

N^o 822

Superintg. Engrs. Office, 5th Div.
Calcutta, 22nd September, 1863.

From

Lieut. Col. H. W. Hitchens, Esq.

Superintg. Engineer 5th Division

To

Colonel, C. A. Orr R.E.

Secretary to Government N.P.W.

Sir,

I have the honor to submit for the consideration and orders of Government the following circumstances under which Mr. Haasbe, Asst. Supervisor, late in charge of No. 2 Range of the South Arcot District, beg to be allowed 15 days' casual leave.

In his letter, dated the 12th ultimo No. 43, Mr. Haasbe reported from Tindivanam that having heard of his wife's detention at Palaveram from dangerous illness while on her journey to Madras he had quitted the District to join her there, and given over charge of his office to Mr. King, the Taluk Officer of Tindivanam.

On his arrival at Palaveram, he forwarded a certificate signed by the Sanitary Officer of that place, stating that Mr. Haasbe was dangerously sick in the Government Hospital there, and that her husband's presence with her was absolutely necessary.

In his letter of the 27th ultimo Mr. Haasbe.

Hasb's reported the death of his wife and his return to his range on that date. He at the same time forwarded a certificate from A. Shaw to the effect that he was necessarily detained at Paloveram between the 12th & 26th Idem, which period Mr. Hasb begs may be counted as casual leave. This leave of 15 days in the year, as far as I understand, can only be taken at different intervals and not at one and the same time. Moreover it has been ruled that casual leave is only available within the limits of the District to which the Executive Member of the N. P. W. belongs.

In the present case, Mr. Hasb left the limits of his District, under very distressing circumstances, and I have to request that you will be pleased to decide how the 15 days absence is to be reckoned, whether as casual or Privilege leave.

Have the honor to be
Yours most obediently

W. O. Kitchen *Sd. W. O.*
Superintending Engineer 5th Div.

fifteen days.

3. There is no rule either that this leave of absence is only available within the Division.

4. It appears ^{to me} that in all such cases it is left entirely to the discretion of the Head of an Office to grant, or not, casual leave or to apply for Privilege Leave if available.

5. I have taken this opinion after carefully reading over the Code, Circular N^o 70 of 7th January, and ruling of the Supreme Government published in Fort Saint George 18th November 1858 Page 1087, which are all the authorities I can find on the subject, if I except a standing Circular N^o XLIV of 17th September 1862 from the Chief Engineer, which rules that casual leave is only to be given within the limits of the district, and at a few days at a time clearly inferring that it was not to be given in a lump. This is the circular on which I suppose Colonel Hitchens founds his letter. I cannot however find any grounds for the Chief Engineer's way of reading this order and must say I do not hold the same opinion.

I have the honor to be

Office of the Comdr & Auditor
of P. W. Accounts
Madras 25th Sept 1863.

Sir,
Your Most Obedient Servant.

W. Williams Lt Col R. A. S.

1864
Hon. for Mr. McKim

1864

NE 173

From,
J. B. McKim & J. McKim, R. S.
Contractors & Builders of the River

To,
Capt. & J. B. McKim, R. S.
Secy to Capt. P. H. S.

Date 25th
Dec. 26 } Dept. 1863

1864
Encls. 1.

Reports that there is

no objection to Colonel
McKim's granting of the
extension of the canal
leave of 15 days under
the circumstances related

1863
With our cordials

Under the circumstances

stated in the letter, Mr.
McKim's absence for 15 days
(between the 12th & 26th June 1863)

may be reckoned as Casual
Leave.

Checkmate
28 May 1863

1863

18
The Secy to the Secy

1863-28 May 1863

1863