7103

Govt. of {1896} Madras.

PUBLIC WORKS.

Dated 8/8/96

Recd.

Encl.

G.O., 7/8 1896 No. 2270 W. ~~2270 W.~~

Civil Service Regulations.

=

The Ruling of the Govt of India as to the interpretation of Article 1159 (explanation) of the —, Comtd to officers of the P.W.D. for information.

~~220/14~~

~~220~~

220/14

INDEXED

3/5

P. W. 13.
1,000—4-5-95.

2048

No. 2270 W., 7TH AUGUST 1896.

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS.

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.

General.
Establishment.

READ—again the following papers :—

G.O. Nos. 1571–72 W., dated 22nd May 1896.

From the Executive Engineer, Kistna Western Division, to the Superintending Engineer, II Circle, dated 30th January 1896, No. 429 S.

I have the honour to forward correspondence as per margin and to request that orders of Government may be obtained.

2. The facts of the case are as follows :—

Mr. L. D. Venkatarama Iyer, Assistant Engineer, halted at Vadhesweram from 2nd to 11th June 1895, *i.e.*, exactly ten days. He then proceeded to Sitanagaram which is 4 miles from Vadhesweram and halted at Sitanagaram for five days (12th to 16th June). Both these places are more than 5 miles from his permanent head-quarters at Guntúr.

3. The Examiner, Public Works Accounts, has disallowed the daily allowance claimed for 12th to 16th June under Civil Service Regulations, article 1159 (explanation).

4. I submit that this disallowance is incorrect. Article 1159 (explanation) only refers to a halt of more than ten days. In this instance, the halt at Vadhesweram was exactly ten days. Mr. L. D. Venkatarama Iyer did not return from Sitanagaram to Vadhesweram ; so I do not see how the explanation of article 1159 applies.

5. I submit that it is immaterial whether Mr. L. D. Venkatarama Iyer moved his camp 1 mile or 30 miles on the 12th June provided—

(1) He did not halt more than ten days at one place.

(2) That the place or places were more than 5 miles from his permanent head-quarters.

(3) That he did not return to the place at which he had halted more than ten days previous to the 12th June.

As none of these conditions apply to the present case, I believe Mr. L. D. Venkatarama Iyer is entitled to daily allowance from 12th to 16th June 1895.

6. If, however, Government agrees with the Examiner, Public Works Accounts, and considers that the halts at Vadhesweram and Sitanagaram constitute a single halt of fifteen days' duration, I have the honour to request that daily allowance for 12th to 16th June 1895 may be passed as a special case under article 1159 (*a*), as I had to proceed to Masulipatam on urgent business and instructed Mr. L. D. Venkatarama Iyer to remain at or near Sitanagaram when canals were first re-opened (the head-sluices were opened on the 8th June) to attend to the regulation.

ENCLOSURES.

From M.R.Ry. L. D. VENKATARAMA IYER Avergal, Assistant Engineer, Eastern Sub-Division, to the Executive Engineer, Kistna Western Division, dated 14th July 1895, No. 9[illegible].

With reference to the list of observations No. 13, on my travelling allowance journal for June 1895, I have the honour to point out that article 1157 of the Civil Service Regulations deals with the limiting distance of 5 miles from head-quarters, and in the present case the distance of

Sitanagaram from Guntúr (my head-quarters) is 18 miles. Article 1159 of the Civil Service Rugulations says that a daily allowance may not be drawn for more than ten days' halt at one place, and I have not halted for more than ten days at Vadhesweram. The explanation under article 1159 says as follows :—

> "An officer who remains *more than ten days* halted at any place, may, after the completion of the ten days' halt there, draw travelling allowance under the ordinary rules applicable to him for any journey made on one day from and to the halting place, if he reaches a point more than 5 miles distance from it. A halt is not interrupted for the purpose of this rule by an absence on duty from the place of halting for less than three nights."

This explanation implies that, when an officer halts for *more than ten days* at one place, that place is treated as his temporary head-quarters, and that the ordinary rules of travelling allowance will apply for the journeys made from that station. In the present case I have halted *only for ten days* at Vadhesweram, and not for *more than ten days*, and consequently Vadhesweram cannot be considered as having been made my temporary head-quarters, Guntúr continuing to be my head-quarters, so long as I do not halt for more than ten days at any one station.

Article 1164 (*c*) of the Civil Service Regulations will apply to the present case, only if it be construed that Vadhesweram has been made my temporary head-quarters. As pointed out above, Vadhesweram has not been made my temporary head-quarters, and consequently this article of the Civil Service Regulations does not apply to the present case.

From M.R.Ry. L. D. VENKATARAMA IYER Avergal, the Officer in charge, Eastern Sub-Division, to the Executive Engineer, Kistna Western Division, dated 24th January 1896, No. 218.

In returning herewith the extract from the list of disallowances from travelling allowance bill for June 1895, I have the honour to point out that the final orders of the Examiner are based on no argument to suit my explanation. I do not say that Sitanagaram is not within 5 miles from Vadhesweram, nor do I say that I did not halt at Vadhesweram for ten days (2nd to 11th June 1895). I only say that, as I have halted *only for ten days* and not for *more than ten days*, article 1159 (explanation) cannot apply to this case. As the Examiner has finally disallowed the claim, the only course left for me now is to refer the matter to Government through you and the Superintending Engineer. When referring the matter to the Superintending Engineer, please kindly send my full explanation contained in my letter No. 93, dated 14th July 1895.

In this connection, I have also to point out that, under your instructions, I had to stop at or near Sitanagaram, in order to look after regulation, when the main canal was opened in the evening of the 8th June, as you had to go to Masulipatam in connection with a law suit. If it is to be decided by Government that ten days' halt at Vadhesweram and five days' halt at Sitanagaram constitute fifteen days' halt at one place, I will have to make my representations to Government, that I had to make that continued halt in the interests of public service, and that my allowances should be passed under article 1159 (1) of the Civil Service Regulations. But I do not wish to take that course without ascertaining whether the claim, as put forth by me, is admissible or not.

No. 2321 K.S.

Forwarded to the Chief Engineer, Public Works Department, for favour of orders.

2. The arguments of the Executive and Assistant Engineers appear to be sound.

6th February 1896.
(Signed) W. M. ELLIS, Capt., R.E.,
Suptg. Engineer, II Circle.

Office-note from the Examiner, Public Works Accounts, dated 18th February 1896, No. 130 A.D.

The claim is inadmissible. The Assistant Engineer's journey from Vadhesweram to Sitanagaram was not to a point more than 5 miles from the halting place and he is not, under the ordinary rules applicable, entitled to any travelling allowance for journeys under 5 miles. The exemption asked for under Civil Service Regulations, article 1159, may be granted should Government consider the case justifies the concession.

Memo. No. 1176 C.

Referred to the Financial Department for favour of information as to the practice in the Civil Department in similar cases.

2. The Examiner states that Assistant Engineer Mr. L. D. Venkatarama Iyer's claim to daily allowance for the halt at Sitanagaram is inadmissible, but there appears to be much force in the Executive Engineer's arguments in favour of the claim. The chief point appears to be that the Assistant Engineer did not return from Sitanagaram to Vadhesweram, that therefore the latter ceased to be the halting place when he left it, and that the halt at Sitanagaram was a fresh one for which daily allowance should be granted.

(Signed) D. McNEIL CAMPBELL, Col., R.E.,
Joint Secretary to Government.

2nd March 1896.

No. 511, Financial.

Referred to the Accountant-General for favour of remarks.

(By order.)

(Signed) W. W. PHILLIPS,
Ag. Assistant Secretary.

Fort St. George,
6th March 1896.

From F. C. HARRISON, Esq., Officiating Accountant-General to the Government of Madras, to the Chief Secretary to Government, dated Fort St. George, 23rd March 1896, No. 901.

With reference to Government endorsement No. 511, Financial Department, dated the 6th of March 1896, referring for my remarks, correspondence relating to the claim to daily allowance preferred by M.R.Ry. L. D. Venkatarama Iyer Avergal, Assistant Engineer, for the period from 12th to 16th June 1895, I have the honour to observe that the practice of this office in similar cases has been to admit the claim for the whole period on the ground adduced by the Joint Secretary to Government, Public Works Department, in his Memo. No. 1176 C., dated 2nd March 1896, viz., that, as the officer did not return from Sitanagaram to Vadhesweram, the latter station ceased to be the halting place when he left it, and that the halt at Sitanagaram was a fresh one for which daily allowance should be granted.

No. 749, Financial.

Transferred to the Public Works Department.

(Signed) W. W. PHILLIPS,
Ag. Assistant Secretary.

Fort St. George,
3rd April 1896.

Office-note from the Examiner, Public Works Accounts, dated Madras, 18th April 1896, No. 1105 D./E.

[Your office-note No. 1956 C. of 11th April 1896.]

Under article 1164 (*c*) a halt within 5 miles of head-quarters is a halt *at* head-quarter, *i.e.*, at the head-quarters station.

2. Under article 1159 (explanation) a halt *during tour* (obviously at some place other than head-quarter station) is not interrupted by an absence of less than three nights, nevertheless an officer so halting may draw travelling allowance *under ordinary rules* for any journey made during such halt and from such place.

3. The Assistant Engineer halted at Vadhesweram ten days, his journey "from the place of halting" during tour to Sitanagaram was not to a point more than 5 miles from that place of halting and though his absence from Vedhesweram was three clear days, 13th—15th, he was not under ordinary rules entitled to any travelling allowance because he travelled within 5 miles.

4. I therefore do not consider the claim admissible.

Order—No. 1571 W., dated 22nd May 1896.

The Government of India will be addressed.

2. Meanwhile Mr. L. D. Venkatarama Iyer, Assistant Engineer, will be exempted from the operation of article 1159, Civil Service Regulations, in respect of the halt at Sitanagaram from the 12th to 16th June 1895.

[Here enter No. 1572 W., dated 22nd May 1896.]

(True Extract.)

(Signed) D. McNEIL CAMPBELL, Colonel, R.E.,
Joint Secretary to Government.

Letter—from the Joint Secretary to the Government of Madras, Public Works Department, to the Secretary to the Government of India, Public Works Department, dated Ootacamund, 22nd May 1896, No. 1572 W.

I am directed to submit the following case for the orders of the Government of India.

2. In June last year, Mr. L. D. Venkatarama Iyer, Assistant Engineer, attached to the Kistna Western Division, proceeded on duty to Vadhesweram in the Kistna district, and halted there from the 2nd to the 11th June, *i.e.*, for ten days. He then proceeded to Sitanagaram, which is 4 miles from Vadhesweram, and halted at the former place from the 12th to 16th June. Both these stations are more than 5 miles from his permanent head-quarters at Guntúr. From Sitanagaram he proceeded on his tour without returning to Vadhesweram. The Examiner, Public Works Accounts, under article 1159, Civil Service Regulations (*explanation*) disallowed the Assistant Engineer's claim to daily allowance for the halt from 12th to 16th June at Sitanagaram on the ground that the journey there was to a point not more than five miles from the previous halting station. The Executive and Superintending Engineers under whom the Assistant Engineer was serving contested the Examiner's ruling on the ground that, as the Assistant Engineer did not return from Sitanagaram to Vadhesweram, the latter station ceased to be the halting place, and that the halt at Sitanagaram was a fresh one, for which daily allowance should be granted. This Government concurred in the above view, and referred the question for opinion to the Accountant-General to the Government of Madras, who also agrees with the Superintending Engineer and reports that the practice of his office is to admit daily allowance for the second halt in similar cases. The Examiner, however, maintain his position, and I am therefore to request a ruling on the point from the Government of India.

Read—also the following papers :—

From the Government of India, Public Works Department, dated 15th June 1896, No. 1489 G.

From G. H. D. WALKER, Esq., Under Secretary to the Government of India, Public Works Department (General), to the Joint Secretary to the Government of Madras, Public Works Department, dated Simla, the 20th July 1896, No. 1807 G.

With reference to correspondence ending with your letter No. 2000 W., dated 8th July 1896, I am directed to state that the interpretation placed by the Government of Madras on article 1159 (explanation) of the Civil Service Regulations is correct. The claim preferred by Mr. L. D. Venkatarama Iyer, Assistant Engineer, to daily allowance for the halt at Sitanagaram from 12th to 16th June 1895 should therefore be admitted and passed.

Kistna

Order—No. 2270 W., dated 7th August 1896.

The ruling of the Government of India will be communicated to the officers of the Public Works Department for information.

(True Extract.)

Under Secretary to Government.

To the Examiner, Public Works Accounts.
,, Superintending Engineers.
,, Lieutenant-Colonel Smart, R.E.
,, the Consulting Architect to Government.
,, the Financial Department.

Exd. Md. Pahilvan.
Spare Copies

GENERAL.
ESTABLISHMENT.

Govt. of {1896} Madras.
PUBLIC WORKS.

Dated August, 7th.

Recd. *Encl.*

G.O. No. 2270 W., 7th Aug. 1896.

AUGUST.

Civil Service Regulations

The ruling of the Government of India as to the interpretation of article 1159 (explanation) of the —, communicated to officers of the Public Works Department for information.

EXAMINER
14 APR 1896
P.W. ACCOUNTS

Letter from the Exe. Engineer, Kistna Western Dn., to the Supg. Engineer, 2nd Circle, d/ 30th January 1896, No. 429 S.

I have the honour to forward correspondence as per margin and to request that orders of Government may be obtained.

2. The facts of the case are as follows:-

Mr L.D. Venkataramadyer, Asstt. Engineer halted at Vadheswaram from 2nd to 11th June 1895, i.e. exactly 10 days. He then proceeded to Seetanagaram which is 4 miles from Vadheswaram and halted at Seetanagaram for 5 days (12th to 16th June). Both these places are more than 5 miles from his permanent Head Quarters at Guntur.

3. The Examiner, P.W. Accounts has disallowed the daily allowance claimed for 12th to 16th June under C.S. Regulations Art: 1159 explanation.

4. I submit that this disallowance is incorrect. Art: 1159 explanation only refers to a halt of more than 10 days. In this instance the halt at Vadheswaram was exactly 10 days. Mr. L.D. Venkataramadyer did not return from Seetanagaram to Vadheswaram, so I do not see how the explanation of Art: 1159 applies

5. I submit that it is immaterial whether Mr L. D. Venkatarama Iyer moved his camp 1 mile or 30 miles on the 12th June provided

(1) He did not halt more than 10 days at one place

(2) That the place or places were more than 5 miles from his permanent head Quarters.

(3) That he did not return to the place at which he had halted more than 10 days previous to the 12th June.

As none of these conditions apply to the present case I believe Mr L. D. Venkatarama Iyer is entitled to daily allowance from 12 to 16 June 95.

6. If, however, Government agrees with the Examiner, P.W.A and considers that the halts at Vadheswaram and Seetanagaram constitute a single halt of 15 days duration, I have the honour to request that daily allowance for 12 to 16 June 1895 may be passed as a special case under Art: 1159 (a) as I had to proceed to Masulipatam on urgent business and instructed Mr L. D. Venkatarama Iyer to remain at or near Seetanagaram when canals were first reopened (the

Head

J. P.

Encl 1.

10 ... 1896 ACCOUNTS

EXECUTIVE ENGINEER'S OFFICE, Regr. No. 547 10 JUL. 95 DUGGIRALA. KISTNA WESTERN DIVISION.

3/2385 P.W.D. SECOND CIRCLE.

EXAMINER No 14 APR 1896 P. W. ACCOUNTS

No 93 / 14.7.95

From

M. R. Ry. L. D. Venkatarama Aiyar Avergal

Assistant Engineer, Eastern Sub-Divisi

To

The Executive Engineer,

Kistna Western Division.

Sir,

With reference to the list of observations No 13, on my T. A. Journal for June 1895, I have the honor to point out that Art. 1157 of the C. S. R. deals with the limiting distance of 5 miles from Head Quarters, and in the present case the distance of Sitanagar from Guntur (my Head Quarters) is 18 mile Art 1159 of the C. S. R says that a daily al lowance may not be drawn for more than 10 days' halt at one place, and I have not halted for more than 10 days at Vaddeswara The explanation under Art 1159 says as follow "An officer who remains more than ten day halted at any place, may, after the Completi of the ten days' halt there, draw travelling al lowance under the ordinary rules applicable him for any journey made in one day from me to the halting place, if he reaches a point more than 5 miles distant from it. A halt s not interrupted for the purpose of this rule y an absence on duty from the place of halting for less than three nights."

This explanation implies that, when an officer halts for more than ten days at one place, that place is treated as his temporary Head-quarters, and that the ordinary rules of travelling allowance will apply for the journeys made from that Station. In the present Case I have halted only for ten days t Vaddeiswaram, and not for more than ten days, and Consequently Vaddeiswaram Cannot be considered as having been made my temporary Head-quarters, Guntur Continuing to be my head-quarters, so long as I do not halt for more than 10 days at any ne station.

Art 1164(c) of the C.S.R will apply to the present Case, only if it be construed that ddeiswaram has been made my temporary d-quarters. As pointed out above, Vaddeiswa- has not been made my temporary Head-quar- and Consequently this Article of the C.S.R o not apply to the present Case.

I have etc.

C.D.Venkatsaramam
12-7-95.
Sub Divl officer

Explanation seems correct

Records 16.7
28/8

SEP 7
2687/56

---

3 S.P

No. 218
27-1-96.

SUB-DIVISION OFFICE
STATION
DATED 24 — 1 — 1896.

8992

From

THE OFFICER IN CHARGE,
Eastern Sub-Division.

To

THE EXECUTIVE ENGINEER,
Kistna Western Division.

Sir,

Enclosures. 1.

In returning herewith the extract from the List of Disallowances from Travelling allowance bill for June 1895, I have the honor to point out that the final orders of the Examiner are based on no argument to suit my explanation. I do not say that Sitanagaram is not within 5 miles from Vaddeiswaram, nor do I say that I did not halt at Vaddeiswaram for ten days (2 to 11 June 95). I only say that as I have halted only for 10 days and not for more than 10 days, Art 1157 Explanation cannot apply to this Case. As the Examiner has finally disallowed the claim, the only course left for me now is to refer the matter to Government through you and the Superintending Engineer. When refering the matter to the Superintending Engineer, please kindly send my full explanation contained in my No. $\frac{93}{14-7-95}$.

In this Connection, I have also to point ou

EXECUTIVE ENGINEER 28 JAN 96 GUNTUR KISTNA WESTERN DIVISION

SUPG. ENGINEER'S OFFICE No. 4/2385 31 JAN 96 P.W.D. SECOND CIRCLE

EXAMINER 14 APR 1896 P. W. ACCOUNTS

15 1896 ACCOUNTS

that, under your instructions, I had to stop at or near Sitanagaram, in order to look after regulation, when the Main Canal was opened on the evening of the 8th June, as you had to go to Masulipatam in connection with a law-suit. If it is to be decided by Government that 10 days' halt at Vaddeswaram and 5 days' halt at Sitanagaram constitute 15 days' halt at one place, I will have to make my representations to Government, that I had to make that continued halt in the interests of public service, and that X my allowances should be passed under Art 1159(b) of the C.S.R. But I do not wish to take that course, without ascertaining whether the claim, as put forth by me, is admissible or not.

I have etc.
L.D. Venkataraman.
24-1-96.
Sub Divl officer

Papers & CSR
76
Alle
28.1

~~1318~~/86
~~187~~
~~135~~
757

6
Fil
3
548

Sub Divl officer

Head Sluices were opened on the 8th June) to attend to the regulation.

4P

No. 2321 KS / 6.2.96

Forwarded to the Chief Engineer, P.W. Department, for favour of orders.

2. The arguments of the Executive and Assistant Engineers appear to be sound.

Encls
1 Divl: Lett: from S.D.O. Bill of KWD for June/95
1 Rejoinder to do
2 E.E. Do. letters No 93 / 14.7.95 & 218 / 27.1.96

4

Wm. M. Ellis Captn. R.E.
Supg Engineer, 2nd Circle
5/2/96

P. W. CURRENT ~~1318~~ E.6

~~1787~~

3435/96

Encls 5

Recd: ~~8-2-96~~
21.2.96

From

The Supg. Engineer
Second Circle

To The Chief Engineer
Public Works Dept.

Dated 6th February 1896

Encl 4

No. 2321 KS

~~Ow E.G 5 / C.Mr 3435/96~~ 3757/96

L. D. Venkatrama Iyer
Sub Asst. Engineer E. G. Dn., K W Dn — Travelling allowce. preferred by — Forwards for orders copy of E Es letter in connection with the claim of — for June/95

No. 860 C of 13th February 1896

To C

For favour of remarks

5 P CH03 11.2.96 Dr.

No. 130 A of 18 Feby '96

To W.

The claim is inadmissible. The Asst. Engineer's journey from Vadeshwaram to Sitanagaram was not to a point more than 5 miles from the halting place and he is not, under the ordinary rules applicable, entitled to any travelling allowance for journeys under 5 miles. The exemption asked for under C.S.R. article 1159 may be granted should Govt. consider the case justifies the concession.

18/2/96

C.

EXAMINER
14 APR 1896
P. W. ACCOUNTS

Government of Madras.

1896

P. W. DEPARTMENT.

~~CURRENT No.~~

From

The Examiner of P. W. Accounts

~~Enclos.~~

No. 130 A

Dated 18.2.96

~~Received~~

SUBJECT.

Mr L. D. Venkatrama Aiyar Asst: Engineer: Stating that the claim of ——— to travelling allowance is inadmissible.

4

Ass. 3

~~3435~~ / 96

3757

1896

Finl Dept.

Enclos. No. 1

To

C. No. 548

P. W. CURRENT No. ~~1781~~

5-3

DISPOSAL.

No. dated

3035/56

Enclos. 5

Rec: 21-2-96

CURRENT No 548 Finl

14 APR 1896

P. W. ACCOUNTS

No. 1176 C

Government of Madras.

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.

MEMORANDUM.

Dated Madras, 2nd March 1896. 78

From the Superintending Engineer, II Circle, No. 2321 K.S., dated 6th February 1896.

Office Note from the Examiner, P.W. Accounys, No. 130 A dated 18th February 1896.

Referred to the Financial Department for favor of information as to the practice in the Civil Department in similar cases.

2. The Examiner states that Assistant Engineer, Mr. L. D. Venkatarama Aiyar's claim to daily allowance for the halt at Sitanagaram is inadmissible, but there appears to be much --- force in the Executive Engineer's arguments in favour of the claim. The chief point appears to be that the Assistant Engineer did not return from Sitanagaram to Vadhesweram, that -- therefore the latter ceased to be the halting place when he left it, and that the halt at Sitanagaram was a fresh one for which daily allowance should be granted.

D. W. Campbell Colonel, R.E.,
Joint Secretary to Govt. P.W.D.

The Financial Department,
with original papers.

OWC 23
~~3035~~
57/96

EXAMINED
14 APR 1896
W. ACCOUNTS

[illegible]

Referred to the Accountant
General for favour of remarks.
13 April
[illegible]
[illegible]

[illegible]
2 March 96

CURRENT No. 548

1896. Finl.

Public Works Department.

No. 1176C

Dated 2-3-96

Despatched

Received 4-3-96. Encl (6)

SUBJECT.

Requesting for information correspondence relating to the claim for daily allowance preferred by L. D. Venkataramaiyar, Asst. Engineer.

O.W.E. 72
~~2438~~ 3757/96

WE

50—2,000—21-12-94.

ACCOUNTANT GENERAL'S OFFICE
7 MAR 96
MADRAS

Endt. No. 511

Referred to the Accountant General for favour of remarks.

(By Order)

W W Phillips

Ag. Asst Secretary

C.S.
5/3/96

Fort St. George
6th March 1896

CHIEF SECRETARY
4 MAR. 1896
GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS

Gazetted Audit

DEPARTMENT.

EXAMINED
14 APR 1896
P. W. ACCOUNTS

FORT ST. GEORGE,
Accountant-General's Office,
23rd March 1896.

No. 901

98

From

F. C. Harrison Esquire,
Offg. ACCOUNTANT-GENERAL TO THE
GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS,

To

THE Chief Secretary to Government,
Financial Department.

SIR,

With reference to Government Endorsement No. 511 Financial Department dated the 6th of March 1896 referring for my remarks correspondence relating to the claim to daily allowance preferred by M. R. Ry L. D. Venkatarama Aiyar Avergal Assistant Engineer for the period from 12th to 16 June 1895, I have the honour to observe that the practice of this office in similar cases has been to admit the claim for the whole period on the ground adduced by the Joint Secretary to to Government Public Works Department in his memorandum No. 1176 c dated 2d March 1896 viz that as the Officer did not return from Sitanagaram to Vadeshwaram the latter station ceased to be the halting place when he left it and that the halt at Sitanagaram was a fresh one for which daily allowance should be granted.

I have the honour to be,
Sir,
Your most obedt Servant,

J. Marrison

Offg. Accountant General.

dw
21/3

~~CURRENT No. 740~~

~~Fin~~ (189) DEPARTMENT.

From

THE ACCOUNTANT-GENERAL,
MADRAS,

THE Chief Secretary to
Govt. Financial
Department.

No. 901.

Dated 23d } March 96
Received 24 }
Regd. 25

Encl. C. No 576 [illegible]
6 Encl. returned.

CHIEF SECRETARY
No.
24 MAR. 1896
GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS

Subject.

Stating the practice of this office in cases similar to that of the claim of M.R.Ry L. D. Venkataramier Act. Asst. Engineer to daily allowance

P. W. CURRENT No. 3435

10 P

Recd C. No. 749.

Transferred to the Public Works Department

W. W. Phillips
Ag Assistant Secretary

Enclos: 9

AC
31/3/96.

Recd: 6.4.96

Fort St. George }
3d April 1896 }

No. 1956 C of 11th April 1896

To C

Please say whether you now see any objection to the admission of the claim.

9/4/96
W

Comms
7.4.96.

E. No. 27.
1,000—9-12-95.

KEEP-WITH CURRENT No. GOVT. OF MADRAS. } 1896. { P. W. DEPT.

dated 189 .

EXAMINER, P. W. ACCOUNTS,

Madras, 18 April . 1896.

OFFICE NOTE No. 1105 D/E

11 P

To

W.

Your office note No. I956 C. of IIth. April I896.

Under article II64(c) a halt within 5 miles of head quarters is a halt at head quarter i.e. at the head quarters station.

2. Under article II59 (Explanation) a halt during tour (obviously at some place other than head quarter station) is not interrupted by an absence of less than three nights, nevertheless an officer so halting may draw travelling allowance under ordinary rules for any journey made during such halt and from such place.

3. The Asst. Engineer halted at Vadeshwaram IO days-his journey "from the place of halting" during tour to Sitanagaram" was not to a point more than five miles from that place of halting and though his absence from Vadeshwaram was three clear days, I3th.-I5th.

P. W. CURRENT No. 3757

he was not under ordinary rules entitled to any travelling allowance because he travelled within 5 miles.

4. I therefore do not consider the claim admissible.

C.

Encloss 10

Ans. 21-4-96

No. 195 b cd/ 11-4-96
1176 cd/ 7-3-96
860 cd/ 13-2-96

O.L.S. 51 R. 18/5/96

No 1571 W, d 22nd May 1896.

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE MADRAS GOVERNMENT.

READ the following

From the Superintending Engineer, II Circle, No 2321 K.S. dated 6th February 1896.

Office Note from the Examiner, P.W. Accounts, No 130 A dated 18th February 1896.

Endorsement in the Financial Department, No. 747 Ck dated 3rd April 1896.

Office Note from the Examiner, P.W. Accounts, No. 1105 D/E dated 18th April 1896.

12 P

ASH 11.5.96

The Government of India will be addressed.

2. Meanwhile Mr. L.D. Venkatarama Aiyer, Asst. Engineer, will be exempted from the operation of Article 1159 C.S. Regulations in respect of the halt at Sitanagaram from the 12th to 16th June 1895.

S.E. II Circle with 3 dis. lists.

Examiner, P.W. Accounts.

23

H. E.

40—300—6-3-96.

H.E. No. 1572 W d/ 22nd May 96

To
The Secy. to the Govt. of India,
P. W. D.

Sir,

I am directed to submit the following case for the orders of the Govt. of India.

2. In June last year, Mr. L. D. Venkatarama Aiyer, Asst. Engineer, attached to the Kistna Western Division, proceeded on duty to Vadeshwaram in the Kistna District, and halted ~~at the latter station~~ there from the 2nd to the 11th June, i.e. for ten days. He then proceeded to Sitanagaram, which is 4 miles from Vedeshwaram, and halted at the former place from the 12th to 16th June. Both these stations are more than five miles from his permanent headquarters at

at Guntur. From Sitanagaram he proceeded on his tour without returning to Vadeshwaram.

+ The Examiner, P.W. Accounts, under Art. 1159 C.S.R. (Explanation) disallowed the Asst. Engineer's claim to daily allowance for the halt from 12th to 16th June at Sitanagaram on the ground that the journey there was ~~a~~ to a point not more than 5 miles from the previous halting station. The ~~Examiner~~ Executive and the Supdg. Engineers under whom the Asst. Engineer was serving contested the Examiner's ruling on the ground that as the Asst. Engineer did not return from Sitanagaram to Vadeshwaram, the latter station ceased to be the halting place, and that the halt at Sitanagaram

garam was a fresh one, for which daily allowance should be granted. This Government office Concurred in the above view, and referred the question for opinion to the Acct. General to the Govt. of Madras, who also agrees with the Supdg. Engineer and reports that the practice of his Office is to admit daily allowance for the second halt in similar cases. The Examiner however maintained his position, and I am therefore to request a ruling on the point from the Govt. of India.

I have &c.

4/5/96

W.

CWB
4.5.96

Cu

~~H.6~~ / 16

Halting allowance claimed by Mr L. D. Venkatarama Aiyar, Asst. Engr.

Nos 1571-72 W, d/22-May 1896

E
N

INDEXED

7/27/5

No. 1807 G.

GOVERNMENT OF INDIA.

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.

GENERAL.

15P

All communications should be addressed to the Secretary.

To

The Secretary to the Government of Madras,
Public Works Department.

Simla, the 20th July 1896.

Sir,

With reference to correspondence ending with your letter No. 2000 W., dated 8th July 1896, I am directed to state that the interpretation placed by the Government of Madras on Article 1159 (explanation) of the Civil Service Regulations is correct. The claim preferred by Mr. L.D. Venkatarama Aiyar, Assistant Engineer, to daily allowance for the halt at Sitanagaram from 12th to 16th June 1895 should therefore be admitted and passed.

I have the honour to be,
Sir,
Your most obedient servant,

G. H. Walker

Under Secy. to the Govt. of India.

Documents accompanying :-
Nil.

P. W. CURRENT No. 7103
P. W. C. d.

Recd 27-7-96

Regd: 6.8.96

2000 W d/ 8.7.96.
1571.72 W " 22.5.96.
1956 C - 11.4.96.
1476 C - 2.3.96.
860 C - 13.2.96.

d/ 284

A/

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.

No. 2270 W. dated 7th August 1896

PROCEEDINGS OF THE MADRAS GOVERNMENT.

READ again the following

Print G.O. 1571-72 W, d/ 22nd May 1896.

Read also

18 P.

~~Lists~~ From the Govt: of India P.W.D. } (A.E. No. 1489 G, d/ 15 June 1896)

14 SP

Print — Do — do — (" " 1807 G, d/ 20 July 1896).

16 P

The ruling of the Government of India will be communicated to the officers of the P.W. Department for information.

27/7/96

A.S.H. 2.8.96

R.S.

The Exar. P.W. accounts
Suptg Engineers.
Lt Col: Smart. R.E.
The Consulting Architect
" Financial Dept.

Despd 19/8/96

[2,000-

(40—4,000—2-11-95.)

~~H.C.~~

Ruling of the Govt. of India on a question of Travelling allowance

B/

E 3/8

[illegible]