

7133
Public Works (1896) Department.

G.O., No. 2710-11 ✓

DATED 23rd September
1896

[Despatch Abstract.]

Mr C.H.T. Norfor, Ex. Engineer, forwarding
to the Govt of India a memorial from —
praying to be admitted to the more
favourable pension rules.

P. W. 25.
1,000-5-5-96

INDEXED.

1579

to be submitted to Govt
replied from India
29.9.96

joined to this Govt

praying to be admitted to
the more favourable pension
rules. A previous appli-
cation for this concession
was transmitted with
Colonel Pennington's
letter no 2185 W dated 2nd
September 1895 but was
rejected by the Government
of India after the corres-
pondence ending with
your letter no 899 G dated
18 April 1896. His Excellency
the Governor in Council
has no further remarks
to make.

I have etc

11/9/96

W

No 2710-11 W, dt 28-9-96

recd
24/9/96

7133

H.C.

The office order for
disposal of papers is
not being attended to.
DW complained about
this yesterday. Here is
another case. The papers
should go to DW to be
dealt with.

L.B.
9 Sep 96

DW.

Submitted for ^{final} disposal.

~~When~~ Mr. Kofor's appeal was
on its receipt in the office sent to
you for disposal in the first instance.
You marked it to W and the paper
was disposed of by him by a note
for order.

Maj
9/9/96

Cons 9.9.96.

HC Keep with disposal
on Mr Kofor's petition
today.
Cons 16/9/96

P. W. DEPARTMENT.

pray
H

No. 2710-11 Wd 23-9-96.
Mr. Norfor's memorial for admission
to the more favorable pension rules.

P. W. DEPARTMENT.

Read the following:-

Memorial from C. H. J. Norfor Esq., Executive Engineer Bangalore
to the Govt of India dated Aug 3rd 1896, praying for
admission to the more favorable pension rules.
Letter from the same officer No. 3200 of Aug 3rd 1896.
Enclt by the S.E. 106W of 6.

FOR ORDERS.

+ flagged B.

* flagged M.

± flagged N.

x flagged K.

The reasons for Mr. Norfor's
supercession are given in my
note dated 5th March 1896.

2. While Mr. Norfor was temporary
Deputy Engineer 111 while he submitted
an application to be admitted to the
more favorable pension rules and
this was forwarded to the Govt of
India who replied that it was
premature to consider the
application at present and that
in any case the application
would have to receive the
support of the Government of Madras.

3. Another application was
submitted by Mr. Norfor and
forwarded to the Government
of India who in reply requested
to know what prospect there was
of Mr. Norfor being temporarily
or permanently promoted to
administrative rank, and
were informed by this Govt.

43-500-6-2-94.

that there was no chance of his
being promoted to such rank.
Whereupon the Govt of India
answered that this commission
is intended as a reward for good
service which is proved by an
officer's promotion to Supt Engineer,
and is not intended for officers
who have been tried in Supt
Engineer's posts and failed as
Mr. Nafar appears to have done.

4. Mr. Nafar now submits a
memorial to the Viceroy. His contention
is wholly untenable, by the condition
of his service he comes under Part IV
of the C.S.R. applicable to officers
trained and appointed in India,
but he claims to be brought under
Part II which only applies to those
appointed in England, and he
bases his claim on article 704
under which certain exceptions
are made in the case of officers
who have risen to the rank
of Supt Engineer, but he entirely
ignores the fact that this promotion
does not, ipso facto, at once
entitle him to the more liberal
promotion rules; he must not only
be recommended but the
recommendation must be "favourable"

FOR ORDERS.

5. flg 10-1

recorded in Co. 1586 W 24/5/96

considered" by the Government
of India, and the latter have
already refused to grant the
commission.

5. Mr. Nafar states that the
fact that he has rendered
good service in the Department
is proved by the Government
having granted him his first
increment on completion of
four years in the rank of
1st grade Executive Engineer
under para 13, Chap. I, Vol. I
P.W. Code; but this is altogether
beside the point, because,
though he may have carried
on his duties as Executive
Engineer sufficiently well
to admit of his being granted
the increment, it by no means
follows that he is fit for the
administrative post of
Supt Engineer. There are
several officers who are now
1st grade Executive Engineers,
whom it would not be advisable
to promote to Supt Engineer.

Mr. Norfor also calls attention
to Government of India No. 21375
dated 9 August 1890, copy of
which he forwarded, but there
have been no unfavourable confidential
reports on him.

The chief reasons why this
Government decided that he was
not fit for the post of Deputy Engineer
were based on an office note ^x flagged D.
from Colonel Pannycik to
Lord Minto, and it was never
intended that the remarks in
such notes should be communicated
to the officers concerned.

7. Perhaps the petition may
be forwarded with the remark
that the Govt of India have already
decided that Mr. Norfor is not
entitled to be admitted to the
more favourable rules in their

No. 899 dated 18 April
1896. (Co. No. 1506W of
21 Mar 1896)

1/3/96

W

and
99%

Yes.
A.H.
2.9.96

BB
4/9/96

28
8/9/96

+ flagged I

No 3200 d/ 3rd August 1896

From. C. H. J. Norfor Esquire
Executive Engineer Tanjore Division
To the Supg. Engineer, V Circle.

Sir,

^x
with 4 enclosures

^x I have the honour to forward a
Memorial to the Government of India
and request that it may be sent on, through
the usual channel.

I have &c
Signed - C. H. J. Norfor
Executive Engineer

No 106 M
c

Copy to the Chief Engineer P. W. Dept.,
with the memorial, for favour of transmission

C. S. Lamm
6/8/96

Colonel R. E.

Supg Engineer V Circle

6 August
1896 }
}

BB
5.8.96

From
The Chief Engineer
S. Field.
To
The Chief Engineer
P. W. Department.

Encls 5
Acad: 7.8.96

Dated 6th August 1896
Recd.

Encls 5.

Pr 1067

C. H. J. Norfor Esq.
Executive Engineer.

Forwarding the Memo-
rial of - for favour of
transmission to the Govt.
of India.

No. 1807 W. D. 4-6-96
1549 W. D. 14-5-96
2606 W. D. 13-10-93

W.
17896
SW

P.L. 321 R 16/9

C. H. J.

"Please see the report
para 1 & 2 I have
understand that he is working
at his department
quite all right.
(4) What are the more
favourable points
that he makes of his
at his case.

25/10/96

(1)

Mr. Norfor's contention
is wholly untenable, and he
is wasting the valuable
time of all his superior
officers who have to go
through his papers and
point out the fallacy of
his arguments.

By the conditions of
his service, Mr. Norfor comes
under Part IV of the C.S.R.
applicable to officers trained
and appointed in India.

From

No. 7133

He claims to be brought under Part I which only applies to those "appointed in England". He bases this claim on Art. 704 under which certain exceptions are made, having view to the "rank of Superior Tending Engineer". But he entirely overlooks the fact that this promotion does not, ipso facto, at once entitle him to the more liberal pension rules applicable to the European Service. He ^{not only} must be recommended, but the recommendation must be "favourably considered" by the Govt. of India. He has been recommended by the Madras Govt., but the Govt. of India has declined to accede ^{recommendation of the} to the Govt. of Madras, as they are entitled to do under Art. 704 of the C.S.R. According to Mr. Hooper the Govt. of India have no right to exclude him, and they do not even understand the rules.

(2) The scale is given in Art. 712 of the C.S.R.

L.S.
26 Aug 96

No. 7133

OS 321

M. with bond 14/9

The return for the Madras
Application for pension in

27/10/23-9-96.
I. From Madras & accede
Report.
J. Report of Madras Government
A. Report of Govt. of India
pensionary instructions
B. By Madras Govt. 5/5/94
Application Madras
K. From Madras Govt. of India
any share of the pension being
there & S.C. & amount to
N. Application of Madras Govt.
from Government Pension rules
M. Application of Madras Govt. & rules
what the Madras Govt. S.P.
D. Govt. P. along with application

From

He claims to be brought
under Part I which only
applies to those "appointed
in England" - He bases this
on art 704 under

No. 7133

L. in Note on Trusts
J 8. in Walsby's & others
rewards.

No 7133

321

M. the Lord
14/9

The reason for the various
applications are given in
my note dated 5/3/86

While the Note is being
D.C. 3rd Class the Minister
an application to the Minister
the new family provision rules
and his application in favour
of the 1st of June the other
that it is in relation to
among the application is made
that in any case the application
was then to meet the wishes
of the 1st of June.

Another application was
submitted to the Minister of Finance
to the 1st of June the in
very respect of the same which
marked the end of the Note
being temporary a permanent
provision to Administer the same
with reference of the 1st of June
there is no change of the
being provision to be made

Page 8

Page 10

Page 11

Page 12

Whether the fact of
his answer that the
concession is intended as
a matter of fact seems
that in fact I am then
proven to be right, and
not intended to offend the
law been true in fact
but facts & facts & the
Naga state & have done.
The Naga state officials have
intended a memorial to the
Viceroy. This intention is
chiefly intended, of the
conclusion of his answer to
ask when Part IV of the
C.S. is applied to this
training and expansion in
India but he claims to be
bound when Part V which
may apply to those who are
in India & he bases his claim
on Act 704 under that section
exceptions are made in the
case of officers who have been
in the rank of Major General

Page 9

undated in 1936 Wap/5/96.

but he is trying to ignore the
fact that the provision
does not say fact or one
wholly true to the fact
because provision makes, he
must not only be recommended
but the recommendation
must be honestly considered
of the fact of India and the
C.S. has already referred
to prove the concession.
The Naga state that the fact
that he has answered good
points in the answer - from
of which the fact having
granted him the fact
in answer to question 4
given in the report of 19 Jan
but he was from 13 Oct 1
Vol 1 O.C. but this is
altogether beside the point
because though he may have
come on his duties & he has
done his duties & he has
appeared to be a soldier of his
but granted the concession, it
if he may follow that he
is fit for the admission he has done

I hope you will be able
to see it in the paper
for it is one of
the most interesting
to me

Mr. Wagoner who calls attention
to G. I. No. 2137 G.
dated 9th March 1890 which
states to forward him the
has been an interesting
conference reports on him
the the chief reason why this
is desired that he can not
for the first of the year
has been an interesting
from Col. Morgan & his
of which one of the most
interesting the most
in communication to the office
concern.

Page D

When the petition is
forwarded with the amount this
the G. I. No. 2137 has already
decided that Mr. Wagoner is not
entitled to be admitted to the
from of which the petition is
dated 10th March.