

- (1) பக்கங்களின் எண்ணிக்கை 44
 (2) புதுக்கித் திருப்பிய நாள் 19-7-89
 (3) ஆதாரங்குறிப்பவர் சுருக்கொப்பம் 69

தமிழ்நாடு ஆவணக் காப்பகம்.

தமிழ்நாடு அரசு

P. W. D. துறை

அரசாணை எண். மு. கோப்புத் தாள் எண்.	2655-W	அச்சகம் பலவகை
நாள் :	25-7-1890	198

மடிக்கவோ கண்டபடி கையாளவோ கூடாது

Office of the Chief Engineer
Periyar Project
No. 943, P.R. Koodakulam 9th June 1890.
D/W 2055

From

Col. J. Pennington, R.R.
Chief Engineer,
Periyar Project.

To

The Chief Engineer,
P. W. D.

Sir,

Enc-1

With reference to item no. 1 of
the enclosed disallowance list I
have the honor to request that
definite orders may be passed
as to the rate of Furlough pay,
if any, to be passed to Supervisor
J. Vaidyalingam Pillai from 1st
December 1889.

2. The Examiner has disallowed
this payment under article 377-
of the Civil Service Regulations
which

which states that Furlough
granted to an officer ^{before} after he
attains the age of 35 years ceases
to have effect on the date ^{on which} he
attains that age.

3. The supervisor had com-
pleted his 55 years in Decmbr/89,
and he having been reported
by the Medical officer to be quite
fit for further service, the ex-
ension of Furlough has been
sanctioned by you, vide page
294 of the Fort St George Gazette
dated 25th February/90.

4. The supervisor has
been directed to submit a certi-
ficate of physical fitness before
he rejoins his appointment, vide
G. O. No 890 W dated 13th March/90.

5. I would suggest that
in cases similar to this, steps
should be taken to obviate any
objection.

objection on the part of the
Examiner before the grant²⁰⁵⁵
of leave is notified; it is
highly detrimental to depart-
mental discipline that the
Examiner should be in a
position to overrule the orders
of the Chief Engineer.

I have the honor to be,
Sir

your most obedient Servant

J. B. J. Call R.R.

Chief Engineer Pajoor Prop.

P.W.C. No. 5539

No. 943.P.R

From.

The Chief Engineer,
Periyar Project.

To

The Chief Engineer,
P.W.D.

Dated 9th June 1890

Ord. 13 - 6-90

Enclote

T. Vaidyalingham Pillai,
Supervisor.

Requests that definite
orders may be passed
as to the rate of fur-
-lough pay, if any,
to be passed to -

13/6

No. 945 C of 21-2-1890

No. 945 C of 22-1-1890

No. 945 C of 27-1-1890

No. 945 C of 15-1-1890

No. 945 C of 14-1-1890

No. 945 C of 25-7-1890

No. 945 C of 18-5-1890

No. 311 D Orlacam 18 June 1890

To C

It is clear that a
mistake was made in
granting the Supervisor ex-
-tention of furlough after
he had completed 55 years
of age.

If he be now
called upon either to
return to duty or to
retire at once, please
favour me with your
advice as to how the
period from December
1889 to date should be
treated - Can he be regarded
as on leave without pay?

P. W. D.
16.6.90 W.

(C. No. 120/8)

GOVT.
OF MADRAS.

1890.

P.W.
DEPT.

EXAMINER, P. W. ACCOUNTS.

KEEP-WITH

CURRENT No.

Madras, 5 July

1890.

dated

189

OFFICE NOTE No. 3965

To

W.

Your office note No. 311 D. dated 18th.
June 1890.

T. Vydialingam Pillay Supervisor
is shown in the establishment audit re-
-gisters of my office as having been born
in December 1834. The exact date of his
birth in December 1834 is not known &
in the absence of precise information
on the point, 1st. December 1834 has been
assumed to be the date of his birth.

2. Under Civil Service Regulations
article 377, the limit of leave admissi-
-ble even without allowances expired on
31st. May 1890 and as Vydialingam Pillay
did not return to duty on 1st. June 1890,
he has forfeited his appointment under
Civil Service Regulations article 261 &
being over 55 years of age it seems
very doubtful whether he can be reap-
-pointed. There is no absolute rule on
the subject, but the general spirit of
the rules seems opposed to the reap-
-pointment of an officer who has attain-
ed the ordinary age for superannuation.

3. If Government is of opinion that the supervisor cannot be reappointed there is apparently nothing to be done but to consider him to have retired from date of his attaining 55 years of age.

4. The additional complication now introduced has been caused entirely by the delay on the part of the Chief Engineer Periyar Project Works in referring the matter for the orders of Government. The claim to leave allowances was first disallowed under date 14th. February 1890 in the disallowance list on the salary bill for January 1890, & was finally confirmed under date 14th. April 1890 in the rejoinder to the reply to that disallowance list, and if the matter had then been promptly referred for the orders of Government it would have been settled long before the expiry of six months' leave admissible without allowances.

5. The rule (see code paras 543 & 544) that appeals against disallowances by the Examiner should be preferred by the officers concerned, or by or through their executive and administrative superiors is well known, and grounded on obvious reasons; but when the Executive Engineer asked the Chief Engineer to refer the matter for the orders of Government, the latter objected to being made a post office in a matter which, as he said, concerned the Chief Engineer P.W.D. and not himself, and sent

205/5
4

on the disallowance list (with the Executive Engineer's reply) to me for reference to the Chief Engineer P.W.D. Such references cannot be properly made by the Examiner, who is not the person to make recommendations as to what should be done, and who is seldom in possession of all the facts on which to ground any recommendation whatever; and I therefore returned the disallowance list, under date 29th. April 1890 pointing out to the Chief Engineer that it rested with him to refer the matter for the orders of Government if he thought the disallowance incorrect, and that I had nothing more to do with the matter except to watch the recovery, and to report to Government if the recovery should be unduly delayed.

6. If I had foreseen (which I did not) the possibility of the supervisor exceeding the maximum leave admissible to him, and if I had supposed (which I could not) that the Chief Engineer would decline to take any action until I should have been compelled to bring the matter to notice of Government, by reason of the undue delay in the recovery of the amounts disallowed, I would of course have warned the Chief Engineer, as to the possible consequences of the supervisor exceeding the maximum leave; but I do not think that, by any reasonable stretch of the doctrine of responsibility it can be held to be the duty of an audit office to foresee and guard

against all the indirect consequences which may conceivably result from the disregard of a plain rule by an administrative officer.

7. Although the rule is plain (vide code para 542) that when any allowance actually drawn is subsequently disallowed by the Examiner, it should be immediately refunded, whether the validity of the disallowance is disputed or not, I would not for a moment think of contending that there may not be circumstances in which an officer would be justified in deferring the enforcement of a recovery pending a reference to Government, provided the reference is made with all possible promptitude; but I submit that nothing can justify an officer in abstaining from all action whatever until, as a consequence of a report by the Examiner of undue delay in effecting the recovery, he is called upon by Government for an explanation; and in view of the fact that the abolition of pre-audit is now under discussion, I think it right to draw special attention to the action of the Chief Engineer Periyar Project Works in this matter. If pre-audit be abolished it can only be on the condition that the rule as to recovery is stringently enforced, and this is insisted upon by the Government of India; but it is hardly likely that it will be rigorously acted upon if Superintending Engineers and officers in analogous

2056
5
position set the example of disregarding it.

8. With reference to para 5 of the Chief Engineer's letter, I have long ago taken steps which I trust will prevent the possibility of the recurrence of such a case. It has never been the practice of the Examiner's office to examine grants of leave, and to question them if necessary on receipt of intimation of the grant, with reference to the 55 years' rule; and there is no rule that requires this to be done; but I think it is only reasonable and proper that it should be done; & therefore when this case -- the first instance of its kind as far as I am concerned -- came under my notice about five months ago, I at once gave directions that in future in all such cases the leave should be challenged at the time of granting. More than this I cannot do, because I am forbidden to report on leave applications of officers for whom service books are kept; but this should be quite sufficient provided the officers concerned do not disregard the objections of the Examiner. I do not think however that departmental discipline is at all likely to suffer, because an officer discharges the very duties for which he is appointed; it seems to me that it is more likely to suffer from disregard of rules by those whose duty it is to enforce their observance.

2057
5
6

P.W. C No. 6398

(32)

Ad. 7-7-90
Enc 4

No. 2055 W/S/25-7-90

Ans B. Vic

No. 305 D of 7 June 1890 P.W.D.
2055/6

Memorandum

With reference to
letter from the Chief
Govt. P. Project No.
943 P.R. 79 June 1890
the undersigned has
the honor to state
that it is now clear
that a mistake was
made in this office
in granting Supervisor
T. Vaidyalingam Pillai
an extension of furlough
> beyond the date on
which he attained
the age of 55 years,
& that any furlough
pay drawn by the
Supervisor after that
date must be re-
covered from him.

The Chief Officer

Person Project is re-
quested to be good
enough to call upon
the Supervisor without
delay to elect between
returning to duty or
retiring from the service
at once.

The question
as to how the period
from ~~1887~~ 1887 to
the present time should
be treated will be
further considered
in communication with
the Examiner. From

Article 377 C. S. Regs
it would appear that
the Supervisor can get
nothing more ~~than~~ ^{in proper circumstances}
six months leave without
pay after attaining 55
years.

It is observed
that if the mistake
had been brought to
the notice of this office
immediately it was

If he desires to return
to duty, he must produce
a medical certificate of
fitness before he is
permitted to do so.

pointed out by the
Examiner in his ²⁵⁵⁶ Disallow-
ance list dated February
last, its rectification
it would have been
very much simplified.
Attention is also invited
to the extract from
Service register forwarded
with letter from the
Ch. S. P. Project by
2067 P.R. of 17 Nov.
1889. at the foot of
which it was certified
by the Ch. S. P. Project
of the S. S. Div. that they had satisfied
themselves that an
extension of four
months leave to the
Supervisor from 1 Oct.
1889 was admissible,
whereas, ^{let it} ~~leave with pay only~~ ^{be made up}
to completion of 55 years
of age was admissible
under Art. 377 C. S. R.
This fact however does

not correct the mistake
made in this office.

Recd
17.6.90
SIR

No 305 D of 17 June 1890

Ch. S. P. Project
17.6.90

2055
Chief
OFFICE OF THE SUPERINTENDING ENGINEER,
PERIYAR PROJECT.

No. 22C
PR

Kodakkand 26 June 1890

From

Colonel J. P. P. S. E.
Chief Superintending Engineer,
Periyar Project.

To

The Chief Engineer,
P. W. Department.

Sir,

with 2936
sent 4/6/90
ENCLOSURES.

With reference to G. O. No 1616 of
10 Instant and to your No 305 D of
17 Instant I have the honor to state
that I had received information
(previous to the receipt of the G. O.
quoted) of the irregular payment
to Supervisor Vaidyalingam Pillai.

2 It would seem the most
natural course and would certainly
save a great deal of delay and
trouble for the Examiner to bring a
payment of this kind to the notice
of the Superintending Engineer
concerned directly he receives information of it,
which in this case must have been
before

before the end of March, and not to wait for nearly three months and then report the matter direct to Government. Had he done so in the case in question orders would have been at once issued (as has now been done) for the recovery of the amount paid.

3. The Examiner does not appear justified in entering the item as "improperly paid before audit"; the charge was a recurring one and had been duly passed for preceding months, and the extension of leave having been granted by yourself, the Executive Engineer was justified in supposing that any objection under article 377 of the Civil Service Regulations had been removed. It is impossible for an Executive Engineer to go behind the orders of the Chief Engineer in such a case.

4. If however there was any irregularity in the matter it is the

the Examiner himself who is responsible for it; it was his duty to bring to your notice any objection which might exist to the grant of furlough to the Supervisor immediately on the extension of furlough from 21st October to 21st February being gazetted which was in January 1890.

5. Had he done then the order granting the leave could have been cancelled before the payment objected to was made.

6. G. O. No 1724 W of 11 June 1888 (an order which has caused a large increase in clerical work with no practical advantage) was passed at the instance of the Examiner expressly in order that he might take prompt action in case similar to the one under discussion, and of course the same principle applies to sanctions granted by the Chief Engineer.

Not

Not only did the Examiner neglect to take action, as he should have done, of his own accord, but he has persistently refused to do so when requested by this office (vide my letter to 943 PR of 9 instants) and I have had myself after some months delay to refer the matter to you for orders

7 It does not seem right that the Examiner should be permitted to induce an irregularity by his own neglect, and then after some months delay to report it to Government with an incomplete statement of the facts drawn up in such a manner as to imply that the responsibility rests with the Executive Engineer

8. The Supervisor had returned to duty, his furlough having expired, before action could be taken on para 2 of your memo
under

with 311 D-4
18.6.90 at 10.15
January

311 D-4 18.6.90
at 10.15

under reply; a medical certificate of fitness to remain in the service was forwarded ~~was forwarded~~ with my endorsement to 55 PR of 13 June 1890, but he will be directed to obtain a fresh certificate if you consider it necessary.

I have the honor to be,
Sir,

Your most obedt servant,

J. B. R. E.

Chief Engr, Peninsular & Oriental Steam Navigation Co.

P. W. D. Periyar Project.

From

Chief
The Superintending Engineer,
PERIYAR PROJECT.

To

The *Chief Engineer*
I. M. Department
No. *22C*
PR

Dated *26* } June 1890
Received *30* }

Enclosure. - *two*

Subject.

Supervisor Vaidyalingam Pillai

State that - had returned to duty before action could be taken on para 2 of Chief Eng's Memo to *305D* *17.6.90* that a medical certificate of fitness to remain in the service was forwarded with the office to *55PR* and that the Supervisor will be directed to obtain a fresh one if necessary.

P. W. D.

8. Aug 1724 w 7 11-6-18

No. 376 D. 5th July 1890.

To C

For per our of any remarks you may wish to offer, in connection with your reply to this office to 311 D 27/18th June 1890 -

2. Both the notifications printed, extending leave to Supervisor J. Vaidyalingam Pillai were sent through your office, as usual, for publication, and as the leave was inadmissible, it is thought that the notifications should have been held back, & the mistake pointed out to the office at once.

5/7/90
I fold

(C. No. 1201)

255
11

GOVT. OF MADRAS.

1890.

P. W. DEPT.

EXAMINER, P. W. ACCOUNTS.

KEEP-WITH

CURRENT No.

Madras,

9th July 1890.

OFFICE NOTE No. *4086*.

dated

189

To

Your office note No. 376D dated 5th July 1890.

Please see para 8 of my office note No. 3965 dated 5th July 1890, which answers your para 2. It was obviously unlikely that I should come to know the practice of this office, in such a matter, except through the occurrence of some difficulty and when I learnt what the practice was I immediately took steps to have it altered.

2. Admitting that the action of my office was not all that it might have been, I must point out that nevertheless it was in no way responsible for

for the overpayment, which
was brought about solely
by the Executive Engineer's
disregard of a positive rule.
Code para 473/81(a) says as
plainly as possible that
leave allowances are not
to be paid before audit, and
if the Executive Engineer had
not disregarded this rule
there would have been no
overpayment to recover.

3. With reference to para 2
of the Chief Engineer's letter,
I do not see what necessity
there can be for bringing
all irregular payments
at once to the notice of the
Superintending Engineer.
The Executive Engineer's con-
cerned know perfectly
well that in all such cases
it is their duty to recover
promptly the amounts
disallowed; and it would
give much trouble and
it seems quite unnecessary
to

2058
to proceed on the assumption
that the Executive Engineers
will not observe a well
known rule, without being
expressly ordered to do so
on each separate occasion.
The report "direct to Govern-
ment" was made in ac-
cordance with a practice
approved by government,
and having regard to the
desirability of expediting
such recoveries to the
utmost possible extent,
I am disposed to doubt
the expediency of modify-
ing the present practice,
which has resulted in a
great reduction of the num-
ber of such irregularities
outstanding ^{for} ~~from~~ any
length of time. Nor was
there any ^{undue} ~~undue~~ delay in
making the report; the ac-
counts for February are
not received until nearly
the

the end of March, and are
not completely disposed
of until nearly the end
of April, and the report
was made on the 3rd June.

4. My para 2 above dis-
poses of the Chief Engineer's
para 3. The amount was
"improperly paid before audit"

5. The same para and my
previous explanation dis-
poses of his paras 4 and 5.

6. With regard to two paras
to the wisdom of G.O. No.
1424, W. dated 11th ^{June} ~~November~~
1888 is not ^{now} ~~more~~ in question,
and need not be discussed;
and the latter part of this
para has been disposed
of in anticipation by para
5 of my office note No 3965
dated 5th July 1890. When
I have been obliged to dis-
allow a claim, I have no-
thing more to do with
the matter. The code rule

is perfectly plain and I
venture to think that the
common sense of the mat-
ter is equally plain. Even
if it was otherwise reason-
able that the onus of
rectifying the irregularities
of executive and administra-
tive officers should be
put upon me, it would
not be to the advantage
of those principally con-
cerned, because I not only
have no interest in the
matter but from the
very nature of my duties,
I am liable to an unfavor-
able bias: moreover I
seldom have sufficient
information to enable
me to state the case com-
pletely and properly. Also
I am certainly not the proper
person to make recommen-
dations (for exemptions
and mitigations) such

as are generally necessary
in such cases

y. I do not ^{exactly} ~~equally~~ under-
stand what may be the
meaning of the remarks
in para y about "an incom-
plete statement of the facts
drawn up for you". I did not
pretend to give a complete
statement of the facts. It
was not my business to
do so. I simply gave such
a description of the trans-
action as would suffice
for its identification. But
if there ^{was} ~~were~~ anything in
the description that implied
the responsibility of the
Executive Engineer, the
implication was, I think,
quite correct.

8. My office Note No 3965
dated 5th July 1890 was
written under the im-
pression that the Chief
Engineer Periyar project
works

2058
14
works was all along aware
of the overpayment having
been made; but it now seems
a little doubtful whether
this was the case although
as Colonel Pennycuik
evidently supposed that
leave allowances were
payable before audit,
the natural thing would
apparently be for him
to assume that the amount
had been paid, and to
proceed accordingly. Para
1 of the Chief Engineer's
letter certainly says that
he had received intimation
of the payment, but this
paragraph, as it stands
reads ^{curiously} ~~assessably~~ and is
scarcely reconcilable with
para 2, and it seems pro-
bable that the word "no"
has, by a clerical error,
been omitted between "received"
and

and "intimation". If it is a fact that the Chief Engineer was not aware that payment had been made, I must ask that my previous remarks (office note No. 3965) so far as they are based upon, or ^{derive} ~~claim~~ any force from, such an erroneous assumption, may be considered cancelled or modified.

9 Since writing my office note No. 3965, it has occurred to me that a way out of the difficulty may be found by taking advantage of the doubt as to the exact date of the Supervisor's birth. The practice, when only the month of birth is stated, is to take the first of the month as the date, but I am not aware of any rule on the subject and

subject

2065
subject to the approval of government there is probably no insuperable objection to taking the last day of the month as the date of birth. If this is done the supervisor will not, I believe, have exceeded the six month's leave admissible, without allowances, after attaining the age of 55, and he will become entitled to another month with allowances reducing the overpayment to Rs 100.

1/6
906
R/7
(R/7/7)

305 D - 17.6.20
 376 D - 5.7.20
 311 D - 18.6.20
 945 C - 21.2.20
 408 C - 22.1.20
 5520 C - 27.11.89
 5320 C - 15.11.89
 4635 C - 14.10.89
 3621 C - 25.9.88
 1724 W - 11.6.88

PW Cdn 6523

Ord 10-7-90
 Encl

890 W - 18.3.90. Revised

No. 2055 W 25-7-90

27 Oct 75 VII
 R 23 7 90

6523

Wm 18.6.20
 18.6.20

70 W

J. Vanderglinen Pallen's

leave.

In this case the
 the Ch. S. P. Project then
 the leave on the basis
 office for not leaving
 to notice the irregular
 from of leave, while
 the day then leave
 the leave of the Ch. S.
 P. Project.

The fact remains
 that the notification
 from the extension
 of leave were sent through
 the basis office for check
 & publication in the
 usual way, of the
 inadmissibility of the
 leave after 58 years &
 age should have been
 detected at once. On
 this point, the C. might
 until lately it was not
 usual for his office
 to check leave application
 of subordinates, having
 inclusion the case. There
 could have been no
 object in sending

the anticipation through
C's office for publication.

Further, - in the
53 years statement in
the file it was stated
distinctly that an
extension of leave to
the Supervisor had
been applied for,
but C sent this on
without remarks.
Whereas he should
apparently have
pointed out that
the extension after
Decr 1899 was
inadmissible.

The Sup shows
a copy out of the
docket in the
last para of his
note by 4086 29-7-90,
his approval, his
impression correct
be adapted, &
nothing more said
of the irregular part.

There have been
oversights all round,
it will be difficult

to fix the responsibility.

In the 80. it
is proposed that
that in Decr last
the Supervisor should
produce a further
medical certificate
possessing if he
wishes to remain in
the service.

Cu

14-7-90

Note by the Chief Engineer P. W. Dept.

Supervisor J. Vaidyalingam Pillai, employed on the Periyar Project, was granted furlough for one year from 21st October 1888.

In January 1890 he was granted an extension of four months on medical certificate, and in February 1890 a further extension of four months was granted, bringing his leave up to 20th June 1890.

In the meantime the Supervisor had attained his 55th year in December 1889, and under Article 377 C. S. Regulations he was thereafter eligible to no other⁺ leave than 6 months without allowances.

The applications for extensions of leave made

+ He was not eligible for priv. leave, & could not take leave on pr. again, as he had already had furlough.

2055
12 23 7 7

no mention of the fact that
the Supervisor had attained his
55th year in December, and
the Certificates accompanying
the applications, to the
effect that the Executive
Engineer has satisfied
himself that the leave
applied for was admissible,
were duly signed by the
Executive Engineer No. II
Division and the Chief
Engineer, Periyar Project.

The fact that the Supervisor
was over 55 was overlooked
in the Chief Engineer's office,
and the notifications granting
the extensions on medical
certificate were thereupon
issued.

It may be here
mentioned that Gazette
notifications of every
description relating to the
Engineer Upper Subordinate
establishment, emanating
from the P. W. Secretariat,
are sent to the Government
Press through the Office of

of the Examiner, P. W. Accounts,
the object being that any
irregularity may be checked
and brought to notice before
publication. The notifications
granting Vaidyalingam
Pillai followed the usual
course, but the fact that
leave on half pay was
admissible ^{to} no later date
than December 1899 escaped
notice in the Examiner's
office also.

The leave pay of the
Supervisor was however
disallowed by the Examiner
in his disallowance list
of 14th Feb. 1899 on the
salary bill of the Periyar
No. II Division for January
1899, and if the irregularity
had at that time been
promptly reported either
by the Examiner or the Chief
Engineer, Periyar Project,
there

There would have been no difficulty in rectifying it. Much time however was lost in intermediate references between these two officers, & the matter was finally brought to the notice of the undersigned in the letter of the Chief Engr. Penyar Project No. 943PR dated 9th June 1890. In the meanwhile the six months, for which period alone the Supervisor was eligible to leave without pay, had expired.

The Chief Engineer, Penyar Project considers that it was the duty of the Examiner to have reported the irregular grant of leave to this office, while the Examiner thinks that his duty was accomplished when he pointed it out in the disallowance list to the Executive Engineer C^o II Division - with ^{respect} ~~respect~~ to the draft notifications ^{passing}

passing through the Examiner's office to the Gazette ^{press} ~~press~~ without check, that officer explains that until ^{very} recently grants of leave to subordinates were not checked in his office. It is strange however that while the Supervisors leave pay was disallowed by the Examiner on 14th February, the Gazette notification granting the second extension of sick leave was allowed to pass through the Examiner's office to the Press unchallenged on the 21st February. Another strange circumstance is that in the annual 55 years statement submitted at the beginning of this year, the Chief Engineer Penyar Project expressly mentioned that an extension of leave for four months on medical certificate has been applied for on behalf of Vaidyalingam, and the Examiner passed on this remark to Government without question. The case now stands

Yello

No. 2055 Wd/25 July 1890

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE MADRAS GOVERNMENT.

Read the following

Letter from the Chief Engr. Per^r P^r H.S. No 943 P.R. dt 9. vi. 90.
The Secy P. W. Accts. - No 3965 dt 5. vii. 90.
Chief Engineer Sengar P^r - No 222 P.R. dt 26. vi. 90.
The Secy P. W. Accts. - No 4086 dt 9. vii. 90.
Note by the Chief Engineer, P. W. D. - dt 17. vii. 90.

The Government understands that the exact date of Supervisor J. Vaidyalingsam Pillai's birth in December is not known, and that the 1st December has been arbitrarily fixed as the date of his birth. There seems no reason why in his case the last day of December should not be taken for the purposes of the 55 years rule, and the latter date will therefore

No. 2055 Wd/25-7-

be adopted. The leave
on medical certificate granted
to the Supervisor in the
notifications marginally
noted will therefore extend
to the 31st December 1889,
and the remaining period
from 1st January to 20 June
1890 will be commuted
to leave without allowances
under article 377. C. S. Regulation

2. The Supervisor being over
55 years of age, his retention
in the service to the end of
the present calendar year
is sanctioned, but his
further continuance in his
appointment will be left for
consideration until December
next, when the Executive
Engineer under whom he is
serving will report on his
fitness for his duties

Recd 17.7.90

P.W.D. Notification 11/2/85 Part II
20th 11/2/85
Chapter of 44-1-90.

Do " " 11/2/85, Part II
Chapter of 25-2-90.

2055 W/25 July 1890
C. S. R.

Ch. Engr. Power Dept
Mtn Dis. List

Exam^d P. W. A.
Isps. 28/7

C. S. R.
15.11.90

1901/11/28/7