M.R.O. 1—77,006—8-6-37.

(1) Number of pages_____

(2) Date of repair_____

(3) Initials of the Referencer_____

MADRAS RECORD OFFICE.

Government of Madras.

Financial DEPARTMENT.

G.O. No. 1551 Press ~~Mis.~~

215-216

Dated 24-10- 1873.

3%/31

Not to be folded or roughly handled

S.J.M

25-4-98

Proceedings of the Madras Government, Financial Department,
24th October 1873.

No. 215. Read the following letter from G. S. SAGE, Esq., District Engineer, Cuddapah, to Colonel G. W. WALKER, R.E., Secretary to Government, Public Works Department, Fort St. George, dated Cuddapah, 14th July 1873, No. 653 :—

In reply to your Memorandum, No. 1595, of 10th instant, I have the honour to return the papers therewith received, and to inform you that the leave asked for was not granted because the man's conduct had been so bad, he did no work, ignored his Range Officer by not replying to letters or carrying out orders sent to him; he had in his possession plans, &c., the result of two years' surveying, which the Range Officer could not get him to deliver up or complete; also the case being a civil one could be defended by Vakeel.

2. The man had had leave before for the same purpose, and in June 1872 was refused leave by Major Vertue when he absented himself and was warned he would be dismissed if it occurred again.

3. Under these circumstances, I trust the Government will allow his dismissal to stand instead of accepting his resignation, the evil results of which I am now experiencing in having employed a man as Local Fund Overseer who had been allowed to resign his Taluq Overseership; he is utterly worthless I find, and on inquiry it appears he should have been dismissed originally, and the present trouble saved. I am sorry to say there are several men still in the district who require dismissal, and who have been warned.

Referred to the Financial Department.

(Signed) G. W. WALKER, Colonel, R.E.,
Secretary to Government, P.W.D.

No. 216. ORDER THEREON, 24th October 1873, No. 1551.

Section 24, Act IV. of 1871, vests in the President of Local Fund Boards the removal of Local Fund servants from their employment, but it is not clear that in the present instance the order of dismissal emanated from the President although enclosure C shows that he declined to entertain a petition for restoration. The Collector will report on this point.

(True Extract.)

Chief Secretary.

To the Board of Revenue.
,, Collector of Cuddapah.

Exd. J. Wright.

Govt. of [1873] Madras.

FINANCIAL.

To

The BOARD OF REVENUE,
&c., &c.

Dated October, 24th.

Read.

G.O., 24th October 1873, No. 1551.

OCTOBER.
Nos. 215-216.

Cuddapah District Local Funds.—Inquiry made of the Collector as to the authority from whom the order of dismissal of Overseer Veerabudrah Moodely from the service emanated.

1873

To

The Right Honorable the Governor
in Council
Fort St. George

The humble petition of
V. Veerabudrah Moodely late
Local Fund Overseer,
Budvail now Sidhout Range
Cuddapah District.

Most humbly Sheweth,

That your Lordships humble
Petitioner most respectfully begs to represent
that he entered the Department Public Works
in the year 1859 as Mistry on the Nundicanam
Chaut works and was promoted to the post of
Writer and Accountant, which he held till
he joined the Madras Irrigation and Canal
Company in the year 1862 consequent on the
abolition of the petitioner's Range.

Having served in the Irrigation and
Canal Company for a period of six years
your Lordships humble petitioner was in
year 1868 appointed Local Fund Overseer
the Budvail now Sidhout Range and was

performed his duties with the greatest care and diligence.

That your Lordship's humble petitioner while suffering from severe illness in December last received the Summons marked A to attend the Civil Court at Burnpore. As he was in a position not to leave his bed he was till the 30th idem prevented from making an application for leave to the Range Officer.

Your Lordships petitioner that on the 1st of January last proceeded to Outimittah the Range Officer's Head Quarters in compliance to an order received on the 1st January last from the Range Officer directing him to attend at the Heads Quarters and to represent his case in person and obtain leave. The Range Officer having left his Head Quarters the same day the petitioner was not able to see the Range Officer.

As the hearing of the Petitioner's case was already postponed at his request from 4th to 9th January last and that as he was well aware that a further postponement would not be allowed and being apprehensive that his absence at the time of hearing will lead to risk the loss of his [illegible] landed property worth about £600 Rs. Your

Lordships petitioner was constrained to leave District, telling his brother to deliver over the instruments in anticipation of leave being granted to him.

That on your Lordships petitioner being informed on his return to the District, that he had been dismissed he presented a petition to the District Engineer who has granted him the endorsement marked B.

As the endorsement above alluded to has no reference whatever to your Lordships humble petitioner's conduct he presented a [illegible] President of the Local Fund Board whose endorsement is marked C.

That as your Lordship's humble petitioner found no alternate but to prefer his last appeal to your Lordships he wrote vide enclosure marked D. on the 5th March last to the Range Officer requesting to be furnished with Copies of &c &c relating to the petitioner's conduct & qualification from the quarterly as well as annual returns ever since the commencement of his service in Cuddapah District. Finding it inexpedient to lose any more time and being quite destitute

of all means of support, your Lordship's humble petitioner throws himself, at your mercy in the firm conviction that your Lordship will call for the papers alluded to in the above paragraph and after a thorough investigation of the case render him justice, as your Lordship's humble petitioner will otherwise be compelled to drag a miserable existence in this wide world, if he is left in his present helpless situation after a long service in the Department Public works burdened as he is with a large family and professed of no gratifications to enter any other Department at his present advanced age of years.

For which act of benevolence and kindness your Lordship's humble petitioner shall ever pray.

V. Veerabudrah Mond.

Asst. Asst. Civil Surgeon

Rudravaram Mond. & Taluk Cuddapah District

Patcherla

25th January 1873

P.W. 1873

1873
3704

A

True Copy

V. Veerabudrah Mond.

Madras Irrigation & Canal Co.

The bearer Veerabudrah Iyoor has been employed in my Office as writer and Timekeeper for a period of upwards of nine Months. He has been regular in his attentuence and Carefull and attentive to his duties. He leaves us on my departure from Kurnool, being transfer-red to another Range.

Kurnool
10th February 1864

/Signed/ J. Partridge
Asst. Engr.

Kurnool 6th April 1864

The bearer Veerab[illegible] Iyoor has been employed under me in [illegible] which time he has be[illegible] to his duties he can Level and Survey and is a good writer and accountant.

/Signed/ J. Partridge
Sub. Assts. to Engineer

Kurnool 6th June 1864

The bearer [illegible] Iyoor has served under me as Superintendant of works for two years the last 9 months found him willing & attentive to his duties, whether measuring or laying

[illegible] can also Level and Survey, he is also a first rate Office man [illegible] given a very [illegible] charge of the 3rd Range Hindry Division Madras Irrigation and Canal Company —

/Signed/ L. D. Andrews
Sub Engineer

Camp Ludwaud 5th October 1865.

Madras Irrigation & Canal Company

This is to certify Vellore Veerabudrah Mooty served the above Company as Superintendent for the period of two years and three months during which time he gave satisfaction in the discharge of [illegible] entrusted to him. His services are dispensed with on account of the late reductions in the Establishment of the Hindry Division —

/Signed/ P. Hudson
Sub Assistant Engineer

Madras Irrigation & Canal Company
Hindry Division Rumnad 22 October 1868

No. 111

This is to certify that Veerabudrah Mooty has been in the employ of this Company as a Survey for the last six years. He can read Level and Survey as he also manages Coolies on Canal work well and is a steady willing —

/Signed/ P. C. Pillai
Executive Engineer

Madras Irrigation & Canal Company
Hindry Division

V. Veerabudrah Mooty has been with me as a Surveyor & I have found him able to Level and Survey Rapidly and Correctly and under Supervision he is quite Competent to Superintend and measure up works and Cuttings —

Rumnad
1st January 1870

/Signed/ H. St. Rivett
Executive Engineer

From

The Submission Chief
Poddature Range

To

The Superintending Engineer
S. Division

Sir

With reference to your Circular No. 3714 of 30th ultimo I beg to report that Local Fund Overseer Vellore Veerabudrah Mooty can Survey and Level correctly and is a neat Draughtsman.

I Consider him to be well up in his

Kandy to remain
&c
April 1870 — / Signed G. W. Lewis
Superintendent in charge of
Proddatur Range

(True Copy)
for Conservator of Forests
Late Coast Trunk Overseer
Burmah Range

P.M. 4th/73.

From

The Deputy Conservator
Late Coast Trunk Overseer
Burmah Range

No,

To The District Superintendent
Cuddapah District

Honored Sir

Humbly beg to bring to yours honors kind consideration the following few lines and pray that it will meet with your favours and judgement.

I received a Summons Criminal Court which compelled me to apply for leave. Consequently I have done to my Range Officer Mr. Selow with enclosing Summons for his information in original on the 30th December 1872 and awaited the reply till the 7th January 1873 as the commanded date of the Summons viz 4th January 1873 was fail. I had to request the court for a postponment till the 9th finding that this time is also to be failed for reasons stated above and finding no other means of now attending and also to the threat of the warrant and other law suits compelled to depot my departure and begged

Range Officer to take the necessity into consideration of my leaving the Talug in anticipation of Sanction. I have also done this in the idea that it will be granted without pay at least.

2d. I returned as soon as possibly I could from Kurnool on the 22d January 1870 when I was given to understand that my fate ended with the removal from the Department.

3d. I tried to meet your honor in circuit but I found no opportunity of seing and explaining the matter verbally, hearing this day your honor is camped at this place I humbly pray to kindly view this petition and beg that you may take it into your honors deep consideration and reentertain me or accept my resignation and Relieve me with good character so that I may find my pay elsewhere.

I am a very poor man burden with big family and Children and employed ever since the establishment of the Local Fund boards.

I beg to remain

Honored Sir

Your most Obedient & humbly Servant

Nundigalumpetta } [Signed] V. Veerabudrah Chetty
6th February 1873 } Tahsildar Local Fund Overseer

Budvail Range

No. 547 Memo

Petitioner is informed he has been dismissed for absenting himself without leave, he was on Enteimettah on 6th January & knew perfectly well his leave had been refused as he naterally asked Office people who told him so. Further he passed the Range Officer on road on the morning of 6th Instant recognizing him as he should have done when he would have been told his leave was not sanctioned. He wrote to Range Officer on 6th reporting he had given all government property in charge to his Range Office such not being the case. This is the second time he has absented himself without leave & as his conduct generally has been bad he has been dismissed. He received his Summons on 12th December 72 and never sent slip to Range Officer applying for leave till 30th December 1872. Evidently giving little time as possible to obtain a reply to his application instead of applying at once. his behavior has been highly improper.

[Signed] G. L. Stage
District Engineer

Cuddapah
6th March 1873

(True Copy)
V. Veerabudrah Chetty

No. 1 of 1872/173

No,

The President of the
Local Fund Board of Loudoun
Circle

Most Honored Sir

With due respect and hu
Submission I beg permission to approach
honor armed with these few humble lines in
hopes of gaining the object of my ambetion from
your honor's generous hands.

2 By your honors order I received to Submit
that I had the misfortune of being removed from
Ivent Public works for no fault of mine

The only reason assigned for my removal
is my absence from my Salug for a Short time
without leave.

From the accompanying papers it will
found that though I applied to the Range Offi
a Short leave and waited sufficiently long
that Gentleman was not kind enough to grant
me the required leave.

No 22 with enclosure 5
Summons
No 55 lost by
Can be obtained in
Range Office

The leave I applied for was so urgent
and necessary that I was obliged to leave my
station in anticipation of the leave being sanctio
ed and report the same to the Range Office

I am sorry to say that such a simple fault of mine as the present one should be visited by so severe a punishment is nothing but effect of my misfortune and in my humble opinion it is more than I can bare.

Some allusion is made there in the letter to your honor of my general conduct. I beg permission to take this opportunity of calling for all Quarterly reports of the Range Officers noted in the margin* from the year 1868 till 1872. May which would prove to your honor that my character was unsullied and was always taken to be what it ought to be. I further beg to say that the District Engineer being new to the District was misled by the reports of the Range Officers who is not in good terms with me in recommending for my removal. I am sure if the District Engineer had taken the trouble of looking into the Quarterly reports referred above he would not have recommended my removal.

So I have no other means of livelihood and as I am poor and unassisted by any I pray that my miserable condition may deserve your honors kind and favourable consideration

* Mr Lewis
Mr Thorpe
and enclosed all my testimonials

6.4.73

I most humbly request that my poverty being very simple and as I have already suffered doubly I solicit that I may either be entertained or that order may be passed to the effect that I may seek employment elsewhere such that I may have the opportunity of trying my fortune elsewhere as I would not be entertained without such permission.

I beg to remain
Most Honored Sir
Your most Obedient & humble Servant
(Signed) V. Veerabudrah Chetty
Late Local Fund Overseer
No 2 or Sudwail Range

Cuddapah
9th April 1873

No. 114

Petitioner should address the District Engineer. I can do nothing for him.
(Init.) (H.D.H)
April 10/73

(illegible)

(Signed) Cyprian
Vice President

(True Copy)
V. Veerabudrah Chetty
Late Local Fund Overseer

No 39 of 1872/73

To,

The Officer in charge of
No 2 or Budwail Range

Sir

I beg to state that you will be good enough to favour me with a true copy of your orizonal letter written to the District Engineer regarding me, upon my applying to you on the 6th January 1873 for procuring me leave without pay on anticipation of Sanction.

2 Also request that you will be good enough to favour me the true Copy of your letter to the District Engineer regarding my leave upon my letter which I Submitted to you on the 30th December 1872 as I want to make my appeal again to the District Engineer requesting him to render me justice.

3 Lastly I beg to State that the extract of all the quarterly report regarding me to the Superintending Engineer from November 1868 to December 1872 is earnestly solicited.

I beg to remain
Sir
Your most obedient Servant
(Signed) V. Venkatasubbaiyan
late Local Fund Overseer

Cuddapah
5th March 1873

(True Copy)
Where ... Under.

P.M. No 27/73.

No 27 of 1873

the 6th Proximo.

I humbly beg to get some leave from the Sastrikal as to enable me to attend on the 9th January. If I fail to attend that date I promised I will produce my warrants and herewith to submit summon received, and request to return the same.

Beg to remain

Sir

Your most Obedient Servant

December 1872

/Signed/ Veerabudrakal Boodu

Local Fund Overseer

Budwail Range

(True Copy)

Veerabudrakal Boodu

D.W. 1007/73.

A A

Petition N° 1595 of 1873

25

Memorandum

In forwarding the accompanying petition with its enclosures from Veerabadra Moodelly late Local Fund Overseer for examination and report, it is requested that the District Engineer of Cuddapah will state why leave was refused to the petitioner as stated in the District Engineers reply to him and it is suggested that he be permitted to resign according to his own request

/Signed/ P. Montgomerie. Capt. R.E.

Ag. Under Secretary to Govt. PWD

Cotacamund
10th July 1873

To

The Dist. Engr. Cuddapah

S. O. No. 1851 — d/ 24th October 1873. Printd

Ltr 24th Oct/73 No. 215-218

District Engineer's Office
Cuddapah 14th July 1873.

No. 653

27

From

The District Engineer
Cuddapah

To

The Secretary to Govt
P. W. Department.

Sir

In reply to your Memo No. 1595 of 10th Instant. I have the honor to return the papers therewith received and to inform you that the leave asked for was not granted because the man's conduct had been so bad, he did no work, ignored his Range Officer by not replying to letters or carrying out Orders sent to him, he had in his possession plans &c the result of 2 years Surveying which the Range Officer could not get him to deliver up or complete also the case being a Civil one could be defended by Pleader.

2nd. The man had had leave before for

Enclosures 7

for the same purpose and in June/72
was refused leave by Major Vertue
when he absented himself and was warned
he would be dismissed if it occurred again.
3d Under these circumstances I trust
the Government will allow his dismissal
to stand instead of accepting his
resignation the evil results of which
I am now experiencing in having employed
as man as Local Fund Overseer who
had been allowed to resign his Taluq
Overseership, he is utterly worthless
I find and on enquiry, it appears he
should have been dismissed originally and
the present trouble saved, I am sorry
to say there are several more still in
District who require dismissal and
who have been warned.

I have the honor to be
Sir
Your Most Obedient Servant
C. Gillespie
District Engineer
Cuddapah

Compd
A.M.

I am sorry to
be constrained to
differ with Mr Sim
in the matter of appeals
from the Servants of
Municipality

The appointment,
Management and
by emergence the
Dismissal of Munic-
-ipal Servants is
reserved by the Law
absolutely to the
President. The
Commissioners — as
a body or individually
have

have no jurisdiction whatever over the matter & cannot hear appeals. The Master of the district presides as the ex-officio servant of Government and all his individual executive duties are performed as such. It must be the policy of Government to keep him strictly in this position and not allow an irresponsible jurisdiction to spring up without appeal— Especially in respect to Officers whose nomination dismissal are entrusted to him apart from his advisers. We have no right to act in the interest of employers and the public and of Municipalities to leave a public servant of the State outside all control in such a matter.

I consider the right of appeal of every employé a matter of legal right and adopt the highest expediency, if not otherwise provided for by Law it is necessary the Government to whose whom they may appoint in that behalf

behalf - We cannot
reject our responsibility
MR
17/10

I agree with Lord Robinson
that there ought to be a
right of appeal, both as
regards Local & Municipal
Boards, in those cases of
dismissal - part of the
Bd. of Trade, and finally
other part. But the Act
appears to be deliberately
so worded as to exclude any real
appeal: for it can merely
be supposed that the petitioners
overlooked - All words which clearly that
give no legal power of appeal -
and the words: to alter
the Act - he might perhaps
refer to maintenance appeal the
power in any exceptional case which does not appear to be.
case: MR Oct 18/73

35

I am responsible
for the order in the D.P.C.
and if I have exceeded
my charge I hope my
Honorable Colleagues
will accept my apology.

But I am glad
to place before them
my grounds for thinking
this order necessary.

I need scarcely say
that an appeal from
the Executive order
- especially when that
order involves loss of
status and emolument
in the public service -
of

of any Subordinate
is a matter of right - and
more, it is a matter of
great necessity, when
the Servants of the State
are exposed to the often
unavoidably hasty &
dismissal of Executive
Superiors — Municipal
Departments are no
Exception to the control
of the Government in this
respect, Even when the
Commissioners the
dismissers, they act
as Public Servants
under the Law — the
President is a mere
Government Official
responsible for all his
Executive acts to the
Government. But the
matter becomes more
directly

directly a Government
matter when those dismissals
are made for all
practical purposes
by Government Engineer
Officers, who are merely
required to supervise
the work of Municipal
Servants and practically
have neither power of
appointment and
dismissal which they
sometimes appear
to have. Government
must receive appeals
in all cases.

Now as regards
appeals to Government
direct, in the first in-
stance by Small
aggrieved Executive
— I am satisfied that
a course more in accordance
with

with the procedure
of other Departments
is desirable in the
D.P.W. An appeal
to Government should
be in fact a gracious
= special & final appeal
and ought Ordinarily
disposed of in regular
appeal by an intermediate
authority - for whose
guidance rules are
already laid down
for most efficient operation.

I am anxious that
my remarks may not
be misunderstood
as conveying a general
censure - my experience
is very limited in the
Government Office. But
I must say that already
appeals have passed
through my hands in the
D.P.W.

D.P.W., which show
at least an occasional
disregard of Law
and of what in every
other department
is insisted on - deliberate
inquiry and at least
some written notice
to the sufferer of the
definite Reasons for
which he is dismissed,
in fact an order against
which to base an appeal.
I have had before
me Cases in which
the Record would not
have supported the
dismissal of a
Village Coty in the
Revenue Department
or a Talari in the Police

Further the appeals are too numerous for the Members of Government to deal with ~~effectively~~ in the first instance.

I think therefore that if possible a proper appellate tribunal of the first instance should be provided for the class of business under consideration, and this tribunal is clearly the Board of Revenue. I doubt whether any Executive Engineer can legally dismiss any Municipal or Local Fund Servant. He should lay the case

case before the President for disposal. The natural Supervising Authority to whom the appeal from the President's order or Endorsement of the Engineer Officer's dismissal (if not illegal) is the Board of Revenue to whom all these appeals from Municipalities now lie.

By the Madras Board these appeals are, I think, far more efficiently dealt with and the procedure more carefully watched than is possible by a (generally) single member of Government in a Department (the D.P.D.) to

which this class of
Municipal and Local
Fund business does
not belong by Law.
The Government have
power to delegate any
duty — what more
important than this
appellate function? —
to the Board of Revenue
under the Local Funds
and there is no legal
objection to requiring
Appeals to be preferred
in the first instance
to the Board also in the
case of Municipal
Servants.

As to the finality
of appeals, the Law
happily places no bar
to a hearing in the
highest

Petition No 2025 of 1873

highest quarters and
I should be most grieved
to see the Government
debarred from hearing
any special reasons
for disputing the decisions
of subordinate jurisdictions
in the Municipal Depart-
ment. But in practice
not one in ten of these
appeals would have
to go to the Board, and
if they do, we shall find
that the more formal
and convenient procedure
enables an undoubting
decision to be arrived
at in far less time
than it can be now.

In the Case of
M. Krishna Row (Vizaga-
patam) I cannot in
dispose of the appeal
without

without reference to the President and perusal of the correspondence which has been refused to the appellant and I cannot, I believe, according to law call for it in the D. P. B.

In the case of Verrabadrudu (Cuddapah) there is nothing on the record to show that the President of the Local Fund Board has not been ignored entirely - or that the dismissal is not at variance with the Law ab initio. In the Government Office it has apparently been treated as an appeal

appeal from the Engineer in the Imperial Department. I cannot, I think, legally deal with an appeal in this shape.

Both cases are mere samples of what I have had before me in other cases

11/10

I fear to agree with
Mr. Brougham that
it would be very
desirable to en-
-titute the Ld
of Rd. the fine is
a shilling at once
if he can do so -
and if he should
not be over-whelm-
-ed in the work.
I would not do this
as I fear the Chancel-
-ior - but
leave the whole
ment - Dismissal
Punishment &
of the servants kind

wholly out of the
municipal Funds
wholly to the Muni-
cipality - My reason
is that it is derogatory
to evoke a spirit
of independence
& a feeling of respon-
sibility in these bodies.
that as their work
is in their own locality
& as they have proof
positive of knowing
all about their Inh-
-abitants & the act
they are practically
acquainting in the know-
ledge of the wants & &
actions - And then

involves the interests &
employés of Municip-
-alities - let them
understand that
if they accept pay-
ment & undertake
Municipalities,
they stand or fall
by the decisions of
the Com.rs - and they
have no more right
to complain of
their conditions of
Municipal service.
than of the long hrs
&c - or any thing
else. I would then
free hands for the
rigidly adhere to
the terms of the Law

and decline to
receive appeals.
The members of
a Municipality
are as much pub.
servants as the
members of
the Madras Bank
is the Chamber
of Commerce &
consequently has
no right of appeal
to the pub.

As regards Local
Funds Boards I
admit that practically there are
reasons which at
present render
appeals advisable

the members have
not the same means
of knowing the qual-
ifications of
their subordinates
and are not in
the same inde-
pendent position
as members of Mu-
-nicipal Boards.
It would be well
I think as a matter
of practical
expediency to allow
appeals & to refer
them in the first
instance to the
Govt of Mad.: if the

Can. But how
can he? Suppose
Lord L. J. Brand
decline to recognise
the decision of the
Board, can we
compel them. If
he will it - let if
he can - and the
Bd feel equal to
this additional
burden, then by
all means let
us do it - for it
will be a relief
to us - and the work
will be done at
least as well. I

Consider our procedure
in the D.W. army.
I think that all
arbeals - although
the arbeallants are
employed as Engineers
of any trade - should
invariably be simply
"Transferred to
the Financial
Debt." Boards
L. J. Boards &
Municipalities -
are to be done at.
If in such a board
any question arises
on which an "Engineers"
opinion is
needed he can
always get it from

The Govt. having had under consideration a petition dated the 25th June 1873 from Veerabadrah Moodely late Local Fund Overseer Cuddapah District, and a report from the District Engineer No 653 dated 14th July 1873 of the circumstances under which the Local Fund overseer was dismissed, see no reason to interfere with the decision of the District Engineer and the President of the Local Fund Board =

27th August 73.

The Govt. of do not think that the D.E. as such should take part in the Meddle in the affairs.

I. D.S.

16. 10. 73

I am unable to see cause for dismissal here.

Petr. needed leave - the Summons in a civil Suit is not denied as is a suspension - but Reason for leave in all depts.

He went to the Opposition but the Ramnad pleader was absent - and he proceeded to attend to Sangiums.

Pay might have been withheld - he might have been suspended but dismissal is not justified in pursuance of the Circular Letter

reprehensible an offence of one stands.

There is no evidence of this badness of character which is pitted in the case in the report of Sobadri that matter must be treated on its own merits.

I think that the appellate order should be set aside

The Secretary

2/9

PROCEEDINGS of the MADRAS GOVERNMENT.

Department.

Read the following letter Proc.

from the Secretary to Government, Public Works Department, dated 12th September 1873.

The Governor in Council resolves to authorize the Board of Revenue to receive and dispose of appeals from decisions of Presidents of Local Fund Boards dismissing members of the Circle establishment.

If you think that we can also say that we are willing to forward under the Act to the Board of Revenue for disposal if you think it desirable that the Govt. of Revenue should be the final authority in the matter.

We think that the Govt. should be the final authority in the matter.

The Act does not appear to provide for any appeal - but I think the Govt. can assume the power

The Public Works Dept. — Board of Revenue.

Govt. of {187} Madras.

To _____

Dated
Recd. } 187 , No.

Nos.