M.R.O. 1—77,006—8-6-37.

(1) Number of pages 8

(2) Date of repair 10.5.41

(3) Initials of the Referencer

MADRAS RECORD OFFICE.

Government of Madras.

financial DEPARTMENT.

G.O. No. 273 Press / Mis.

84-85

Dated 29-5- 1868.

5/5

84-85

Not to be folded or roughly handled

Proceedings of the Madras Government, Financial Department,

29th May 1868.

Read again Proceedings of Government, Financial Department, dated 23rd April 1868, No. 202.

No. 84. Read also the following letter from the Accountant General, Madras, to the Chief Secretary to Government, Fort Saint George ; dated Fort Saint George, 12th May 1868, No. 461.

Presidency Audit Department.

With reference to the Order of Government in the Financial Department, No. 202, dated 23rd ultimo, impugning the correctness of the decision given by the Examiner of Claims in respect to the claim to deputation allowance advanced by Mr. G. S. Forbes, 3rd Member of the Board of Revenue, during the absence on privilege leave of Mr. Sim, the 2nd Member, and requesting my opinion thereon, I have the honor to state that this case was previously very carefully considered by me, and it was by my direction that Mr. Donald pronounced the claim inadmissible.

2. The case then chiefly relied upon as bearing out the view taken by this Department was that of Mr. Dickinson, who, being 3rd Judge of the Provincial Court, was gazetted to act as 2nd Judge, and as such claimed deputation allowance for acting in a higher appointment. His claim was, however, disallowed by the Supreme Government on the ground that the duties of the Judges being the same deputation allowance could not be passed to him.

3. Since then two cases more strictly analogous perhaps than the above have been brought to my notice, namely, those of Messrs. W. Elliot and A. Maclean, who were respectively appointed to officiate as 1st and 2nd Member of the Board of Revenue during the absence of Mr. G. D. Drury on medical certificate. In both of these cases the nomination of the officer to act in an appointment of superior emolument was formally announced in the *Gazette*, but in neither was deputation allowance passed to the acting officer. In fact, in no single instance have I been able to discover on the records of my office that deputation allowance has been passed to any officer under similar circumstances, the rule invariably acted upon being that where the duties are the same deputation allowance is not admissible.

4. With reference to the 4th paragraph of the Order of Government, I beg to observe that the rule therein alluded to, as prohibiting deputation allowance being drawn till after the expiration of one month, has been rescinded.

No. 85. ORDER THEREON, 29th May 1868, No. 273.

The Governor in Council confirms the view taken by the Accountant General in the foregoing letter, that Mr. G. S. Forbes, 3rd Member of the Board of Revenue, is not entitled to any deputation allowance for acting for the 2nd Member, Mr. Sim, during his absence on privilege leave.

(True Extract).

Chief Secretary.

To G. S. Forbes, Esq.
To the Revenue Department.
,, Accountant General.
,, Examiner of Claims.

Exd. J. Tulloch.

Pressy Audit.
~~Book~~ Department.

No. 461.

Fort Saint George,
Accountant General's Office,
12th May 1868.

From The Accountant General,
to the Government of Madras.

To The Chief Secretary to Government
Financial Department

Sir,

With reference to the Order of Government in the Financial Department No. 202 dated 23d. ultimo impugning the correctness of the decision given by the Examiner of Claims in respect to the claim to deputation allowance advanced by Mr. G. S. Forbes, 3d. Member of the Board of Revenue during the absence on privilege leave of Mr. Sim, the 2d. Member, and requesting my opinion thereon, I have the honor to state that this case was previously very carefully considered by me, and it was by my direction that Mr. Donald pronounced the claim inadmissible.

The case then chiefly relied upon as bearing out the view taken by this Department was that of Mr. Dickinson who being 3d. Judge of the Provincial Court was gazetted to act as 2d. Judge and as such claimed deputation allowance for acting in a higher appointment. His claim was however disallowed by the Supreme Government on the ground that the duties of the Judges being the same deputation allowance could not be passed to him.

Since then two cases more strictly analogous perhaps than the above have been brought to my notice namely those of Mr. W. Elliot & a Maclean who were respectively appointed to officiate as 1st. and 2d. Member of the Board of Revenue during the absence of Mr. G. D. Drury on Medical Certificate. In both of these cases the nomination of the officer to act in an appointment of superior emolument was formally announced in the Gazette, but in neither was deputation allowance passed to the acting Officer. In fact in no single instance have I been able to discover on the records of my office that deputation allowance has been passed to any Officer under similar circumstances the rule invariably acted upon being that where the duties are the same deputation allowance is not admissible.-

With reference to the 4th. para of the order of Government I beg to observe that the rule therein alluded to as prohibiting deputation allowance being drawn till after the Expiration of one month has been rescinded.-

I have the honor to be,
Sir
Your most Obedt. Servt.

F. Cruickshank
Accountant General

Cfd.
C. Nagabhushanam

Financial Department.

No. 240.

From The Accountant General

Dated 12th May 1868.

FOR ORDERS.

It appears to me that the Govt. Servant is right.

Rule as I think.

Pro. 23 April 68 34-35

Financial 1868 department

From Pros. of Insay.
The Accountant General

To
The Chief Secretary
to Government
Fin. Dept.

D/ 12th
R/ 13th } For orders
Insy

No. 461

No 240

with reference to G.C. 23 April 68 No 202 Fin. Dept., Submits his opinion upon the decision of the Board of Revenue that Mr. Forbes the 3rd Member of the Board of Revenue was not entitled to Deputation while acting as 2nd Member for Mr. Sim on leave.

With an order.

Read again Pro. of Govt. Financial dated 23rd April 68 - No 202

29th May 1868 No. 273.

His Excellency in Council confirms the view taken by the Accountant General in the foregoing letter, that Mr. G. S. Forbes, 3rd Member of the Board of Revenue, is not entitled to any deputation allowance for acting for the 2nd Member Mr. Sim, during his absence on privilege leave.

To G. S. Forbes Esqr.
-"- Revenue Department
-"- Accountant General
-"- Examiner of Claims

dated 6/6

C 18 May 1868

84. 85.