

No. 112. Read the following Proceedings of the Board of Revenue, dated 5th March 1872, No. 412:—

Read the following letter from the Superintending Engineer, 3rd Division, to the Secretary to Government, Public Works Department, Fort St. George, dated Ramalkotta, 26th January 1872, No. 1,954.

WITH reference to Government Order No. 112 of 15th January 1872, I have the honour to forward the original estimate and specification which were submitted to Government by my predecessor in August 1863, and were sanctioned in Government Order No. 1,593 of 31st August 1863 in the Revenue Department.

2. The item of wood-work is not included in the estimate, and on this point I would call your attention to Government Order No. 3,754 of 3rd December 1867 and No. 612 of 22nd February 1868. The woods used were obtained from the Forest Department, and were Innomuddy, Vengay, and Mangoe.

3. As regards the plastering having given way, I believe it has been chiefly caused by the water from the roof having come down through the walls, which are of stone-in-clay. The flooring was of dry lime-stone, (small pieces of nodular limestone) rammed and plastered over; this as soon as one hole shows soon gives way if there is much traffic over it. Asphalting was proposed in order to stop leakage down the walls, and in hopes of keeping the white-ants from the roof. I do not think that the mere building the upper portions of the walls of brick-in-chunam would prevent the ants from getting to the roof, as, after getting so high, I believe they would get through the plaster and then go up the wall.

4. On the whole, I would recommend that this building be condemned, and I would suggest that a new Cutcherry should be built near the Rajampett Railway Station. I am aware that in their Order No. 1,003 of 9th June 1863, Government approved of Pullumpett being fixed upon as the Cusbah of the taluq; but I think Messrs. Wedderburn and McQuhae were misled by the then Tahsildar who had a house and a large quantity of land at Pullumpett, and I believe that, if the question was now referred to the Revenue Department, the Collector would agree with me that Pullumpett is not the best site for the Cusbah. It is about  $2\frac{1}{2}$  miles from the nearest Railway Station (Reddypully) from which, I believe, it is also at times cut off by freshes in the Poolunga river; it has not increased in size, whereas I am told Rajampett has. It is certainly more central than Rajampett; but I think this should not be considered, as there is a Deputy-Sub-Magistrate at Chitwail.

TRANSFERRED to the Revenue Department with a view to the proposal of the Superintending Engineer for building a new Cutcherry being considered in that department. There can be little doubt that it would be injudicious to spend much in the repair of the existing building.

(Signed) J. CARPENDALE, Colonel, R.E.,  
5th February 1872. Secretary to Government, P.W.D.

REFERRED to the Board of Revenue for their remarks.

(Signed) W. HUDLESTON,  
6th February 1872. Secretary to Government.

*Proceedings of the Madras Government, Revenue Department,  
11th April 1872.*

As the site of the Pullumpett Catcherry was approved by Government on a distinct statement by the local officers of its superiority to Rajampett, the Board are not prepared to recommend to Government the abandonment of the building so recently erected at the former place by the Department Public Works at a cost of over 8,000 Rupees, on the sole ground that Rajampett is two miles nearer to the Railway and that the Pullumpett Catcherry was badly built.

2. If the cost of asphaltting the floors (or laying them in brick), for replacing damaged timber, and for finishing the walls with brick-in-chunam, would of course fall far short of that of a new building, the repair of the Pullumpett Office should be undertaken, the Board think, at once.

No. 113. ORDER THEREON, 11th April 1872, No. 593.

Miscellaneous.

COMMUNICATED to the Department Public Works, with the request that orders may be issued to proceed at once

with the repairs of the Office at Pullumpett.

2. The responsibility for the bad work in the first instance should be brought home to the proper person.

(True Extract.)

(Signed)

W. HUDLESTON,

Officiating Chief Secretary.

To the Public Works Department.  
.. the Board of Revenue.

No. 1954.

Superintending Engineer's Office.

3rd Division.

Camp Shone Ravalhotta Talook

Stannool District.

The 26th January 1872.

From,

The Superintending Engineer

3rd Division.

To,

The Secretary to Government

Enclosures. 2

Public Works Department

Fort Saint George.

Sir,

In the reference to G.O. No. 112 of 16<sup>th</sup> Jan<sup>y</sup> 1872, I have the honor to forward the original Estimate and Specification which were submitted to Government by my predecessor in August 1863 and were sanctioned in G.O. No. 16 of 2<sup>nd</sup> August 1863 in the Revenue Department.

The item of wood-work is not included in the Estimate and on this point I would call your attention to Government Order No. 3754 of 3<sup>rd</sup> December 1867 and G.O. No. 222 of 22<sup>nd</sup> February 1868. The woods used were obtained from the Forest Department and were Annamuddy, Vengay and Mangor.

As regards the plastering having given way I believe it has been chiefly caused by the water from the roof having come down through the walls which are of stone in clay. The flooring was of dry lime stone (small pieces of nodular limestone) rammed and plastered over. This, as soon as one hole shows, soon gives way if there is much traffic over it. Asphaltting was proposed in order to stop leakage down the walls and in hopes of keeping the white out from the roof. I do not think that the

more building the upper part of  
brick on chimney would prevent the ants from getting  
to the roof as, after getting so high, I believe they  
would get through the plaster and then go up the  
wall.

As the whole, I would recommend, that this  
Building be condemned and I would suggest,  
that a new Cutcherry should be built near the  
Rajampet Railway Station. I am aware that  
in this order of 1003 of 9th June 1863, Government ap-  
proved of Rajampet being fixed upon as the pusbah  
of the Taluk, but I think all for Wedderburn and all others  
were misled by the then Talukdar who had a house  
and a large quantity of land at Rajampet and  
I believe, that if the question was now referred to  
the Revenue Department, the collector would agree  
with me that Rajampet is not the best site for  
the pusbah. It is about 2 1/2 miles from the nearest  
Railway Station (Reddygully) from which, I believe,  
it is also at times cut off by freshets in the Poolingga  
River. It has not increased in size whereas I am  
told Rajampet has. It is certainly more central  
than Rajampet but I think it should not be considered  
as there is a Deputy Sub Magistrate at Elitwail.

I have & Y

W. C. C. S. S. S.  
Superintendent Engineer &c

No. 412.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE BOARD OF REVENUE, dated 5th March 1872.

Read the following letter from Lieutenant-Colonel A. S. MOBERLY, R. E.,  
Superintending Engineer, 3rd Division, to the Secretary to Government,  
Public Works Department, Fort Saint George, dated Ramalkotta, 26th  
January 1872, No. 1,954:—

WITH reference to Government Order, No. 112 of 15th January 1872, I have  
the honour to forward the original Estimate and Specification which were submitted  
to Government by my predecessor in August 1863, and were sanctioned in Govern-  
ment Order, No. 1,593, of 31st August 1863, in the Revenue Department.

2. The item of wood-work is not included in the estimate, and on this point  
I would call your attention to Government Order, No. 3,754 of 3rd December 1867,  
and No. 612 of 22nd February 1868. The woods used were obtained from the  
Forest Department, and were Innomuddy, Vengay and Mangoe.

3. As regards the plastering having given way, I believe it has been chiefly  
caused by the water from the roof having come down through the walls which are  
of stone in clay. The flooring was of dry lime stone, (small pieces of nodular  
limestone) rammed and plastered over: this as soon as one hole shows, soon gives  
way if there is much traffic over it. Asphalting was proposed in order to stop  
leakage down the walls, and in hopes of keeping the white ants from the roof. I  
do not think that the mere building the upper portions of the walls of brick in  
chunam would prevent the ants from getting to the roof as, after getting so high, I  
believe they would get through the plaster and then go up the wall.

4. On the whole, I would recommend, that this building be condemned, and  
I would suggest that a new Cutcherry should be built near the Rajampett Railway  
Station. I am aware that in their Order, No. 1,003 of 9th June 1863, Government  
approved of Pullumpett being fixed upon as the Cusbah of the taluq, but I think  
Messrs. Wedderburn and McQuhae were misled by the then Tahsildar who had a  
house and a large quantity of land at Pullumpett, and I believe, that if the ques-  
tion was now referred to the Revenue Department, the Collector would agree with  
me that Pullumpett is not the best site for the Cusbah. It is about 2½ miles from  
the nearest Railway Station (Reddypully) from which, I believe, it is also at times  
cut off by freshes in the Poolunga river; it has not increased in size whereas, I  
am told Rajampett has. It is certainly more central than Rajampett, but I think  
this should not be considered, as there is a Deputy Sub-Magistrate at Chitwail.

TRANSFERRED to the Revenue Department with a view to the proposal of the  
Superintending Engineer for building a new Cutcherry being considered in that  
Department. There can be little doubt that it would be injudicious to spend much  
in the repair of the existing building.

5th February 1872.

(Signed) J. CARPENDALE, Colonel, R. E.,  
Secretary to Government, P. W. D.

REFERRED to the Board of Revenue for their remarks.

6th February 1872.

(Signed) W. HUDLESTON,  
Secretary to Government.

To,

The Secretary to Government.  
Public Works Department.  
Fort Saint George.

3rd Division.

The Superintending Engineer

From, H. 445.

H. 445 = 1874. 72. 16/11

No. 1954

Dated 26 January 1872.  
Received 27 January 1872.

Forwarding original Estimate  
with plan for building a  
new Cutcherry at Pullumpett  
and recommending that the  
house be built near the  
Rajampett Railway Station  
for the reasons assigned.

Approved by the Supt. Engr.

For this purpose.

6th Feb 72. H. 445.

Received 7th February 1872  
Entered & Returned 10.

J. Grose  
Secretary

As the site of the Pullumpett Cutcherry was approved by Government on a distinct statement by the local officers of its superiority to Rajampett, the Board are not prepared to recommend to Government the abandonment of the building so recently erected at the former place by the Department Public Works at a cost of over 8,000 Rupees, on the sole ground that Rajampett is two miles nearer to the Railway and that the Pullumpett Cutcherry was badly built.

2. If the cost of asphaltting the floors (or laying them in brick) for replacing damaged timber and for finishing the walls with brick in chunam, would of course fall far short of that of a new building, The repair of the Pullumpett office should be undertaken, the Board think, at once.

(A true Copy and Extract.)

# 593

Secretary.

*I have written to the S.W. & A. the request that the office may be removed to Rajampett. The responsibility for the bad work in the first instance is entirely that of the Board of Revenue. S.W. & A. 12-4-72*

To the Officiating Chief Secretary to Government, Revenue Department,

with two enclosures.

the Collector of Kurnool.

21. Oct. 4. Dept. Secy. 13 April 72  
14. Board of Rev.

Ed. G. A. Turton.

*Mr. P. J. ... will be coming to the S.W. & A. ... thinking that the Cutcherry at Rajampett should be put in order on the same site as the old one.*

Cutcherry.—Proposal of Superintending Engineer, 3rd Division, to abandon existing Cutcherry District, and to build a new one near Rajampett Railway Station, disapproved. Opinion expressed that repair of Pullumpett Cutcherry should be undertaken at once.

MARCH.  
No. 412.

Received 9-

24/10/91 March 172

Encl. 1

PROCEEDINGS, 5TH MARCH 1872, No. 412.

Board of Revenue,  
MADRAS.

Passage 1872. 14/4/72

# 593