

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 extra item of concretionary lime stone, made in claim No.2 at the rate of Rs.119/- 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 defendant proves that they are entitled to deduct the cost of cement used for concrete lining in RA Bill No.7?
5. Whether the defendant proves that stocking charges at the rate of Rs.4.70/- per cubic meter is payable?
6. Whether the plaintiff proves that a sum of Rs.3,45,935/- was refunded being improper stocking charges collected in RA Bill No.7?
7. Whether the defendant proves that the project got delayed due to default of the plaintiff?
8. Whether the plaintiff proves that work was completed on 24.09.2002 and refund of EMD and FSD was made only on 31.03.2006, due to which, he incurred loss of Rs.9,36,964/-

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.35,47,342/-?

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

DATED: 04.04.2026
BELAGAVI