTHER PAPERS.

No.	Date.

seems therefore only fair that rent should be charged. The Supty. Hyr. has fixed the rent at Rs 1-4-0 per mensem. There is no objection to rent being charged although it is not a fort. building & does not come under the rules in chap XI.

If this shed was brought under these rules this is a matter which would have to be reported to the Govt. of India.

Pune
17.F.55.

Lieut
Dy Asst

CW 6557

S.E.W

If the Chief cannot be regarded as a Government building that any rent at all can be charged in it?

W. H. Hall

10/7/11

10/

As the shed is being regularly occupied as a residence by the sub division clerks, it will naturally be repaired from time to time. Unless therefore rent is charged, the whole cost of these repairs will fall on Govt: It