

Marine (1899) Department.

G.O., No. 269 Marine

DATED 21 March 1899.

[Despatch Abstract]

I Kara Sumbi Ran, Clerk, Salome, Namolepale

The opinion of the Accountant & ff
On the question of the Lien, on the substance
of Appointment, of ——— while on temporary
duty in the Rev. Dept., Communicated
to the G.O.

Dr

Clerk Masulipatam
Post office taking an
acting appointment
as Revenue Inspector

BACK PAPERS.

FURTHER PAPERS.

No.	Date.	No.	Date.
837	3-12-86		
672	30-9-86		
1320 Mil	22-9-85		

*Removed
put up with
C.M. 809*

Office of the Collector & Magistrate
Masulipatam

Kistna District, 3rd February 1899.

From.

R. Morris Esq.

Collector, Kistna District

To.

The Port Officer

Masulipatam.

Sir,

In reply to your letter No 562 dated the 24th January 1899, I have the honor to inform you that the order quoted by you does not apply to this case. It is based on G.O's R.D. 1516 dated 4th September 1871 and F.D. No 1320 dated 22nd September 1885 from which you will see that what is prohibited is the grant of leave for more than three months to an officer who is given on probation an appointment in another Department in a full vacancy. The order so far from prohibiting acting appointments in other departments for more than three months expressly allows them.

I am Sir,

(P.T. Singaradu
for Collector.

(True copy)

For the

Commandr R.S.M.
Masulipatam Port Officer


Heading

No. 1868

9

Presidency Port Office,

82



Madras, 4th March 1899.

From

Commander H. A. Street R. I. M.

Presidency Port Officer,

Madras,

To

THE SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT,

MARINE DEPARTMENT,

CHEPAK.

Sir,

One D. Narasimma Rao, clerk Masulipatam Port Office, was allowed to take up an acting appointment as Revenue Inspector in the Revenue Department in July 1898. In January 1899, he submitted to the Port Officer, Masulipatam, an application for furlough and was informed by that officer that as he did not revert to his post in the Port Office within three months from the date of his appointment in the Revenue Department, he had no lien on his substantive appointment as per G.O. No 1320 Financial dated 22nd September 1885, and that therefore he (the

Mar 10/1
39-759

(the Port Officer) could not deal with
his application for furlough.
2. The Collector of Flisha in his letter dated
3rd February, 1899 to the Port Officer Masuli-
patam (copy enclosed) points out, that the
Government Order referred to while pro-
hibiting the grant of leave for more
than three months to an officer on pro-
-bation in another department in a
full vacancy does not prevent an officer
holding an acting appointment in other
departments for more than that period.
As I do not concur in this view, I beg to
be favored with the orders of Government
in the matter.

I have the honor to be
Sir
Your Obedient Servant

A. A. Theet
Commander R. I. M.
Presidency Port Officer

N^o 1021

Fort of George
Accountant's office
15th March 1899.

Forwarded to Government with the remark that in accordance with
para 3 of S. O. No 1516 Rev: dated 4 Sept: 1871, the officer may have been on
his substantive appointment in the Port office establishment Masulipatam
as he was allowed to take up an acting appointment as Revenue Inspector
for temporary duty in the Revenue Department.

M. M. M.

Accountant-General