

Public Works (1899) Department.

G.O., No.

910 9

DATED 25 Oct 1899.

[Despatch Abstract.]

Singampatti ^{Perungal} Channel, Innawelly Su,

Approving the suggestion of the S.E.
VI Circle that the Zemindar of
Singampatti be considered to have con-
tributed his share, by work
carried out by himself, towards clearing
breaches in the ———

SUBJECT.

Lingampatti Srinivas
Chb — Submitting copy
of Correspondence in regard
to the contribution to be received
for closing breaches in —
and informing that the
Lingampatti Srinivas may
be considered to have contributed
his share by work carried
out by himself.

Nov. 79

BACK PAPERS.

FURTHER PAPERS

Put

No.	Date.
R 13 T. 1.	29-3-99
R 190-2	17-4-99.

No.	Date.
-----	-------

Copy of Imineelly Collectors' letter.
 No. $\frac{345}{25-4-99}$ to the executive engineer.
 Imineelly Division: -

With reference to your letter no 763 dated 26-2-99, I have the honor to inform you that the Zemindar of Urkad has remitted into the Taluk Treasury, his share of Rs 22-8-n and that the Zemindar of Singampatti has declined to pay his share Rupees 134-8-n on the plea that the necessary repairs to the channel have already been done by himself, and to request that you will be good enough to state whether as stated by the Zemindar of Singampatti, the necessary repairs have been done by him and if there is any necessity to collect the amount from him.

2. The enclosures are returned.

Executive engineer's letter no 3291

dated 7-9-99 in reply to the above.

1. With reference to your no 345/99 dated 25-4-99. I have the honor to inform you that the work done by the Zemindar was simply clearing the channel bed and laying the spoil on the inner slope instead of on the outer. Some work is also done by the department and it is reported by the S.D. Officer that no more work is urgently required. I therefore propose to close the accounts of the work.

2. The value of work done by the department is Rs 31-11-5. From your letter no $\frac{9}{14}$ 199 dated 2-8-99. it appears that half the cost of any work done in the channel must be borne by the Singampatti Zemindar, $\frac{1}{14}$ by the Arkad and $\frac{6}{14}$ by Government. As Arkad

Zemindar has already contributed the amount asked of him, Rs 31-11-5 must be considered to be half the cost of work done in the channel. The Singampatti Zemindar must therefore contribute

Rs

Rupees. 31-11-5. The quantity of work done by him is 19 units of clearance and this at the rate of Rs 1-10-8 (which is more than the quality of the work done deserves) amounts to Rs 31-11-5. He may therefore be considered to have contributed his share in the shape of work and no more demand need be made of him. But the amount of Rs 22-8-11 contributed by Arkad Zemindar is more than he should pay as all the work provided for in the estimate of Rs 180 is not done. I therefore request that Rs 22-8-11 minus $\frac{1}{7}$ of Rs 31-11-5, or Rs 17-15-6 may be returned to him.

no 3583 dated 24-9-99. of 26


It is forwarded to the Superintending Engineer, 6th circle, for information, with reference to his endorsement no 2977 dated 18-4-99, on S.O. no 3412 dated

14-4-99. sanctioning the estimate of
Rs 180 for closing breaches in Sin-
gampatti Perungal channel.

Signed S. Gopalakrishna Iyer
24-9-99.

Executive Engineer

N^o 806 T.N. of 5 October 1899
86-



Copy submitted to the Chief
Engineer for Irrigation. for information,
in continuation of this office letter no
253 T.N dated 28 March 1899, and
with reference to G.O. no 3412 dated
14 April 1899. Under the circum-
stances explained, it may be con-
sidered that the Zemindar of
Singampatti has contributed his
share by work carried out by
himself.

J. V. Roddy Lieut. Col R.E.
Super Engineer, b: circle.