Archives 1—10,000—6-10-76.

(1) Number of pages 4

(2) Date of repair 6.6.86

(3) Initials of the Referencer [illegible]

# TAMIL NADU ARCHIVES

## GOVERNMENT OF TAMIL NADU

Rev. DEPARTMENT

| | |
|---|---|
| G.O. No. / B.P. No. 2246 | Press. / Mis. |
| Dated 20.4.1877 | ~~197~~ . |

*Not to be folded or roughly handled*

*Proceedings of the Madras Government, Public Works Department,*
*10th April* 1877. *No.* 1,249.

Read the following papers:—

No. 280. From J. O'SHAUGHNESSY, Esq., District Engineer, Nellore, to the Acting Joint Secretary to Government, Public Works Department, Buildings and Roads Branch, dated Nellore, 24th March 1877, No. 212.

In reference to your letter No. 778, dated 21st March 1877, I have the honor to enclose copy of communication addressed by me to Messrs. Chockalingum Pillay and Co. When I receive a reply to that communication, I shall forward the bill referred to without any delay; in the mean time there is no objection that I know of to paying the Contractors Rupees 75,000 in part of their bill.

---

From the District Engineer, Nellore, to the Executive Officer, Kottapatam Division, dated 21st March 1877, No. 2,350.

In reference to G.O., dated 19th December 1876, No. 3,485, I have the honor to request such information as you are able to give on the following points connected with Messrs. Chockalingum Pillay and Co.'s contract.

I.—Was the rice taken over in the first instance by the Revenue Department as directed in the Government Order under reference?

II.—Were samples of the rice tendered forwarded for comparison with the rice delivered, and was such a comparison made, if so by whom?

III.—On what date was the rice delivered at Kottapatam and at Pakala?

IV.—Why was 8,400 bags delivered at Kottapatam, when only 4,200 bags were contracted for at that port?

V.—By whose request and on what authority did you take charge of the rice?

VI.—At whose cost was the rice landed and stored?

VII.—What reason, if any, have the Contractors given for not delivering rice at Kanuparthy according to their agreement?

VIII.—Have they delivered rice at Ramapatam according to agreement and to whom?

(Signed) J. O'SHAUGHNESSY,
District Engineer, Nellore.

---

Forwarded to Messrs. Chockalingum Pillay and Co., with a request that they will favor the undersigned with detailed information on the several points mentioned.

(Signed) J. O'SHAUGHNESSY,
District Engineer, Nellore.

Nellore,
21st March 1877.

---

No. 280-A. From J. O'SHAUGHNESSY, Esq., District Engineer, Nellore, to the Acting Joint Secretary to Government, Public Works Department, Buildings and Roads Branch, dated Nellore, 4th April 1877, No. 28.

In continuation of my letter No. 212, dated 24th March 1877, I have the honor to forward Messrs. Chockalingum Pillay and Co.'s reply to the communication I made to them on the subject of their contract for the supply of rice to the Coast Canal.

I beg to forward copy of Lieutenant Rawson's reply to a similar communication to him on the same subject.

I am not quite satisfied that the terms of the contract have been sufficiently fulfilled to enable me to countersign the bills.

I do not think it was optional to the Contractors to deliver 8,400 bags of rice at Kottapatam or at Kanuparthy; I read this part of the agreement as giving the Contractors the option of delivering the first cargo of 4,200 bags either at Kottapatam or Kanuparthy, and the second cargo of 4,200 bags at either of those places at which the first cargo was not delivered.

I am also of opinion that the terms of the contract in regard to the examination of the rice have not been fulfilled. This may not be the fault of the Contractors, but their statement that the rice was compared with the sample, &c., is so far as the 4,200 bags delivered at Pakala is concerned apparently incorrect.

I have addressed the Collector on the subject,* but I have not received his reply yet. In order to save delay I now send all the information I possess regarding it, and if you think I may in the face of Lieutenant Rawson's report sign the bills I shall do so, immediately I hear from you to that effect.

* *Vide* Chief Engineer's memorandum, No. 101, dated 16th January 1877.

I would observe in regard to the rice at Ramapatam that the 15 Rupees Gumastah who is styled Sea Customs Superintendent of that Port is not, in my opinion, sufficiently intelligent to decide a matter involving a sum of between 30,000 and 40,000 Rupees. The Customs Superintendent at Kottapatam is a man of higher standing and position, but I doubt if it was the intention of Government to leave the passing of bills for such large amounts to either of those officers.

---

From the Officer in charge, Kottapatam Division, to the District Engineer, Nellore, dated 25th March 1877, No. 37.

With reference to your No. 2,350, dated 21st instant, I have the honor to give the following replies to the questions in it:—

I.—The rice landed at Kottapatam was in the first instance taken in charge by the Sea Customs Superintendent. At Pakala the rice was landed on the beach by the Contractor, who wrote to me saying that no one would receive charge of it; I therefore ordered the Sub-Divisional Officer to take charge of it himself directly from the Contractor.

II.—Samples of the rice tendered were compared with the rice delivered by the Sea Customs Superintendent at Kottapatam, and was found to be satisfactory. The rice at Pakala was, I believe, not compared with the samples.

III.—The rice was taken over from the Sea Customs Superintendent at Kottapatam on the 13th February. At Pakala from the Contractor on the 14th February.

IV.—According to the written contract signed by General Walker, shown to me by the Contractor, it appeared that the rice could be delivered at *either* Kottapatam or Kanuparthy.

V.—The Sub-Collector had requested me to take over *all* Government rice for the Canal works before this particular rice arrived.

The rice at Pakala was taken over by me at the request of the Contractor, as he stated that no one else would do so.

VI.—The rice was landed on the beach at the Contractor's cost. We paid for storing it in the godowns.

VII.—The contract does not appear to specify that rice must be landed at Kanuparthy.

VIII.—I do not know anything about the rice at Ramapatam beyond the fact that the rice intended for that place was brought to Kottapatam at the same time that the rice for Kottapatam came here.

(Signed) C. C. RAWSON, Lieut., R.E.,
Officer in charge, Kottapatam Division.

*Proceedings of the Madras Government, Public Works Department,*
*10th April* 1877. *No.* 1,249.

From R. P. CHOCKALINGUM PILLAY and Co., to J. O'SHAUGHNESSY, Esq., District Engineer, Nellore, dated Madras, 26th March 1877.

We have the honor to acknowledge memorandum No. 349, dated 21st March 1877, forwarding true copy of your letter No. 2,350, dated 21st March 1877, to the address of the officer in charge of Kottapatam Range, containing certain queries to be replied by that officer in connection with our contract for the supply of rice for the ports at Nellore. Reference of the queries having been made to us we beg respectfully to state—

I.—The Sea Customs Superintendent took charge of the rice from us and gave us a receipt for its correct delivery, which receipt the Range Officer took charge of.

II.—Samples of rice were tendered for comparison with the rice delivered. The comparison was made, and made by the Sea Customs Superintendent, the Village Munsiff, and two Native merchants appointed by the Revenue authorities.

III.—At Kottapatam on January 30th, 1877.

At Pakala on February 9th, 1877.

IV.—Eight thousand and four hundred bags were delivered at Kottapatam, in accordance with the instructions of Government, viz., "delivery of the first and second cargoes of 4,200 bags each, to be made either at Kanuparthy or Kottapatam."

V.—To be replied by the Range Officer.

VI.—The cost of only landing the rice on the beach was incurred by us.

VII.—Please refer to reply No. IV above.

VIII.—The rice for Ramapatam was ready for delivery at that port on the 9th instant, but as far as we are aware it has not yet been taken charge of by the Sea Customs Superintendent; notice was duly given to this officer of the rice being ready for delivery, but he was prevented through indisposition from taking charge.

We trust that the explanation submitted above will be found satisfactory, and that you will be pleased to see to the early disposal of our bill, as the delay is causing us much loss by way of interest on the amount.

---

No. 281. Order thereon, 10th April 1877, No. 1,249.

ACCOUNT, No. 9.

The Government consider that if the District Engineer is satisfied that rice of the quantity and quality contracted for has been delivered at the different places in the Nellore District, he should furnish the Contractor with the necessary receipts as early as possible.

2. It is observed that the Contractor was not bound by the contract to deliver the second cargo of 4,200 bags at Kanuparthy, he having delivered the first cargo at Kottapatam, and that he reported that 8,400 bags had been delivered by him at the last named place.

(True Extract.)

Colonel, R.E.,
Secy. to Govt., P.W.D.

To the District Engineer, Nellore.
" Revenue Department.

Exd. E. C. Shunker.

Spare Copies

Rev. 1877 Sept.
2246 72, 2590

Govt. of 1877 Madras.

PUBLIC WORKS.

To

THE DISTRICT ENGINEER,
NELLORE.
&c., &c., &c.

Dated April 10th.

Issued

Recd. 17.

Encl.

G. O., 10th April 1877, No. 1,249.

APRIL.

Nos. 280-281.

Rec. 12 Apl 77

Book 4 47

№ 2246

Communicated, to be returned

20 April/77-

Rice supplied to East Coast Canal.—The District Engineer, Nellore, instructed to furnish Messrs. Chokalingum Pillay and Co. with the necessary receipts as early as possible for ...