C.A.W. In Circ: 14/

The acceptance of the
Tee under paras 806 + 809
of Code seems to me clearly
admissible & the S.E. recom-
mends the same. Please
draft sanction accordingly for
CW's approval.

CAJ
14.1.84

C. A. 10660
215

The rulings quoted by C in para 1 of his office note 952 d/ 8 Dec. 83 do not seem to be in point. The facts are not as stated & sanction any increase to the officer's pay; but to allow him to accept a Commission Star awarded by a Civil Court. Such transaction being admissible under Code para 806. Exception is to be.

K.S
12.1.84.

OFFICE OF THE SUPERINTENDING ENGINEER,
6TH CIRCLE.

Tuckingpoly 10th January 1884.

No. 69 T.M.

From

The Superintending Engineer,
6th Circle.

To

The Chief Engineer
P.W.D.

Sir,

ENCLOSURE.

With reference to your Memorandum No. 26286 of 17th December 1883, I have the honor to report, that Superintendent Mr. Taylor, during the time he was engaged on the field work of the Survey of the disputed hills he was also attending to his usual office work, and while he was plotting the Survey, he attended to both the field and office duties of his appointment in this Department.

I have the honor to be
Sir
Your most obedient Servant
Lieut Col R.E.
Superintending Engineer 6th Circle

No 3015 Wd/24-10 B.
" 2528 Cd/17.12.83

Jerom.

The Supt Engineer
6 Circle

To,
The Chief Engineer
P W D.

W. 6 g 1 T.D.

Date 10 January

No 219 Sa/24 January

Mr Taylor Superv

Reports that —
during the time he
was engaged on the
survey of the distr
Hill, was attending
also to his office

The Asst Member
the Supplg Engr does
not certify to the
extra assumed
and Mr Taylor's own
letter worked out
authorize such a
certificate - There
can be no doubt
that a portion of
the "official time"
was devoted to this
work.

K.S.
19.1.82.

I discussed this matter
with the Hon: Mr Jackson,
who is still of opinion that
section 809 of the P. W. Code
is the one under which the
acceptance of this
fee must be sanctioned.

M.
22/1/82

K.S.
23.1.82

Ld W

C. No: 21

Strictly speaking, a "Commissioner" is not an "Arbitrator" - but I think Exception 1 to para 806 may be made to cover the present case by regarding the duty on which Mr. Taylor was employed as of that judicial character contemplated by the Rules, and for which the receipt of special remunerations is allowable. There will be no infringement of principle. If the receipt of remuneration is unobjectionable in the one case, it is Equally so in the other.

It will I think be difficult to apply para 806 & succeeding

I do not think the para quoted covers the case. W. Taylor was not appointed an Arbitrator but was Commissioned by the Court to prepare a survey of a particular locality. Sec: 806 (d) does not seem to meet the case as the Sup.t Engineer certifies that W. Taylor's employment under the Court's Commission did not interfere with his Official duties.

H.S.L
18/1/84

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.

No. 2195

PROCEEDINGS OF THE MADRAS GOVERNMENT.

UNDER date the 26th January 1884

READ the following

Letter from the Supdg: Engr:
II. Circle: N.E.: No. 618 T.W. dy 28th Nov.r 1883
Office Note from the Exc.r
P.W. Accounts — " — 952 dy 8th Dec.r 1883
Letter from the Supdg: Engr.
II. Circle — " — 691 T.W. dy 10th Jany 1884

The Government sanction ~~under para 806~~ ~~exception I or II~~ (4 or 4) of the P.W. Code, the acceptance by Mr. E. Taylor, Supt. 1st grade, of the fee of Rs 350/ awarded by the Subordinate Court of Tinnevelly, for services rendered by Mr. Taylor as Commissioner in a suit

suit before the Court.

2. The rulings quoted by the Examiner P.W. Accounts are considered inapplicable to cases of this kind, which are specially provided for in the Code. Vide Section 809.

14-1-84

19-1-84.

No 219 W dy 24th Jany/84

Supdg. Engr. III Circle

Examiner P.W. Accts