

ADDITIONAL ISSUES

1. Whether the plaintiff proves that the variation in the total quantity of excavation as per the tender and as per the actual, are due to erroneous assessment?
2. Whether the plaintiff proves that he is entitled for the excavation of non tendered item of concretionary lime stone made in claim No.2 at the rate of Rs.125.28 per cubic meter ?
3. Whether the defendant proves that estimation was given after due survey and investigation of canal alignment being approved and taking exploratory core boards as pleaded in para 30 of the written statement?
4. Whether the plaintiff proves that a sum of Rs.66,81,162/- was due as early as on 30.09.2001 and an amount of Rs.25,32,173/- was paid on 30.11.2005, leaving a balance of Rs.41,48,989/- and there is loss of interest?
5. Whether the defendant proves that they are entitled to deduct the cost of cement used for concrete lining in RA Bill No.7?
6. Whether the plaintiff proves that a sum of Rs.1,27,754/-/- was refunded being improper stocking charges collected in RA Billa No.7?
7. Whether the plaintiff is entitled for additional overhead charges of Rs.45,52,362/- for the subsequent tender period?

8. Whether the plaintiff proves that work was completed on 30.06.2002 and refund of EMD and FSD was done only on 31.03.2006, due to which he incurred loss of Rs.10,12,425/-?
9. Whether the suit is barred by limitation?
10. Whether the plaintiff proves that he is entitled for the additional overhead charges subsequent to tender period to the tune of Rs.45,52,362/-?

**(Manjunath Nayak),
Prl. District Judge,
Belagavi.**

**DATED: 04.04.2026
BELAGAVI**