

Public Works (1896) Department.

G.O., No. 3414 W

DATED 30 Nov 1896

[Despatch Abstract.]

Daily allowance: Correspondence on the
subject of certain — claimed on behalf
of Mr. R. L. D. Venkataswami an
Asst Engineer for his salt at Sitanafram
during June last, recorded with remarks.

FURTHER PAPERS.							
G.O.	No.	Department	Date.	G.O.	No.	Department	Date.

CURRENT No. 10267

3414, Vol 30-11-96

From

The Examiner
P. W. Accounts

No. 3925-7e

Dated 12 Nov/86.

Received 13. 11. 96

Enclosures 6

Spare copies

SUBJECT.

G.O. no 1571 w of 22 May 1896, Mr. L. D. Venkatarama Iyer
 & the decision of the Govt. of B. A. B. C. E. Assistant Engineer
 India communicated with ——— Informing that he has
 G.O. no 2270 w of 7th Aug. no remarks to offer in connection
 may be taken as ——— with the Daily Allowance due to
 General ruling - no further ———
 action is required.

 C_4

A. S. II *crucif*

Copy, M. A. V.

Winters Journal.

BACK PAPERS.

FURTHER PAPERS.

KEEP-WITH

CURRENT No.

dated

189 .



GOVT.
OF MADRAS.

1896.

E. No. 27.
1,000-9-12-95.

{ P. W.
DEPT.

EXAMINER, P. W. ACCOUNTS.

Madras, ²⁸^π August 1896.

OFFICE NOTE No. 622 A

To

W.

The decision communicated with G.O.No.2270 W.dated 7th.August 1896 is based on the supposition that the Asst Engineer did not return from Sitanagaram to Vadheswaram, but as a matter of fact he did so return, on the 16th. June 1895, as shown in my No. 1105 D/E dated 18th. April 1896" though his absence from Vadheswaram was three clear days 13th. to 15th.". The journal of Asst. Engineer is sent herewith for reference.

2. Under these circumstances I would suggest a reconsideration of the order.

C

Ans
2878

Enr. 1

10267

The all in efficiency
 person when a mistake
 identity & I cannot see
 how the person can have
 been with L. D. 1571
 of 22nd May (1896) (this was
 I cannot find) the the
 mistake in the form was
 the mistake.

18/11/96

~~W~~ W

In para 2 of G.O. No.
 1571 W of 22.5.96, the
 one sup. was exempted
 from the operation of G.O.
 1157 C.S.R. as regards the
 total halt, irrespective
 of the question whether
 the march to Sitanagarom
 from Vadheswaram did
 or did not interrupt
 the halt - the general
 question was then re-
 ferred to India.
 G.O. No. 1571 W

Order 3
 5685/96
 10267

Public Works (1896) Department.



534
 CURRENT No. 7827
 9685/96
 10267

Order No 3287C d/8 September 1896.

Referred to the
 Superintending Engineer II
 Circle for the explanation
 of the Executive Engineer
 District Western division, who
 in para 4 and 5 of his letter
 No 429.5 dated 30 January
 1896, distinctly stated
 that Mr L. D. Venkatarama
 Aiyar did not return from
 Sitanagarom to Vadheswaram
 on the occasion in question.
 It was on this statement,
 on which the whole question
 hinged, that the case
 was referred to the Govt.
 of India -

From
 The Examiner
 P. W. Accounts
 Madras

No. 622 A

Dated 28th August 1896.
 Received 31-8-96
 Enclosures + 2
 Spare copies

SUBJECT.

M. R. Ry. L. D. Venkata-
 ramier Asst. Engineer.
 Requesting a reconsi-
 deration of the orders
 authorizing the ad-
 mission of daily
 allowance from 12th
 to 16th June 1895 to -

J. H. Campbell Colonel R.E.
 Chief Engineer.

C
 028.369 27/9

With reference to your
 No. 4658 herewith returned, I have
 the honor to submit the following
 explanation:-

1. I halted at Taddeswaram from the 2nd to 11th June, 1895 which is a halt only for two days and not for more than 10 days.
2. I halted at Sithanagararam from the 12th to 15th June which is a period for four days halt.
3. I stopped at Taddeswaram on the 16th, at Duggirala on the 17th,
at

at Tanali on the 18th and so on,
and the tour that was Com-
-menced from Sithanagaram
on the 16th was a continuous tour.
4. Mr. Malit, the Executive Engr.,
when he said that I did not re-
-turn to Vaddeswaram from Sitha-
-nagaram on the occasion in
question, meant only that I did
not return to Vaddeswaram
within the period required to break
the continuity of the halt at Vaddes-
swaram which first lasted from
2nd to 11th June, but he did not
mean that I did not at all
return to Vaddeswaram. If my
return to Vaddeswaram on the
16th June, i.e., after four clear
nights from the period of first halt,
should affect the break of the halt,
according to the Engineer's inter-
-pretation, it is not understood
why it is stated in the Civil Service
Regulations

Regulations that an absence for
only three nights is necessary for
interrupting a halt.

5. Mr. Malit had to state that
I did not return to Vaddeswar
because the allowances claimed
were disallowed under article
1159 explanation which runs as
follows:-

"An officer may
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 distant from it."

The provision and condition of
in the article quoted above refer
to the journey from and to the halt-
ing place made on any one day.
I made a journey from the halting
place on the 12th June, but did not

not return to the halting place
till the 16th.

N^o 3262 from A. A. G. Maset ^{Letter} ²⁻¹⁰⁻⁹⁶ ²⁻¹⁰⁻⁹⁶

I was certainly under

the impression when I wrote my

N^o 4298 that Mr. Venkataswami

30-1-96

Spr did not halt at Vaddeswaram

after leaving Sithanagaraiam on

the 15th. Mr. Venkataswami's

Journal was, I believe, with the

Examiner, P. W. A. & not before me

at the time of my information was

based on other sources but what

they were I am not able to say.

The point now raised by the Examiner

P. W. A. does not in my opinion affect

the case as Mr. Venkataswami Spr

was absent from Vaddeswaram for 4

(four) nights & therefore the halt at

Vaddeswaram was completely bro-

-ken as per L. S. Regulations & in

my opinion the ruling already passed

in this case should hold good

under the ordinary rules in force for

for drawing travelling allowances.

2004 HW
26-10-96

Endos: 4

Copy forwarded to the Chief

Engineer, P. W. Department with reference
to his memo N^o 3287 C, dated 8-9-96.

W. B. Sadashay Major R. E.

Superintendent Eng-
2nd Circle

J. M.

6 NOV 1896

22.5.96 will be found
printed at page 4 of
Spec. No. 2270W 57
2.8.96 (closed A)
no further action
is therefore needed as
regards the daily allow

It was the general
question which was
raised under a
series of questions in of
the facts.

[Faint handwritten notes and stamps at the bottom of the left page]

Public Works (1896) Department.

CURRENT No. ^{5.6} 9685
10267/96

No. 3914 C of 6 November 1896
Order O. u.

To E
for favour of
Remarks.
2/11/96
W

From Major W. L. B. Basset
Superintendent

No. 2004 HW

Dated 26 October 1896
Received 28.10.96
Enclosures 4
Spare copies

SUBJECT.

Mr. L. D. Subbarayana
B.A. B.C. & asst engineer
B.A. sec to - for certain days
in June 1895 - Forwarding
explanation on & annex
note regarding

5.5.96
10267/96

{ P. W.
DEPT.

OFFICE NOTE No. 3925 7/2

There is nothing new in the Executive Engineer's letter, and I have therefore nothing to add to the remarks in my office notes, No 130 A of 18th February 1896, and No 1105 D/E dated 18th April 1896.

attached with the orig. of
2270 4578

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{r} 1176e \\ 2-3-96 \\ 0\ 1571.72e \\ 22-5-96 \end{array} \right.$$

gce

C.
179