Public Works (1896) Department.

G.O., . No. 1611W

DATED 28th May
1896

[Despatch Abstract.]

Accounts clerks

Stating that the rate of pay for—fixed at Rs 40 to 50 will be open not only to future nominees but also to those already on the list on the lower rate of Rs 30 to 40, and directing that the best men whether over or below the limit of 25 years should be selected for the Accounts branch.

[P. W. 26.
500—13-3-96.]

BACK PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.	G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

FURTHER PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.	G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

GENERAL.
ESTABLISHMENT.

Govt. of {1896} Madras.

PUBLIC WORKS.

Dated May, 28th.

Recd. *Encl.*

G.O. No. 1611 W., 28th May 1896.

MAY.

Accounts Clerks

Stating that the rate of pay for — fixed at Rs. 40 to Rs. 50 will be open not only to future nominees, but also to those already on the list on the lower rate of Rs. 30 to 40, and directing that the best men whether over or below the limit of 25 years should be selected for the Accounts branch.

No. 1611 W., 28th May 1896.

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS.

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.

General.
Establishment.

Read—the following papers :—

Petition from P. KUTUMBA RAO, Accounts Clerk, IV Class, 2nd grade, in II Circle, to the Joint Secretary to Government, Public Works Department (through the Executive Engineer, Kistna Northern Division), dated Bezwada, 25th March 1896.

I most respectfully beg to represent that G.O. No. 555 W., dated 13th February 1896, that Accounts clerks should generally be of less age than 25 years does not say that it has retrospective effect from 10th July 1893, the date of the Government Order sanctioning the entertainment of Accounts clerks, nor does it or any other Government Order cancel the G.O. No. 1802 W., dated 10th July 1893, *with retrospective effect.* This, I believe, has been done on principle, as otherwise the rule would affect the prospects of a number of men. This principle is in keeping with that adopted generally in cases of this nature when personal prospects are affected, but to my great misfortune the Examiner takes a different view altogether and says everything to have retrospective effect ; the result of this interpretation is nothing but to confirm his previous proceedings to keep me for ever outside the Accounts branch.

2. At this stage it will not be out of place to mention my claims based on past history :

I was appointed as clerk in Public Works Department on 6th January 1881.

Passed Entrance examination for Accountants, 4th grade, Public Works Department, in 1886.

Was for the first time appointed Accountants, 5th grade (temporary rank), on 13th March 1891.

Reverted to clerical branch owing to re-organization of 1891 on 31st December 1891.

Again appointed Accountant, 4th grade (temporary rank), during the absence on sick leave of Mr. Smith in "Berar" on 20th February 1892.

Reverted to clerical branch, 9th August 1892.

Appointed as Accounts clerk under G.O. No. 1802 W., dated 10th July 1893, on 9th September 1893.

Appointed to officiate as Accountant, 8th grade, on 15th October 1895.

Reverted to clerical branch on 29th December 1895.

These events alone in my life must give me a claim for an appointment as accountant, especially because on the occasions I was appointed as Accountant I had very favourable reports about me.

3. While I was being appointed as accountant and reverted to clerk, by my fortune (now it looks as misfortune) the Government Order about Accounts clerks came in on 10th July 1893 and this gave me full hopes of getting the first chance; but vacancy after vacancy up to not less than a dozen have been filled in and many a time my Executive Engineer represented my case with strong recommendation of his own and I was told in reply:

Executive Engineer's recommendation.	*Examiner's replies.*
(i) *No.* 73, *dated* 17*th October* 1893, *from Executive Engineer, Kistna Western Division, to the Examiner*—about my transfer to the Examiner's office. (Replied to in No. 1532 D., dated 25th October 1893, noted in the margin.)	"The question of transferring clerks allotted for training as Divisional Accountants will be taken up for consideration when reports from all Superintending Engineers are received."
(ii) *No.* 6, *dated* 2*nd April* 1894, *from the Executive Engineer, Kistna Northern Division, to the Examiner*—about my supersession in making appointments.	No reply from the Examiner.
(iii) *No.* 97 *M., dated* 24*th April* 1895, *from Executive Engineer, Kistna Northern Division, to the Examiner*—renewing my application for transfer. (Replied to in No. 1611 D.E., dated 4th May 1895, noted in the margin.)	"In view of the return from Foreign service of three Accountants, the prospect of appointing P. Kutumba Rao to the Subordinate Accounts establishment is more distant than ever."
(iv) *No.* 1068 *M., dated* 15*th October* 1895, *from Executive Engineer, Kistna Northern Division, to the Examiner*—about my supersession.	No reply from the Examiner.
(v) *No.* 518 *S.E., dated* 20*th December* 1895, *from Executive Engineer, Kistna Northern Division, to the Superintending Engineer, II Circle*—appealing against the appointments made by the Examiner from August 1892 the date on which I returned from Berar. (Replied to by the Examiner in No. 13 D.E., dated 8th January 1896, noted in the margin.)	"No appointments have been made under the conditions of G.O., No. 1802 W. of 10th July 1893, as those orders are under reconsideration by Government; such appointments as have been made are of persons who are qualified by having passed the Entrance examination as heretofore."

Note.—Four appointments have since been made.

Note.—I beg to say that I have also passed the Entrance examination.

At last, the Executive Engineer has felt the hardship of the case so much that he put two blunt questions to the Examiner either to give me appointment or say it will not be given, again recommending strongly about my fitness in his *No.* 583 *S.E. of* 27*th January* 1896; and the result is that, the first time and at this late hour, it is hinted (although not in conformity with previous endorsements) in Examiner's reply No. 268 D.E. of 1st February 1896, that my not being appointed was due to my not having preferential claims over the men appointed.

4. A few days after this the interpretations have even extended to the limit of saying that I am no more even an Accounts clerk, so that I am permanently debarred from getting into the Accounts branch for no fault of mine.

5. Claims to appointments may be based on two considerations—one is efficiency and the other is service. As regards the first I was reported, and have been reported up to date, to be thoroughly competent for the post aspired for, and if there are others equally competent it cannot be my fault and then the service alone must be the consideration; this you may judge yourself by obtaining a comparative statement of the services of each. Copies of testimonials I beg to enclose herein for your perusal.

6. If I am to be put off, as the Examiner has done, without being appointed to vacancies that occurred, I cannot but grow old as years pass away, and if this be made a reason to throw me out, I need not represent to you what amount of hardship I feel.

Hoping that a favourable view will be taken of the case.

No. 731 S.E.

Forwarded to the Superintending Engineer, II Circle.

28th March 1896.

(Signed) H. T. KEELING,
Ex. Engr., Kistna Northern Divn.

No. 24 K.N.

Transferred to the Chief Engineer, Public Works Department, with a list of men employed in the II Circle who have passed the Accounts Test, and who have reason to believe that the resolution of the Government of India, printed with G.O. No. 1802 W. of 10th July 1893, would be acted upon.

4th April 1896.

(Signed) W. L. C. BADDELEY, Major, R.E.,
Superintending Engineer, II Circle.

ENCLOSURE.

LIST of men employed in the II Circle who have passed the Accounts Test, &c.

Name.	Age up to 31st March 1896.		Present salary.	Date of	
				Joining department.	Passing the test.
	YS.	MS.	RS.		
1. P. Kutumba Rao	35	8	34	June 1882.	1886
2. M. Venkata Subbiah	32	11	30	May 1884.	1891
3. Ch. Mukteswera Rao	25	7	32	June 1890.	1894

Office-note from the Examiner, Public Works Accounts, dated Madras, 1st May 1896, No. 309 C.

[Your office-note No. 2015 C., dated 21st April 1896.]

The question raised is whether G.O. No. 1802 W. of 10th July 1893 is superseded by G.O. No. 257 W. of 22nd January 1896.

2. By the first order appointments were introduced of Accounts clerks on a salary of Rs. 30 rising to Rs. 40. Owing to representations made in July 1895, the title of the men appointed Account clerks to promotion in the ordinary course on the clerical establishment had to be considered. The matter generally came under reconsideration, and G.O. No. 257 W. was the result. The appointments were to be on a salary of Rs. 40 to Rs. 50, and the persons appointed were to have no claim to promotion on the clerical establishment.

3. Under the first order the appointments were not available for men drawing more than Rs. 30, whereas under the second order they were open to men drawing Rs. 30 to Rs. 40, and the appointments were thus available to another class of candidates from the establishment of clerks. If the second order does not supersede the first, men put in on Rs. 30 shut out those claiming to be put in on Rs. 40. Had Kutumba Rao been in the Rs. 40 to Rs. 50 grade, he would not have concerned himself about the first order and another man would have been appointed, but on receipt of the second he would no doubt have claimed to be appointed on Rs. 40 and would have agreed in the opinion that G.O. No. 257 W. superseded the first order.

4. G.O. No. 555 W. of 13th February 1896 does not affect the general question—it is a detail. It cannot be seriously argued that, because the question of age had not been specially taken up previous to its issue, a man of any age up to 55 has a claim to appointment and that his prospects are affected if he is not appointed. He has as much chance of being made an *accountant* irrespective of these orders as he had before, and his prospects, meanwhile, in the clerical branch are not interfered with.

5. In my opinion G.O. No. 257 W. of 22nd January 1896 does supersede G.O. No. 1802 W. of 10th July 1893, and if so, the appointments made under the latter are void and the men revert to their position as clerks. They might be proposed for nomination under the revised orders on the same salary (Rs. 30 to Rs. 40) pending

vacancies in the Rs. 40 to Rs. 50 grade, but they have no preferential claim by virtue of their appointments under the first order which had not the scope of the second, and I should very strongly oppose men of 30 to 34 being put into "in training" appointments when we can get plenty of young men under 25 years of age to train.

Order—No. 1611 W., dated 28th May 1896.

His Excellency the Governor in Council observes that in G.O. No. 257 W., dated 22nd January 1896, it was decided that Accounts clerks would in future enter on a higher initial rate of pay than that previously allowed; and in a subsequent order No. 555 W., dated 13th February 1896, it was declared that the limit of age up to which Accounts clerks should be appointed would be 25 years. But there was nothing in either of these orders to bar the transfer to the Accounts branch of men already in the list under the provisions of an ~~earliest~~ earlier order on the subject, viz., G.O. No. 1802 W., dated 10th July 1893.

2. The rate of pay for Accounts clerks has now been fixed* at Rs. 40 rising by the usual annual increment to Rs. 50, and this rate of pay will be open, not only to future nominees, but also to those already on the list on the lower rate of Rs. 30 to 40 under the provisions of the order of the 10th July 1893.

3. The selection of men for the Accounts branch rests with the Examiner, and in his nominations he must be guided by a due regard for the interests of the service, selecting from those already in the list the best men whether over or below the limit of 25 years.

(True Extract.)

(Signed) D. McNEIL CAMPBELL, Colonel, R.E.,
Joint Secy. to Govt., P.W.D.

* G.O. No. 257 W., dated 22nd January 1896.

To the Chief Engineer for Irrigation.
,, Superintending Engineers.
,, the Consulting Architect to Government.
,, the Examiner, Public Works Accounts.

Exd. T. K. Narayana Aiyangar.
Spare Copies

Public Works Department.

No 1611 W. dated 28th May 1896.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE MADRAS GOVERNMENT

gent [illegible]

Read the following

Petition from P. Kutumba Rao, (H.E. d/25 March 1896)
Endt by the E.E. Kistna Western Dn (- No 731 S.E. d/28th - -)
" " S.E. II Circle (- - 24 K.W. d/4 Apl.)
Office note from the Ex. P.W.A. (- - 309 C d/1 May.)

Print

A.S.H
21.6.96

H.E. the Govr. in Council observes that in G.O. No. 257 W dated 22d January 1896 it was decided that accounts clerks would in future enter on a higher initial rate of pay than that previously allowed; and, in a subsequent order, No. 555 W dated 13 Feby. 1896, it was declared that the limit of age up to which accounts clerks should be appointed would be 25 years. But there was nothing in either of these orders to bar the transfer to the Accounts

Branch of men already on the list under the provisions of ~~the~~ an earliest order on the subject, Vizt G.O. No. ~~1802 W~~ 1802 W d/10 July 1893.

2. The rate of pay for accounts clerks has now been fixed× at Rs 40 rising by the usual annual increment to Rs 50, and this rate of pay will be open not only to future nominees but also to those already on the list on the lower rate of Rs 30 to 40 under the provisions of the order of the 10 July 1893.

3. The selection of men for the Accounts Branch rests with the Examiner, and in his nominations he must be guided by a due regard for the interests of the service, selecting from those already on the list the best men (whether over or below the limit of 25 years.

12/5/96

CW 881
13.5.96

5

Accounts Clerks

× G.O. 257 W d/22nd Jany 96

DESPATCHED
10 JUN 96

C. E. for Irrign.
Supdg Engineers
Consg Architect
Ex. P. W. Accts

DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS
No. ....
27 MAR. 96
KISTNA NORTHERN DIVISION

EXAMINER
23 APR 1896

To,

The Chief Engineer and Secretary to Government,
P. W. D. Madras.

Through,

The Executive Engineer,
Kistna Northern Division.

The humble representation of P. Kutumba Rao, Accounts Clerk II class 2nd grade in Second Circle.

Sir,

I most respectfully beg to represent that G. O. No. 555 W dated 13th February 1896 that Accounts Clerks should generally be of less age than 25 years does not say that it has retrospective effect from 10th July 1893 the date of the G. O. sanctioning the entertainment of Accounts Clerks nor does it or any other G. O. Cancel the G. O. No. 1802 W dated 10th July 1893 with retrospective effect. This I believe has been done on principle as otherwise the rule would affect the prospects of a number of me[n]. This principle is in keeping with that adopted generally in cases of this nature when personal prospects are affected b[ut] to my great misfortune the Examiner takes a different view altogether and says every thing to have retrospective effect. The result of this interpretation is nothing but to confirm his previous proceedings to keep me for ever outside the Accou[nts] branch.

2. At this stage it will not be out of place to mention my claims based on past history:—

I was appointed as Clerk in D. P. W. on - - - 6-1-
Passed Entrance Examination for Accountants 4th grade P.W.D. in 18
Was for the first time appointed Accountant 5th grade (T. R.) on 13-3-
Reverted to Clerical branch owing to reorganization of 1891 on 31-12
Again appointed Accountant 4th grade (T. R.) during the absence on sick leave of Mr Smith in 'Berar' on 20-
Reverted to Clerical branch - - - - - - 9-
Appointed as Accounts Clerk under G. O. No. 1802 W d/10-7-93 on 9-
Appointed to officiate as Accountant 8th grade on - - - 15-
Reverted to Clerical branch on - - - - - - 29-

These events alone in my life must give me a claim for appointment as Accountant especially because on the occa[sion] I was appointed as Accountant I had very favorable [illegible] about me.

~~[illegible]~~ G.O. No. the G.O. fixes the limit of age as 25 in all cases
[illegible]

Cs [illegible] 15/2/96
as rates of pay are changed

When there before to say that I have also passed the Entrance examination -

While I was being appointed as Accountant and reverted to Clerk, by my fortune (now it looks as misfortune) the G.O. about Accounts Clerks came in on 10.7.93 and this gave me full hopes of getting the first chance; but vacancy after vacancy upto not less than a dozen have been filled in and many a time my Executive Engineer represented my case with strong recommendation of his own and I was told in reply:—

Executive Engineer's recommendation.	Examiner's replies.	
No 73 of 7-10-93 from Executive Engineer Kistna Western Division to the Examiner about my transfer to the Examiner's office (Replied to in No 1532 D of 25-10-93 noted in the margin) - - - - - - -	"The question of transferring clerks allotted for training as Divisional Accountants will be taken up for consideration when reports from all Supdg. Engineers are received."	
II. No 6 of 2.4.94 from the Exe: Engineer Kistna Western Dn. to the Examiner about my supercession in making appointments	No reply from the Examiner.	
III. No 97 M of 24.4.95 from Exe: Engineer Kistna Northern Dn. to the Examiner renewing my application for transfer (Replied to in No 1611 D/E of 4-5-95 noted in the margin) - - - - -	"In view of the return from Foreign Service of three accountants, the prospect of appointing P. Kutumbarao to the Subordinate Accounts Establishment is more distant than ever."	**Note.** Four appointments have since been made. 25/3
No 1068 M of 15-10-95 from Exe: Engineer Kistna Northern Division to the Examiner about my supercession - - - - -	No reply from the Examiner.	
No 518 S.E. of 20-12-95 from Exe: Engineer Kistna Northern Dn. to the Supdt. Engineer Second Circle appealing against the appointments made by the Examiner from August 1892 the date on which I returned from Berar - - - - - Replied to by the Examiner in No 13 D/E of 8-1-96 noted in the margin.)	"No appointments have been made under the conditions of G.O. No 1802 W of 10-7-93 as those orders are under reconsideration by Govt; such appointments as have been made are of persons who are qualified by having passed the Entrance Examination as heretofore."	**Note.** I beg to say that I have also passed the Entrance Examination. 25/3

At last the Executive Engineer has felt the hardship of the case so much that he put two blunt questions to the Examiner ither to give me appointment or say it will not be given gain recommending strongly about my fitness in his o 583 S.E. of 27th January 1896 and the result is that, first time and at this late hour, it is hinted (although t in conformity with previous endorsements) in Examiner's by No 268 D/E of 1st February 1896 that my not being appointed was due to my not having preferential claims over the men appointed.

4. A few days after this the interpretations have been extended to the limit of saying that I am no more than an Accounts Clerk so that I am permanently debarred from getting into the Accounts branch for no fault of mine.

5. Claims to appointments may be based on two considerations; one is efficiency and the other is service. As regards the first I was reported and have been reported upto date to be thoroughly competent for the post aspired for and if there are others equally competent it cannot be my fault and then the service alone must be the consideration; this you may judge yourself by obtaining a comparative statement of the services of each. Copies of testimonials I beg to enclose herein for your perusal.

6. If I am to be put off, as the Examiner has done, without being appointed to vacancies that occurred I cannot but grow old as years pass away and if this be made a reason to throw me out I need not represent to you what amount of hardship I feel.

Hoping that a favorable view will be taken of the case

I beg to remain,
Sir,
Your most obedient Servant
Mutuntakam,
Clerk,
Kistna Northern Division

Bezwada
25th March 1896

Thro',
The Manager.

26/3/96

Kistna Northern Division Office.
No 731 E.E. dated 28.3.96
Forwarded to Supt Eng II

27/3/9

Enclo. 1.

SUPDG. ENGINEER'S
30 MAR 96
SECOND CIRCLE

From

The Executive Engineer
Kistna Northern

To

The Supdg Engineer
II Circle

No 7318 dated 28.3.96.

Enclos 1.

Subject.

Kutumbarao pantulu petition. Forwards
regarding
his reversion to ordinary
clerkship.

with an endorsement on the reverse

No 24 K.N / 4.4.96

~~3419.~~

Enclos 2
1 Copy of Testimonials
1 List

No 24 K.N 2 / 4-4-96

Forwarded to the Chief Engineer P.W.D. with a list of men employed in the II Circle who have passed the Accounts test, & who have reason to believe that the Resolution of the Govt of India, printed with G.O. No 1802 W of 10th July 93 would be acted upon.

W W Batchelor
Major R.E.
2-4-96.
Supdg Engineer
II Circle

Recd 6.4.96

No. 2015 C d/ 21st April 1896

To
C

For favour of remarks.

V/4

10.4.96

EXAMINER
28 APR 1896
ACCOUNTS

COPIES OF TESTIMONIALS OF

Name:—Perapragada Kutumba Rao, ~~Accountant 5th Grade, Temporary Rank.~~ Clerk II Class 2nd grade

Date of birth:— 10th day of June 1860.

Date of Entertainment in Public Service:— 6th day of January 1881.

Examinations passed:—

1. General Test—Anglo Branch.
2. Translation Test—Lower Grade—English and Telugu.
3. Precis Writing Test Higher Grade—English.
4. Examination in Public Works Code Procedure and Practice.
5. Entrance Examination for Accountants 4th Grade Public Works Department

---

1. P. Kutumba Rao Pantulu has served under me for one year and-a-half as a Temporary Clerk, during which time I can testify to the zealous discharge of duties entrusted to him. He is intelligent and hard-working and has given me every satisfaction. He leaves this office on a permanent footing.

(Signed) C. MITFORDSMITH, Assistant Engineer,
Southern Sub-Division.
6—6—1882.

---

2. Perapragada Kutumba Rao has been Sub-Divisional Office Clerk under me for the last nine months previous to which he was under the Overseer Runga Rao Naidu. He is active, intelligent and willing and as far as I can judge seems to understand thoroughly the working of the P. W. D. Accounts.

6—11—1883. (Signed) J. J. WHITELY, Assistant Engineer.

---

3. I am glad to bear testimony to the industry and good habits of P. Kutumba Rao, the Cowtaram Sub-Divisional Clerk, short as my experience with him is, owing to my intimate acquaintance with him as my only Clerk during that period.

He appears to be also intelligent. I have no doubt he is a useful writer and deserves every encouragement.

(Signed) S. VENKATARAMANAYYA, Supervisor,
Cowtaram and Gudivada Sub-Divisions,
28—12—1883.

---

4. P. Kutumba Rao was nnder me as Clerk in the Cowtaram Sub-Division from January 1883 to June 1884. He is a capable man and knows his work thoroughly and would I consider do well in a higher post.

(Signed) J. J. WHITELEY, Assistant Engineer,
Cowtaram Sub-Division.
17—9—1884.

5. P. Kutumba Rao has been Clerk under me for thirteen months and has invariably given satisfaction in all his work. He goes from me to take up his permanent appointment in the Western Division K. S.

(Signed) P. ROSCOE ALLEN, Assistant Engineer,
7—8—1885. Cowtaram Sub-Division.

---

6. P Kutumba Rao has been Sub-Division writer under me for about three months. He appears to be quick and intelligent, accurate and well acquainted with Sub-Divisional accounts &c.

(Signed) S. D. PEARS, Assistant Engineer,
14—11—1885. Eastern Sub-Division.

---

7. Extract of remark from Service Register :—

P. Kutumba Rao has proved to be an excellent Sub-Divisional Clerk. He is quick and intelligent and has been recommended to the Examiner P. W. Accounts as suitable for an acting Accountant's post.

(Signed) G. D. WYBROW, Executive Engineer,
10—11—1886. Kistna Western Division

---

8. P. Kutumba Rao was Sub Divisional Writer in the Eastern Sub Division under me from September 1886 to April 1887 during which period he gave complete satisfaction. He has a good knowledge of the office work and accounts of the Sub Division, and is a hard-working and deligent writer.

(Signed) C. W. WOOD, Assistant Engineer,
7—5—1887. Eastern Sub-Division.

---

9. P. Kutumba Rao was Sub-Divisional Clerk under me from April 1887 to October 1888 and has thoroughly borne out all that has been said of him and is a most valuable and hardworking writer and has given complete satisfaction in every way. If promoted to a higher grade and to a position of greater trust, I feel quite sure that he will continue to be as useful and to give complete satisfaction.

(Sgined) A. C. PEREIRA, Assistant Engineer,
8—10—1888. Kistna Western Sub-Division.

---

10. P. Kutumba Rao Pantulu has been working under me as clerk during the last five months of my tenure of the Kistna Western Sub-Division. He is intelligent and quick in work and has abilities that deserve to be utilized in higher official position. I should be very glad to hear that he gets promotion and is well appreciated by officers of higher standing capable of doing him good.

(Signed) A. NILAKANTA SASTRY Supervisor,
9—3—1889. Kistna Western Sub-Division

11. P. Kutumba Rao Pantulu served under me as Sub-Divisional Clerk for a period of nine months from May 1889 during which time he discharged his duties to my entire satisfaction. He knows his work thoroughly, has passed the necessary tests for higher posts and is deserving of every encouragement. He is obedient and well behaved.

(Signed) T. SUBRAHMANYA IYER, Supervisor,
4—2—1890. Kistna Western Sub-Division.

---

12. P. Kutumba Rao Pantulu was clerk of Western Sub-Division of Kistna Western Division when I joined it in February 1890 and continued to be so till March 1891 when he left it on being made a probationary accountant. He was very good in his work and hard-working. I should be glad to hear of his being made permanent in his new footing and I doubt not he will be giving satisfaction to his Superiors in his new capacity.

(Signed) S. GOPALAKRISTNIER, Executive Engineer,
22—4—1891. Kistna Western Sub-Division.

---

13. Annual Report on the efficiency of Accountant for the year ending 31st October 1891, submitted to the examiner P. W. Accounts, Madras:

"Has worked satisfactorily."

(Signed) A. A. G. MALET, Executive Engineer,
10—10—91. Kistna Western Division.

---

14. Executive Engineer's endorsement on application dated 15—11—1891 addressed to the examiner P. W. Accounts, Madras, for a permanent Accountant's post:

"Forwarded. Applicant has worked satisfactorily since he was posted to this office. The Head Accountant reports that he understands the preparation of Divisional accounts."

(Signed) A. A. G. MALET, Executive Engineer,
Kistna Western Division.

15. P. Kutumbarao worked as temporary accountant in my Office for nearly a year.
He did his Work satisfactorily.

(Signed) Allan A. G. Malet,
3. 2. 92. Executive Engineer
Kistna Western Division.

Printed at the Hindu, Press", Mount Road, Madras.

16. Extract from letter No 518 S.E. d/20.12.95 from the Executive Engineer Kistna Northern Dn to the Supt Engr: II Circle.

"V. P. Kutumbarao has been doing the Accounts work in this Division which is from an accounts point of view a very heavy one having transactions in Workshops, Stock, Manufacturing Operations and Floating plant as as well as ordinary works since 15th October last. During this time he has been assisted by no trained Accounts Clerk and I have no reason to believe the Accounts have been submitted in a discreditable manner. This seems to me the best of all tests as regards fitness.

VI. I would be glad if you would endeavour to arrange that P. Kutumbarow be afforded the opportunity of undergoing any further qualifying service considered necessary and that his case may be considered in making appointments."

P. Kutumbarow,
25/3

SUPG. ENGINEER'S OFFICE
No. 2917
30 MAR. 96
P. W. D.
SECOND CIRCLE

1611 W

0455+2
~~3415~~/96
4103

KEEP WITH CURRENT No.

dated 189 .

GOVT. OF MADRAS. } 1896. { P. W. DEPT.

EXAMINER, P. W. ACCOUNTS,

E. No. 2
1,000—9-12-

Madras, 1 ~~April~~ May 1896.

OFFICE NOTE No. 309.C

To

W.

Your O.N.No.2015 C.of 21st.April 1896.

The question raised is whether G.O.No.1802 W. of 10th.July 1893 is superseded by G.O.No.257 W. of 22nd. January 1896.

2. By the first order appointments were introduced of accounts clerks on a salary of Rs.30 rising to Rs.40. Owing to representations made in July 1895, the title of the men appointed account clerks to promotion in the ordinary course on the clerical establishment had to be considered. The matter generally came under reconsideration, and G.O.No.257 W. was the result. The appointments were to be on a salary of Rs.40 to Rs.50 & the persons appointed were to have no claim to promotion on the clerical establishment.

3. Under the first order the appointments were not available for men

ng more than Rs.30, whereas under second order they were open to men rawing Rs.30 to Rs.40 and the appointments were thus available to another lass of candidates from the estab-ishment of clerks. If the second order oes not supersede the first men put in n Rs.30 shut out those claiming to be ut in on Rs.40. Had Kotumba Row been in the Rs.40 to Rs.50 grade he would not have concerned himself about the first order and another man would have been appointed, but on receipt of the second he would no doubt have claimed to be appointed on Rs.40 and would have agreed in the opinion that G.O.No.257 W. superseded the first order.

4. G.O.No.555 W. of 13th. February 1896 does not affect the general question - it is a detail. It cannot be seriously argued that, because the question of age had not been specially taken up previous to its issue, a man of any age up to 55 has a claim to appointment and that his prospects are affected if he is not appointed. He has as much ~~claim~~ chance of being made an accountant irrespective of these orders as he had before, & his prospects meanwhile in the clerical branch are not interfered with.

5. In my opinion G.O.No.257 W. of 22nd. January 1896 does supersede G.O.No. 1802 W. of 10th. July 1893 and if so, the appointments made under the latter are void and the men revert+ to their posi-
[illegible] might be

+ Why [illegible] they?
[illegible]

R.A. [illegible] 13.5.96 12/5/24

2

[illegible]

proposed for nomination under the revised orders on the same salary Rs.30 to Rs.40 pending vacancies in the Rs.40 to Rs.50 grade, but they have no preferential claim by virtue of their appointments under the first order, which had not the scope of the second, and I should very strongly oppose men of 30 to 34 being put into "in training" appointments when we can get plenty of young men under 25 years of age to train.

DCG

C.

[illegible]
30/4

P. W. CURRENT No. 4103

No. 2015 cw/ 21-4-96
555 w d/ 13-2-96
257 w d/ 22-1-96
2962 cd/ 14-10-95
2519 w d/ 12-10-95
2269 cd/ 12-7-95
2182 cd/ 2-7-95
1902 w d/ 10-7-93
2503 w d/ 7-9-92
3680 d/ 9-7-86
24670 d/ 22-12-85

Encls: 3

Recd: 1.5.96

7/5/96

t
h
o
a
h
p
i

o
p
u
th
is

re
are

2nd.
802 W. of
ppointments
oid and the

5. 63 cw

Question submitted for orders, as well as the meaning of the orders themselves. I accordingly submit a revised draft which, it is hoped, will render the matter clear.

C.S.
7 May 96.

I am not quite sure about para 2. If a man entered as accounts Clerk on 30-40 under G.O. No 1802 W d Aug/93 he cannot [illegible] I should say be promoted to accounts Clerk on 40-50 under G.O. 257 W 22nd Jan/96 but I should say he is equally entitled to selection of accounts branch with those who entered on 40-50

9/5/96

W

If it be decided in this way, the men on Rs 30-40 will have a grievance, and may justly complain that the latter order – No. 257 W d/ 22nd Jany 96 – intended to benefit them, affords them no relief. Some of these men have long been on the list of accounts clerks – they have been barred from promotion on the Clerical Establishment in consequence – and they will now see new men put in over their heads, on the higher rate of Rs 40-50. They put upon a separate list and declared eligible for appointment to the Accounts Branch – and now to tell them that they are no longer eligible, as the Examiner suggests, would, it is submitted, amount to a breach of faith. There is nothing in G.O. 257 W d/22nd Jany 96 to warrant such action.

C.S.
9 May 96

CN-4103
Ol. 63

Why [illegible] the matter to G.O. Can it not be from the Gov[illegible]

7/5/96

W

The question is one of interpretation of Govt. orders, and it is Govt. alone that can decide. Looking into the case I think C has a very confused idea of the

---

may well ask why if new men can come in on Rs40-50, they, who have been long qualified, should be kept down on to a lower rate of pay?

R.S.
9 May 96

As I understand the matter those who came in on 30-40 were to get promotion on the clerical staff; and when the salary increased to Rs 40-50 they were not to get such promotion. Consequently the petitioner is entitled to get promotion on the clerical staff & also to be selected for the accounts branch. G.O. No 1802 W of 16th Dec/93 has not been superseded by G.O No 257 W of 21st Jan/96.

8/5/96

W

The above seems the intention of the orders. Certain men have qualified under assurances given by Govt. They have been