

(1) Number of pages 6.(2) Date of repair 2-7-58.(3) Initials of the Referencer CV

MADRAS RECORD OFFICE.

Government of Madras.

Financial DEPARTMENT.

<i>Letter</i> G.O. No.	<i>508</i>	Press Mis.
<i>35</i> Dated	<i>11-7-</i>	<i>18 62.</i>

*35**4/5*Not to be folded or roughly handled

*Proceedings of the Madras Government, Financial Department,
11th July 1862.*

No. 33. To the Officiating Secretary to the Government of India, Financial Department, dated Fort Saint George, 11th July 1862, No. 508.

I am directed by the Governor in Council to acknowledge the receipt of Mr. Under Secretary Bernard's letter, dated the 16th May last, No. 3,407, noticing certain discrepancies in the Statements of Pensions and Gratuities granted by this Government during the 1st quarter of 1861-62.

2. With respect to cases 1 and 15 in the Pension Statement, I am desired to state that as the difference in excess of the amount calculated according to the average salary for the last five years of their service was only 3 Pies and 8 Pies respectively, the applicants were allowed the benefit of the fractions of the Anna.

1. Kadumiah, Tahsildar.					
Average salary	-	Rupees	107	15	4
Pension at one-third	-	"	35	15	9
Pension allowed	-	"	36	0	0
15. L. Texeira, Examiner.					
Average salary	-	Rupees	70	14	8
Pension at one-half	-	"	35	7	4
Pension allowed	-	"	35	8	0

4. Streenavassa Iyen, Salt Peishcar in Tanjore	Years	31	½
6. Shama Row, Goomastah in Madura	"	25	1
11. Tiruvangada Pillai, Deputy Tahsildar in Tanjore	"	23	9½

3. In regard to cases 4, 6 and 11 of the Gratuity Statement, I have to explain that of the total period of service (31 years) entered against the name of the first No. 4, only 14 years were passed in grades eligible to pension and therefore a gratuity was awarded. In the second case No. 6, the applicant was reported to be fit for further employment. In the third case No. 11, the party had served as Writer in the Military Auditor General's Office for a period of years 18-5-3, and as Deputy Tahsildar in the Tanjore District for years 5-4-23. The former period of service was disallowed as having been passed in the Military Department and not qualifying for Civil Pension; and therefore only a gratuity was awarded to him. This disallowance of service does not appear to have been necessary under the Pension Rules, the applicant not having been borne on the effective strength of the Army, but employed in an Office of Military account. His case will be re-considered.

4. In reference to the remark in paragraph 3 of the letter under reply, that in certain cases the character of the individuals has not been noted, I am directed to observe that the omission was caused by an oversight.

(Signed) A. J. ARBUTHNOT,
Acting Chief Secretary.

N^o 508.

To the Offg. Secretary to the Govt. of India.

Financial Department

Sir,

I am directed by the Governor in Council to acknowledge the receipt of Mr. Under Secretary Bernard's letter dated the 16th May last, N^o 3407, noticing certain discrepancies in the Statements of pensions & gratuities granted by this Govt. during the 1st Quarter of 1861-62.

1. Kadumialu, Tahsildar.
Average salary — Rs. 107-15-4
Pension at one third — 35-15-9
Pension allowed — 36
15. S. Fereira, Examiner.
Average salary — Rs. 70-14-8
Pension at one half — 35-7-4
Pension allowed — 35-8-0

2 With respect to cases 15/5 in the Pension Statement, I am desired to state that as the difference in excess of the amount calculated according to the average salary for the last five years of their service was only 3 pice & 8 pice respectively, the applicants were allowed the benefit of the fractions of the anna.

W. L.

1. Sreenavasa Sanyal, Salt
 Peishcar in Tanjore - 31-1/2
 2. Shama Koul, Soubahdar
 in Madras - 25-1
 11. Simvangaiah Pillai, Dy.
 Tahsildar in Tanjore - 23-9

In regard to cases 4, 6 & 11 of the bi-annuity Statement, I have to explain that of the total period of service (31 years) entered against the name of the first Dy., only 14 years were passed in grades eligible to pension & therefore a gratuity was awarded. In the second case Dy. 6, the applicant was reported to be fit for further employment. In the third case Dy. 11, the party had served as Writer in the Military Auditor General Office for a period of years 18-5-3, & as Deputy Tahsildar in the Tanjore District for years 5-4-23. The former period of service was disallowed as having been passed in the Military Department & not qualifying for civil pension & therefore only a gratuity was awarded to him. This disallowance of service does not appear to have been necessary under the Pension Rules

Rules - the applicant not having been borne on the effective strength of the Army, but employed in an Office of Military account. His case will be reconsidered.

4 In reference to the remark in para 3 of the letter under reply that in certain cases the character of the individuals has not been noted, I am directed to observe that the omission was caused by an oversight.

Fort St. George,
 11th July 1862

W.E.
 12 Copies

Manuscript 1862. 1262

1862.

To the Hon. Secy of the
Dept. of India.

11 July 1862

Offering explanation
with reference to certain
discrepancies noticed by
the Supreme Government
in the statements of the
- - - and - - -
granted by the - - -
- - - during the 1st
Quarter of 1861/62.