

- (1) பக்கங்களின் எண்ணிக்கை 10
 (2) புதுக்கித் திருப்பிய நாள் 12/89
 (3) ஆதாரங்குறிப்பவர் கருக்கொப்பம் lewa

தமிழ்நாடு ஆவணக் காப்பகம்.

57

தமிழ்நாடு அரசு

RD துறை

அரசாணை எண். மு. கோப்புத் தாள் எண்.	1155	அச்சகம் பலவகை
நாள் :	30-4-1889	198

மடிக்கவோ கண்டபடி கையாளவோ கூடாது

5 sheets

Exh
 ஆவண. 40-1-18,000-18-8-87.

1155 From Major G. A. P. Christie R.E.
Examiner, P. W. Accounts, Madras,
to the Superintending Engineer II Circle,
dated 16th March 1889 No 132 $\frac{S.E.}{2}$.

With reference to your memo. No
2489 H. dated 25th February 1889 &
communicating copy of your sanction
to the grant of 5 weeks' Privilege leave
to Asst. Engineer Mr. Ratnasabhapati
Pillai, I have the honor to draw
your attention to Code para 571 from
which it will be observed that an
application in the prescribed form
should have been submitted to
me for report as to the admissibility
or otherwise of the leave. I beg that
this rule may be observed in future.

2. In the present case, the 5 weeks
or 1 month and 5 days Privilege
leave granted to the Asst. Engineer
is admissible under Section 138 of
the Civil Leave Code.

(True copy) J. H. Annam

Superintending Engi
II Circle

H. 24.3.89.

No. 2723 K.S.

1155
Suptg. Engineer's Office,
2nd Circle, Belgaum
22nd March 1889.

From,

J. Hannan Esquire,
Superintending Engineer,
II Circle.

To,

The Chief Engineer,
Public Works Department.

Through,

The Examiner,
Public Works Accounts,
Madras.

Sir,

C. to

1 Copy of letter

I have the honor to forward herewith a copy of a letter received from the Examiner with reference to the 5 weeks' Privilege Leave granted by me to Mr. Assistant Engineer Ratnasabhapati Pillai, and to state that I consider that Code para 571 quoted by him requires modification as if it be strictly enforced, it will be in many cases a source of great inconvenience to officers and subordinates who require immediate leave on urgent & private

private affairs as in this case
or in the case of illness, and its
strict enforcement is of no advantage
to Government. Every officer or
subordinate knows to within a day
or two what Privilege leave is
due him, and if it happens that
a day or two ~~or~~ more than is due
has been applied for, this can
easily be corrected by the Examiner.
There is as far as I can see, no
reason for refusing Privilege leave
until the receipt of Examiner's
certificate as to its admissibility.

I have the honor to be,
Sir,

Your most Obedt. Servt.

J. Hammen

Superintending Engineer
H. Circle.



H.

21.389

83

1155

3



No 414 D 29 March 1889

To E.W. *Encl 1 Jom*

Forwarded with the remark that para 571 of the Madras P.W.D. Code is based on Government of India Code chapter IV, para 31 and that any alteration will require the approval of the Government of India.

W.C.
C.
H. 29
H 29/3

I think a modification of the Code para 571 is necessary to provide for special cases and those of real emergency.

Prud. S.
1.4.89

My code is sent to Secy. Genl to see there. *H.M.*
2 Apr

I don't find anything in para 571 forbidding permission to an officer to go on leave in anticipation of orders in cases of emergency or preventing the grant of leave retrospectively. This often done in the Civil Dept. What is the modification which is considered necessary?
24/4-1.4.89
H.M.
24.8.84 Civ 6/4.

*The Supt. Engineer
II Circle*

*To The Chief Engineer
P.W. Dept
Shri The Engineer
P.W. Dept*

222 D of 8th April 1889
Dated 22nd March/89

No 2723 K.S.

Encl 1
Mr. N. Patherasabhar - pather delay - leave granted to - Jom and Shri letter on the subject of I suggest under the circumstances explain the modification of Para 571 of P.W. Code.

1153

No. 22-8

Government of Madras.

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT,
Ootacamund, 8th April 1889.

OFFICE NOTE.

From *W*

To *C*

Your office note 414 of 29 March 1889.

There seems to be nothing in para 571 of the Public Works Code forbidding permission to an officer to go on leave in anticipation of orders in cases of emergency, or preventing the grant of leave retrospectively. It is often done in the Civil Department. Please let me know whether you agree.

(Sd) R.R.R.O.B.

W

4

11556230.4 1889.



1155

No. 22 D.

Government of Madras.

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT,

Ootacamund, 10 April 1889.

OFFICE NOTE.

From W

To C

Your office letter 414 d/29 March 1889.

There seems to be nothing in para 571 of the Public Works Code forbidding permission to an officer to go on leave in anticipation of orders in cases of emergency, or preventing the grant of leave retrospectively. It is often done in the Civil Department. Please let me know whether you agree.

Yours
W

No 522 of 17 April 1889

To W.

In exceptional cases, an officer may be permitted to go on leave in

No 22 D of 10 April 1889

depl 8/4

10/8/4

anticipation of orders on his applica-
tion, or may be granted leave with
retrospective effect, but there is nothing
in the letter of the Supg. Engineer 2nd.
Circle to show that the case was in
any way exceptional.

No 22 2 Apr 89

W. H. C.

C.

1155 W d/30 April 1889
1155 W d/30 April 1889
1155 W d/30 April 1889
1155 W d/30 April 1889

1155 W d/30 April 1889

Copy of the Examiner's
office note No 522 dated
17th April 1889 is forwarded to
the Supg Engineer II Circle
for information with
reference to his letter No
2723 K.S. dated 22nd March 1889.
2. No alteration of P. W.
Code para 591 seems necessary.

1155 W d/30 April 1889

*do you think this
paper may be
printed and sent
to all officers?*

Pined

23. 4. 89

W. H. C.

29. 4. 89

Not necessary

S.E. II Circle ✓
Enr: P. W. A. ✓

1/5/89

C. 20. 4. 89

1/5/89
1/5/89
1/5/89
1/5/89

(5)

With order