

- (1) பக்கங்களின் எண்ணிக்கை 8
 (2) புதுக்கித் திருப்பிய நாள் 10/80
 (3) ஆதாரங்குறிப்பவர் சுருக்கொப்பம் 60

தமிழ்நாடு ஆவணக் காப்பகம்.

(71)

தமிழ்நாடு அரசு

P. W. D. துறை

அரசாணை எண். மு. கோப்புத் தாள் எண்.	2868	அச்சகம் பலவகை
நாள் :	28 - 10 - 1891	198

மடிக்கவோ கண்டபடி கையாளவோ கூடாது

4. Shells

ஆவண. கா-1-18,006-15-6-87.

Ln. சுருக்கொப்பம்

KEEP-WITH

CURRENT No.

GOVT.
OF MADRAS. }

189/.

{ P. W.
DEPT.

EXAMINER, P. W. ACCOUNTS.

dated

189 .

Madras, 9 October 189/.

OFFICE NOTE No. 6453.

To.

W.

With reference to para 2 of G.O No. 2617 W. dated 30th. September 1891 in which it has been remarked that the question raised in my letter No. 4780 of 17th. August 1891 should have been referred to Government in the first instance instead of to the Accountant General P.W.D., I would observe that the reference to the Accountant General P.W. D. was not made under P.W. Code para 356 as a representation against any decision of Government. It was simply an application for instructions as to the interpretation of a rule in the departmental code, and under para 354 of that Code Examiners are required to seek those instructions through the Accountant General P.W.D.

Offg. C.

P 9/10

Ex. B no 2617-20-2 30.9.91

P.M. CURRENT No 10739

12.10.91

No 2617-18 Waf 30-9-91

1/10

SMW

Cir 10739

28/8/91

OW

For orders.

It does not seem correct in principle that the Examiners should obtain an expression of opinion from the Assessor on an estate question & then ask permission to codify it.

The rules in the Code are based on the orders of the H. of J. or of this Court, but the procedure adopted by the Ex. in the case in point seems virtually to set the Ass. Genl. above this Court.

Cir

10.10.91

Is the rule about which 'C' was in doubt contained in the C.S. Reps.

DOB
13.10.91

No. 2617-18 W of 30-9-91

SW

The rule is not
in the C.S. Rules. It
is a P.W. departmental rule.

Cu

13-10-91

SW

What is his decision
with Madras Code -
I have only vol. I of
the C.S. Code here

SWB

14-10-91

SW

The rule in the
Madras Code is para
452(I)

Cu

14-10-91

No. 2617-18 W of 30-9-91

28/8/3

This observed that
the Govt. did not,
under para 554,
the P.W. Code,
make a reference
to the Q of 1 through
the A.G. He
was by default
the opinion of the
A.G. as to the
interpretation of
a Code Rule in
certain cases,
which opinion he
was desirous being
obtained he desires
that Govt. with a word
sanctioning the
consequence -

SW

No. 2617-80 of 30.9.91

Under these
circumstances
it is of opinion
that the question
should have
been referred
to it in the
first instance

FOR
17/10/91

No. 2617-18 of 30.9.91

19/10

No. 2868 W of 28.10.91

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE MADRAS GOVERNMENT.

2868
u

Read the following

Official note from the Secy. to Govt. N. E. No. 6153 of 9.10.91

It is observed that the
Examiners did not under
para 354 of the P.W. Code
make a reference to the
Govt. of India through
the Accountant General.
He merely sought the
opinion of the Accountant
General as to the interpre-
tation of a Code Rule in
certain cases, which
opinion being obtained
he desires that Govt.
will accord sanction to
its being codified.

11/10
25/10

2. Under these circumstances
Govt. is still of opinion
that the question should
have been referred to it
in the first instance.

Secy. to Govt.
19/10

FOR
19/10/91

~~Photo~~

cl 2868 W. of 28 Oct / 91

(4)

Am. 24-10. 26.30
R 27/10

3/11