

Marine (1899) Department.

G.O., No. ⁴⁹⁸~~488~~ Marine

DATED 5th June 1899.

[Despatch Abstract.]

Travelling allowance

Rejecting, with remark, the appeal from
Mr. L. F. Liseby, Port Conservator, Baluapatawa,
regarding certain claims to — disallowed
by the Presidency Port Office

[illegible]

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.	G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

The Presidency Port office,
Madras

Mr Lisle's claims
are inadmissible under
the rules - His appeal is,
therefore, rejected - He will
be informed that he has,
owing to his unacquain-
tance with the travelling
allowance ^{rules} given, unnece-
ssary trouble, and that he
would do well in future
to accept the decision
of his superior officer
who is vested with control
in such matters.

No. 1649

Dated 5th May 1899

Received 17

Enclosures

Spare copies

SUBJECT.

Forwarding with remark
petition from Mr L. F. Lively
Port Conservator, Calcutta,
regarding the disallowance
of Rs 15-4-0 in his travelling
allowance Bill

L.S.
The P.P. Over the ends

The humble petition
of Louis, Frank, Liselle
Port House-boat and Super-
intendent of Sea Customs
of the Port of Calcutta
in the District of Ganjam
Appointed on the 22nd Aug.
1889 and held these app-
ointments ever since on
a salary of Rs 120 per
mensem.

2 That your humble
petitioner proceeded from
Head quarter on a journey
to Poondi; hence to
Bawanapadao & back
Calicut between
14th Jan'y 99 to 1st Feb'm
99. on duty and with the
sanction of his Superiors
Officers.

Officers, ie the District
Collector of Ganjam and
the Presidency Port Officer
of Madras.

3 That on his return
your humble petitioner
submitted to the Presi-
dency Port Officer of Madras
his travelling allowance
bill for the journey so
travelling on duty, amount-
ing to Rs 44-14-0. Forty
four annas fourteen only
including one pice's batte.

4 That your humble
petitioner is disallowed
milage allowance for the
14th 15th January 99 during
which days up to 16th morning
6 a.m. he travelled 116
miles starting on the 14th
at 4. P.M.

5 That your humble
petitioner is also disallowed
milage for the 23rd Jan'y 99
for a journey of 18 miles
commenced on 23rd Jan 99
4. P.M. ending 24th Jan 99.
6 a.m.

6 That on the 31st Jan'y 99
your

Your humble petitioner started
on a journey to Head quarters
at 4. P.M. and arrived at 6 a.m.
on 1st Feb'y 99 the distance
travelled been 31 miles and
again the milage allowance
is disallowed and for the
three annas noted above
your humble petitioner
is allowed only daily
allowance or Rs 1-4-0 per
diem thus reducing your
petitioner's bill from Rs
44-14-0 to Rs 29-10-0 or Rs
15-4-0 deduction. The
only reason given by the
Presidency Port Officer for
so reducing the bill is the
definition of the word "day"
in Art 29 of C.S.R. 3rd edition.

7 That your humble
petitioner has done every-
thing in his power to prove
to the Presidency Port Officer
that it is not customary
to travel by road and
cart starting at midnight
that no Officers in the
service in the District are
doing it, explaining his
case completely in his
letter No 184/39 dated 29.3.99
even

even begging that if Art 29
C.S.R. is an absolute bar
to deprive him of this
mileage allowance Art
1170 (a) C.S.R. be worked
upon in order that your
petitioner may not be
the loser.

8 That your humble
petitioner regrets to state
that nothing would move
the Presidency Port Officer
& that your petitioner was
directed to submit his
travelling allowance bill
minus the above quoted
reductions of Rs 15-4-0.

9 The bill has not yet
been submitted pending
the result of this your
your humble petitioner's
petition.

10 That your humble
petitioner has during his
Service travelled the same
journey thrice, & that the
objection now raised by
the Presidency Port Officer
has never occurred, though
Art. 29 C.S.R. was in force

long

long before your petitioner
entered the Service and
that your petitioner's case
is unique, as no other
Officers in the District
has ever been subjected
to it.

11 That in order to
submit his case fully
your humble petitioner
encloses herein original
letters from the Presidency
Port Officer, and true
Copies of his own letters
to that Officer also a
Copy of the 1st bill sub-
mitted and the drafted
bill by the Presidency
Port Officer.

12 That your humble
petitioner is poorly
paid and will suffer
by the loss of this Rs 15-4-0
and as explained in
the correspondence your
petitioner's letter No 222/58
dated 19.4.99 his expenses
for

for excess the claim
submitted by him

13 That your humble
petitioner has endeavored
to place before Your Honorable
Government all the facts
of his case in order that
Your Honorable
Government may give
him ~~the~~ justice and
for which Act of justice
Your humble petitioner
as in duty bound ever
prays.



Blind

Port House at Calcutta
See Customs
Calcutta

Calcutta Port Office

Date 26th Apr 99

N^o 1174

Forwarded through the
Accountant General, Madras observing
Para 4 of petition:- The distance travelled
from 4 P.M. of the 14th January to 6 A.M.
of the 16th idem was 46 miles, and the
number of hours spent in journeying
on each of these days were 8 hours on
the

the 14th, 13 hours on the 15th and 6 hours
on the 16th. As information of the actual
distance travelled upto the midnight on
each of the days 14 and 15th cannot be
furnished by the Conservator, the average
distance travelled on those days was
calculated to be 13 miles on 14th

23 " 15th
10 " 16th
and under Article 1170(ii) of the Civil
Service Regulations, mileage was allow-
ed for the journey on 15th and daily
allowance for the other two days.

Para 5.- The distance of 18 miles travelled
on the 23 and 24th January 1899 occupied
8 hours on the 23rd upto midnight and 6
hours on the 24th, and for reasons
stated in para 1, the distance travelled
on each of these days was calculated to
be 10 miles on the 23rd and 8 miles on the
24th. As the distance travelled on each
of these days was not more than 20 miles,
daily allowance was allowed under
Article 1170(ii) Civil Service Regulations.

Para 6.- The distance of 31 miles
travelled on the 31st January and 1st Feb-
ruary 1899 occupied 8 hours on the 31st
January and 6 hours on the 1st February
1899, and for reasons stated in para 1
the distance travelled upto the midnight
of the 31 January 1899 was calculated
to

to be 18 miles, and the balance 13 miles was held to have been travelled on the 1st February 1899 and both the journeys being not more than 20 miles each day daily allowance only was allowed instead of mileage.

Para 7.— The Comptroller was not asked to start on his journey at midnight as stated by him, but was told that the distance travelled each day will be held to be that travelled up to midnight of that day from the previous midnight (Article 29 Civil Service Regulations), and that mileage will be allowed for journeys exceeding 20 miles travelled each day and daily allowance, if otherwise. — Article 1170 (ii) Civil Service Regulations.

Para 10.— On the three previous occasions referred to, mileage rates were allowed for journeys of more than 20 miles travelled in one day, and on a reference to those travelling allowance bills, it is observed, that a distance of more than 20 miles was never travelled in two days or in portions of two days. It is only in the latter case that the hours of starting and arrival are ascertained to make the calculation referred

referred to in para 1. of the same

H. A. Street

Commander R. I. M.

Presidency Post Office.

5th May 1899.

Read the following:—

Petition from Mr L. F. Lisle, Port Conservator, Calingapatam, of 26th April 1899

Endorsement by the Presidency Port Officer, No 1679 dated 5th May 1899

Endorsement thereon by the Accountant-General, No $\frac{7.229}{1644}$ of 15th May 1899

Circulated to

FOR ORDERS

Mr Lisle, Port Conservator, Calingapatam, appeals against the action of the Presidency Port Officer in having disallowed certain ^{of his} claims to travelling allowance. The Presidency Port Officer explains the grounds of his disallowances, and the Accountant-General, through whom the report has been forwarded, considers the Presidency Port Officer has rightly interpreted the rules. Mr Lisle claims mileage for certain days on which he has not covered a distance of more than 20 miles. For these days, the Presidency Port Officer has passed daily allowances instead of mileage, calculating a day to commence and end at midnight, as required by Article 29 in the Civil Service Regulations. Mr Lisle wrongly calculates his journeys on a different principle and thus enhances his claims to mileage allowance. It is submitted that the action of the Presidency Port Officer, supported by the Accountant-General, should be upheld.

2. The Accountant-General suggests that Mr Lisle's

No 7.229
1644

Fort St. George
Accountant-General's Office.
15th May 1899.

Forwarded with the remark that the travelling allowance due to Mr Lisle for the journey in question is rightly calculated by the Presidency Port Officer. Under article 1170 of the Civil Service Regulations daily allowance only is admissible for the days on which Mr Lisle did not travel a distance of more than 20 miles.

If however Government see fit, it may under article 1170 A of the Civil Service Regulations sanction the grant to him of mileage for the entire journey provided no daily allowance is drawn for halts in the course of the journey.

W. H. Dawson
offg. Accountant-General.

The Secretary to Government,
Marine Department.

Mr. Lisle's claims may, if Government sees fit, be dealt with under Article 1170(A) of the Civil Service Regulations. If this be done, Mr. Lisle's claims would be still further reduced. He travelled a total distance of 95 miles, and for this tour, he would, under Article 1170(A), receive only Rs 23.12-0 at the rate of 4 annas per mile, whereas the Presidency Port Officer has allowed him Rs 28.4-0 as follows: -

(1) Mileage for 23 miles travelled on the 15th January 1899 at 4 annas per mile - Rs. Rs. 5.12-0

(2) Daily allowance for 18 days at Rs 1.4-0 per diem - 22-8-0

This is the usual method of calculation -
His actual claim is for Rs 43.12-0 as follows: -

(a) Mileage at 4 annas per mile for the total distance of 95 miles travelled - Rs. Rs. 23.12-0

(b) Daily allowance for 16 days at Rs 1.4-0 per diem - 20-0-0

3. Mr. Lisle seems quite unacquainted with travelling allowance rules and should not, it is submitted, have sent up this appeal against the action of his Superior Officer, who is vested with control in such matters - Y. A. S. H.

Therefore,
 ~~As it is submitted~~

R. S.
 [Signature]
 25.1.99

Revenue Department

[Signature]

L.O. No. 163.

Home (1899) Department.

CURRENT No. 561.

From
 The Port Conservator
 Calcutta

No. 244
 64.

Dated 26-4-99.

Received
 1-5-99

Registered

Enclosures

Spare copies

SUBJECT.

Bringing to notice that the mileage allowance due to him has been disallowed.

Await receipt of
 the original petition
 sent this day P.O.

[Signature]
 25.1.99

BACK PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date

FURTHER PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

From

The Port Conservator

Calcuttapatane

N^o 244
66 To

The Chief Secretary

to the Government of Madras

Marine Department.

Dated Calcuttapatane 26th April 1899

Sir

Herewith enclosed I have the honor to submit for the decision of the Government of Madras my petition of date with seven enclosures marked in red ink A.B.C.D.E.F.G.

(A) First travelling allowance bill submitted.

(B) P.P.O No 562 P date 24.3.99.

(C) Drafted bill by P.P.O

(D) My letter No $\frac{184}{39}$ dated 29.3.99

(E) P.P.O No 653 P dated 13.4.99

(F) My letter No $\frac{222}{58}$ dated 17.4.99

(G) P.P.O No 724 P dated 22.4.99.

2. The original petition has been submitted to the Presidency Port Office for transmission to Government, minus enclosures.

I have the honor to be

Your ^{Very} Obedt Servt

[Signature]
20/4/99
Port Conservator.