

MADRAS RECORD OFFICE.

Government of Madras.

Judicial DEPARTMENT.

G.O. No. *1851-52* Press
Mis.

85-87

Dated *13.11.1862* ~~10~~ .

8/9

Not to be folded or roughly handled

*Proceedings of the Madras Government, Judicial Department,
13th November 1862.*

No. 85. Read the following Petition:—

TO THE RIGHT HONORABLE THE GOVERNOR IN COUNCIL,
Fort Saint George.

Petition addressed by C. VEERASAWMY,
Pillay, District Moonsiff of Conjeeveram.

MOST RESPECTFULLY SHEWETH,

That he was first entertained in public service in 1828 as Translator in the late Zillah Court of Madura, in which he continued until 1834 when he had the misfortune to be dismissed from service by order of Government, but the dismissal was subsequently after a long interval and frequent references to the Home Government declared by the late Honorable the Court of Directors as being irregular and improper and himself ordered to be restored to the service.

That your Petitioner was accordingly re-taken in service in 1847 as Sheristadar of the Principal Sudder Ameen's Court of Chingleput from which he was promoted to the office of District Moonsiff which he now holds.

That having been thus thrown out of employ from 1834 to 1846, he respectfully trusts that the Right Honorable the Governor in Council will be pleased to take the Petitioner's case as a special one deserving of his kind consideration and pass an order to the effect that the period between his dismissal from service and restoration to it may be counted as service at the time of his retiring from Government employment, and as an instance of liberality of Government shown to a public servant similarly circumstanced as your humble Petitioner, the enclosed Minutes of Consultation, dated the 21st April 1855, is herewith submitted.

Your Petitioner in duty bound shall ever pray.

MADRAS, 13th October 1862.

(Signed) C. VEERASAWMY,
District Moonsiff.

No. 86. ORDER THEREON, 13th November 1862, No. 1,851.

The Petitioner sets forth that he was employed in the Zillah Court of Madura from 1828 to 1834, when he was dismissed from the service of Government. On his appeal to the Court of Directors—but after a long delay caused by frequent references on the subject of his dismissal—Petitioner was ordered to be restored to the service in 1847.

2. The Petitioner prays that under the peculiar circumstances of his case he may be allowed to count as service, with a view to pension, the period between his dismissal and re-employment.

3. The Government are of opinion, that as the Court of Directors in their final decision in 1846 in Petitioner's case, pronounced that his dismissal in 1836 was irregular and improper, and as the delay which took place in obtaining this decision was not caused by any act of the Petitioner, this case may be regarded as special and as such be recommended for the favorable consideration of the Government of India.

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

No. 87. To the Secretary to the Government of India, Home Department, dated Fort Saint George, 13th November 1862, No. 1,852.

I am directed to forward, for the favorable consideration of the Government of India, a copy of a Petition from C. Veerasawmy Pillay, District Moonsiff of Conjeeveram in the Madras District.

2. The Petitioner sets forth that he was employed in the Zillah Court of Madura from 1828 to 1834, when he was dismissed from the service of the Government. On his appeal to the Court of Directors—but after a long delay caused by frequent references on the subject of his dismissal—Petitioner was in 1847 re-admitted into the service. He prays that under the

*Proceedings of the Madras Government, Judicial Department,
13th November 1862.*

peculiar circumstances of his case, he may be allowed to count as service towards pension, the period between his dismissal and re-employment.

3. The Government are of opinion, that as the Court of Directors in their final decision in the Petitioner's case, in their Despatch of the 7th August 1839, Judicial Department, No. 10, pronounced that his dismissal in 1836 was irregular and improper, and as the delay which took place in obtaining this decision was not caused by any fault of the Petitioner, his case may be regarded as special, and his application acceded to.

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

*Letter from the Civil
11. 11. 1855*

*Letter from the Civil
11. 11. 1855*

March 1855, No 168)

*... with
the Right
...
... to ... that individual
... public employment to
... the period
... his removal from
... re-appointment in 1851.
... that the above resolution
... Monttosh...*

Proceedings of

In No. 2728 of 1862

peculiar circumstances of
period between his dismi

3. The Governmer
the Petitioner's case in
para. 3, a copy of
improper, and as the de
act of the Petition

9918 of
V. C. 9918 of

Proceeding

peculiar circumstance
period between his

3. The Govern
the Petitioner's case
para. 3, a copy of w
improper, and as th
act of the Petitione

Memo.

The draft letter to Govt. of India
is in accordance with the
draft order.

But an addition has been
made to the letter in para

3.

Instructions solicited whe
then the draft order is to
be altered to correspond.

~~AM~~
h

h

Conclusion

Judicial Department

Proceedings of the Madras

Court.

Read Rpt. from Keralamany

Pillay District Moondiff

Kongieveram in the

Madras District

New Order 13 Oct. 1862.

desp. 13.
to the Govt. of
India

Order thereon 13 Nov. 1862 No 272 D. -
1851

The Rpt. sets forth that he
was employed in the Zillah
Court of Madrasa from 1820
to 1834 when he was dismissed
from the service of Govt.

On his appeal to the Comtee
of directors but after a long
delay & caused by frequent
expresses on the subject
of his dismissal Rpt. was
ordered to be restored to
the service in 1847.

Memo.

W. C.

Note

for being concerned in a case.

announcing facts against the Judge
Mr. Hooper. Rpt.

2 The Pet. prays that under
the peculiar circumstances
of his case he may be
allowed to count as service,
to with a view to pension,
the period between his dis-
missal and re-employment

3 The Govt are of opinion,
that as the Court of Directors
in their final decision ¹⁸⁴⁶
in this case, ^{pronounced} ~~decided~~ that
his dismissal in 1836,
was irregular and
improper, and as the
delay which took place
in obtaining this decision
was not caused by any
act of the Pet., this
case may be regarded
as special and as such

be recommended for the
favorable consideration
of the Govt of India. -

M.L.

note

In the case of Mootoo
Kishoree (1855) who had
been dismissed for bribery and
afterwards restored, that ind.
-vidual was allowed to reckon
as service for pension the interval
between his removal in 1842 &
reappointment in 1851. Vide
Min. Council 21st April 1855.
M.L.

Sept 13

Judicial.

Nº 1852

The Secretary to the Govt. of India.

Home Dept.

Sir-

I am directed to forward, for the favorable consideration of the Govt. of India, a copy of a petition from C. Veeraswamy Pillay, District Munsiff of Conjevaram in the Madras District.

2. The Petitioner sets forth that he was employed in the Millah Court of Madras from 1828 to 1834, when he was dismissed from the service of the Govt. On his appeal to the Court of Directors

Directors, but after a long delay caused by frequent references on the subject of his dismissal, Petitioner was in 1847 readmitted into the service. He prays that under the peculiar circumstances of his case, he may be allowed to count as service towards pension, the period between his dismissal & re-employment.

3. The Court are of opinion that as the Court of Directors in their final decision in the Petitioner's case, pronounced that his dismissal

in 1836 was irregular & improper, & as the delay which took place in obtaining this decision was not caused by any act of the Petitioner, his case may be regarded as special, & his application acceded to.

Port of London,
13th Nov 1862.

J. J.

Indiv. 1862 Dec 14

(S-1052)

to 11. 6)

Don 1862

13" 11" 11"

(S-1052)

Answering for the favorable
consideration of the report of
Helen as stated from O. H. H.
& Henry H. H., District Attorney
of Oregon, saying that
under the peculiar circumstances
of this case he may be allowed
to proceed as desired, with a
view to pension, the fund
between his business and
employment.