

(1) Number of pages 1-30

(2) Date of repair _____

(3) Initials of the Referencer _____

MADRAS RECORD OFFICE.

Government of Madras.

Jenson DEPARTMENT.

G.O. No.	1075	<u>Press</u> <u>Mis.</u>
Dated	7.10.	1894.

Not to be folded or roughly handled

To

HIS EXCELLENCY THE RIGHT HONORABLE
MOUNTSTUART ELPHINSTONE GRANT DUFF,
GOVERNOR IN COUNCIL, FORT ST. GEORGE.

THE HUMBLE PETITION OF S. V. SESHADRI IYENGAR,
LATE 3RD CLASS REVENUE INSPECTOR, CONJEVERAM TALUQ, CHINGLEPUT DISTRICT,

MOST HUMBLY SHOWETH,

That petitioner most respectfully begs to state that he had served the State in various grades for a period embracing more than 24 years, and that during this interval his character for integrity had never been impeached; while so, it unpropitiously occurred that the Thasildar Seethapathy Naidu should submit to the Sub-collector a false report against petitioner, of having disobeyed order, and of having been insubordinate to him, this caused petitioner to be dismissed from Government service on the 11th June 1880. That the enclosure A, which is a copy of an appeal petition addressed to Your Excellency in Council, and in which the particulars of the history of the case have been fully set forth, will show that Petitioner's dismissal was the result of the influence of the animosity harboured by the said Thasildar Seethapathy Naidu since been dismissed from the service, and that the plots concocted by him purposely to entrap the petitioner were various and inexpressible; this had in a great measure tended to entail ruin on the family of the petitioner, who had honestly served the Government for many years. Such was the misfortune of Your Excellency's unfortunate petitioner.

That on the presentation of the appeal to Your Excellency in Council as explained above, Your Excellency was pleased to set aside the dismissal, and directed the Collector J. F. Price Esq. to submit pension application from the petitioner in the usual course, this was accordingly done; but the Accountant General in his report to your Government stated that petitioner's claim for pension was not supported by a medical certificate of permanent incapacity for the public service; and that a person dismissed from the public service on account of misconduct is barred from getting a pension. That upon this, Your Excellency in Council issued an order, enclosure B, to the Collector to the effect that as the petitioner appears to be under fifty five years of age, he must be provided with a suitable post in which he can remain until he qualifies for a pension under pension rules. That upon the receipt of the above order, the petitioner was appointed to the situation of a Gumastah in Sydapet Taluq on a salary of Rupees 15 per mensem; he held the post for 3 months, but was impelled by various unavoidable circumstances to retire from the public service. That as petitioner now learns that his pension

CHIEF SECRETARY
14 JUL 84
GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS

3W

application has been submitted to Your Excellency in Council for sanction, he now craves permission to state that a dismissal effected under illegitimate grounds cannot be regarded in the eyes of law as *bona fide* dismissal, and it cannot therefore entail forfeiture of pay accrued during the dismissal, and he therefore ventures to solicit that Your Excellency's humane disposition will deem it generous to take into your benevolent consideration, and direct the said arrears of pay to be paid to him. That the period of interval intermediate between petitioner's dismissal and restoration is 3 years, 5 months and 6 days as particularized in the statement accompanying this. That petitioner ventures, with great modesty, to state that he has a large family to bring up, and they are now reduced to the lowest state of poverty, and destitute of the necessities of life, and he therefore humbly craves Your Excellency in Council, which has so often been extended to dry the tears of distress, will, on a merciful and deliberate consideration of all the facts and circumstances attending his deplorable case, do him justice by granting his prayer, by ordering to pay him the arrears of pay referred to above.

For which act of charity, the petitioner as in duty bound,

Shall ever pray.

7th JULY 1884.
SAVILIMADU, CONJEEVERAN TALUQ, }
CHINGLEPUT DISTRICT.

V. S. S. S.

5W
To

HIS EXCELLENCY THE RIGHT HONORABLE
MOUNTSTUART ELPHINSTONE GRANT DUFF,
GOVERNOR IN COUNCIL, FORT. ST. GEORGE.

THE HUMBLE PETITION OF S. V. SESHADRI IYENGAR,
LATE 3RD CLASS REVENUE INSPECTOR, CONJEE-
VERAM TALUQ, CHINGLEPUT DISTRICT.

MOST HUMBLY SHOWETH,

That petitioner most respectfully begs to state that he had served the State in various grades for a period embracing more than 24 years, and that during this interval his character for integrity had never been impeached, while so, it unpropitiously occurred that the Thasildar Seethapathy Naidu should submit to the Sub-collector a false report against petitioner, of having disobeyed order, and of having been insubordinate to him, this caused petitioner to be dismissed from Government service on the 11th June 1880. That the enclosure A, which is a copy of an appeal petition addressed to Your Excellency in Council, and in which the particulars of the history of the case have been fully set forth, will show that Petitioner's dismissal was the result of the influence of the animosity harboured by the said Thasildar Seethapathy Naidu since been dismissed from the service, and that the plots concocted by him purposely to entrap the petitioner were various and inexpressible; this had in a great measure tended to entail ruin on the family of the petitioner, who had honestly served the Government for many years. Such was the misfortune of Your Excellency's unfortunate petitioner.

That on the presentation of the appeal to Your Excellency in Council as explained above, Your Excellency was pleased to set aside the dismissal, and directed the Collector J. F. Price Esq. to submit pension application from the petitioner in the usual course, this was accordingly done; but the Accountant General in his report to your Government stated that petitioner's claim for pension was not supported by a medical certificate of permanent incapacity for the public service; and that a person dismissed from the public service on account of misconduct is barred from getting a pension. That upon this, Your Excellency in Council issued an order, enclosure B, to the Collector to the effect that as the petitioner appears to be under fifty five years of age, he must be provided with a suitable post in which he can remain until he qualifies for a pension under pension rules. That upon the receipt of the above order, the petitioner was appointed to the situation of a Gumastah in Sydapet Taluq on a salary of Rupees 15 per mensem; he held the post for 3 months, but was impelled by various unavoidable circumstances to retire from the public service. That as petitioner now learns that his pension

application has been submitted to Your Excellency in Council for sanction, he now craves permission to state that a dismissal effected under illegitimate grounds cannot be regarded in the eyes of law as *bona fide* dismissal, and it cannot therefore entail forfeiture of pay accrued during the dismissal, and he therefore ventures to solicit that Your Excellency's humane disposition will deem it generous to take into your benevolent consideration, and direct the said arrears of pay to be paid to him. That the period of interval intermediate between petitioner's dismissal and restoration is 3 years, 5 months and 6 days as particularized in the statement accompanying this. That petitioner ventures, with great modesty, to state that he has a large family to bring up, and they are now reduced to the lowest state of poverty, and destitute of the necessaries of life, and he therefore humbly craves Your Excellency in Council, which has so often been extended to dry the tears of distress, will, on a merciful and deliberate consideration of all the facts and circumstances attending his deplorable case, do him justice by granting his prayer, by ordering to pay him the arrears of pay referred to above.

For which act of charity, the petitioner as in duty bound,

Shall ever pray.

12th JULY 1884.
SAVILIMADU, CONJEEVERAM TALUQ.,
CHINGLEPUT DISTRICT.

S. S. Sathapathy

To The Honorable C. G. Meester
Member in Council
Fort. St. George.

The humble petition of

S. S. Sathapathy Sengar
Late 3rd Class Revenue Inspector
Conjeeveram Taluq.
Chingleput District.

Most humbly sheweth:—

That the petitioner ventures, with great modesty, to state that the enclosed is a petition which he has addressed to your Honorable Government, soliciting to order payment of the arrears of salary accrued during the period of his dismissal which was set aside on his appeal to your Honorable Government.

That petitioner's dismissal was illegal and was the result of antipathy of the Tahsildar Sathapathy Braidu, since dismissed from the Government Service. That petitioner solemnly avers that, in no instance was his conduct, for a period of upwards of 24 years, ever blamed as unbecoming the character of a Government official. That the accusation formed

against him at the close of his official
career was that he disobeyed the order of
the said Chancellor who was inimical to him


That with extreme regret petitioner
begs to add that he is now turned very
poor and has been left entirely destitute
of every manner of subsistence; and he
therefore ventures with great humility
to lay his distressed circumstances before
your generosity.

That petitioner humbly trusts that your
known generosity will, in consideration of
the illegality of his dismissal and the length
of service, and in compassion with his pre-
sent distressed circumstances, grant
his humble prayer, by ordering the arrears
of his pay to be paid to him, as solicited
in the enclosed petition.

For which act of charity your
petitioner as in duty bound

Shall ever pray

12th July 1881
Schadeggen



To

HIS EXCELLENCY
MOUNTSTUART ELPHINSTONE GRANT DUFF,
GOVERNOR OF MADRAS.

*The humble Petition of SESHADRI IYENGAR, late
3rd Class Revenue Inspector, Conjeveram
Taluk, Chingleput District.*

MOST HUMBLY SHOWETH,

That Petitioner presumes respectfully to submit this Appeal to your Excellency in Council against an order passed by Mr. H. R. Farmer, the late Acting Sub-Collector of Chingleput, dismissing him from his post after the long service of 24 years; this dismissal was effected on the groundless report made against Petitioner by the Tahsildar Seethapathee Naidu, who is now sentenced for two years' rigorous imprisonment for theft of records, and for whom a Commissioner has been appointed. That the charges brought against Petitioner were four in number, as set forth in the enclosure marked A.

1st Charge.—That Petitioner had disobeyed the instructions conveyed in the Jamabundy Circular Order, by not writing the Ajmaish remarks properly.

With respect to this charge Petitioner begs to state that he was deputed to ajmaish 18 villages, he ajmaished them all, and minutely examined the Adangal book prepared by the Village Officers, and the remarks entered therein by them respecting the condition of the tank, &c., he verified them, and he further entered all what were left out by Village Officers. Besides this, Petitioner noted in a separate note-book furnished to him by the Tahsildar, all the particulars required for the information of the Settlement Officer.

That what the decision of the Sub-Collector says is, that the verification made by Petitioner in the Adangal book is not acceptable, but that he should have entered the said account in his own remarks. Petitioner begs to say, that this cannot be a fault on his part, in as much, as he had minutely scrutinized the Adangal book, and wrote his own remarks in the separate note book as is stated above. That it was not the Petitioner alone that did write so, but the other Revenue Inspectors, Deputy Tahsildars, and Taluk Sheristadars also followed the same course. That however Petitioner at the permission of the Tahsildar wrote separate remarks in the said Adangal book with the exception of 4 villages, which he was not able to do as the Kurnums had taken away the accounts to their villages. The Jamabundy was conducted satisfactorily by the information furnished; had there been any defect in the information, the Settlement Officer Mr. W. A. Happel, would have noticed it, but nothing of the kind took place. That if Petitioner was considered to have been guilty of disobedience of orders, the Deputy Tahsildar, Sheristadar, and other Revenue Inspectors who followed the same course as he did, must have been guilty too of the same act, but no notice whatever was taken of them. That it is a matter of extreme regret, that Petitioner alone was singled out and selected for punishment.

2nd Charge.—That Petitioner did not keep his Diary in his own hand, but allowed his son to copy out the Diary for him.

That with regard to this charge, Petitioner begs to say respectfully, that multiplicity of the various works which Petitioner had to attend to, induced him to allow his son to write the Diary, it was minutely examined, compared, and signed by Petitioner. That Petitioner begs to add, that the whole Diary of Daseega Chari, one of the Revenue Inspectors of the said Taluq, is written by others owing to his sheer inability to write a line himself, this Mr. H. R. Farmer, is well aware of having been brought to his notice by the Tahsildar by means of an Urzee.

3rd Charge.—That Petitioner was insubordinate to the Tahsildar Seethapathce Naidu and absented himself without leave.

That Petitioner begs respectfully to state that he absented from duty for 3 days having had occasion to go to the Sub-Collector but he never did so without previously reporting the same to the Tahsildar, the enclosed Translations marked C and D which are copies of registered letters sent by Petitioner to the Tahsildar, one informing him of his going to the Sub-Collector, and the other of reporting his return, will convince the truth of his assertion. The ill-treatment to which Petitioner was then subjected at the hands of the said Tahsildar, induced him to go to the Sub-Collector to represent his grievance. Although Petitioner absented himself for 3 days, yet the Tahsildar stopped his pay for 15 days.

That about 2 years ago Petitioner was transferred from Ponneri Taluq to Conjeveram. No sooner he assumed charge of his duties, then the said Tahsildar addressed an Urzee to the Sub-Collector, that *he did not wish* to have him in his Taluq, but as no notice of the Urzee was taken, the Tahsildar a few days after this stopped Petitioner's 10 days' pay under some frivolous pretence. Petitioner was molested in various ways, viz., sending for him from his station by summons, and detaining him in his Cutcherry, 10 or 15 days, by taking Kypith or Memo. accusing him of various groundless charges, and threatening him to put him in Jail or commit him to the Sessions Court, and insulting him publicly. His unnecessary detention for days together in the Taluk Cutcherry tended to throw his work in disorder. Besides this, he was on divers occasions deputed by the Tahsildar to attend to some works in other villages not appertaining to his range. This was done with a view to prevent him from conducting his legitimate work efficiently, and thereby subject him to a fine. Petitioner is able to prove the fact of his vexatious detention in the Taluk Cutcherry, by unimpeachable testimony, i.e., the enclosed marked E, F, G, H, I, which are some of the summonses issued by the Tahsildar, to attend his Cutcherry; besides this, Batta Peons were frequently sent to bring him to the Taluk Cutcherry from his station, and on each occasion he had to pay the Batta Peon 8 Annas, 12 Annas, and a Rupee as batta, as per chit produced by the Peon from the Tahsildar; unfortunately Petitioner has not preserved all such chits, but however the enclosuro marked J, is one of the chits produced by a Batta Peon bearing the signature of the Sheristadar for Tahsildar, and he paid the Rupee to the Peon as directed therein. That the frequent harsh treatment, to which Petitioner was subjected having given him cause for apprehension of disastrous consequence, he was prompted to address two

registered Petitions to the Sub-Collector to transfer him to another Taluk (Enclosure marked F,) dated 2nd May 1880, but to no purpose.

That Petitioner begs to state, that his transfer from Ponneri Taluk, to that of Conjeveram was not for any fault but on public grounds, i.e., that he had been allowed to remain in the same Taluk for a period of 20 years. It was not he alone that was transferred, but 5 others were also transferred on the same ground at the same time; considering that the transfer of Petitioner might be a point open to question in the eye of justice, the Tahsildar of Ponneri was persuaded to send a report to the Collector as if Petitioner had been guilty of neglect of duty, there is no record to show anterior to such transfer, that he was subjected to any punishment for a space of 20 years. That a few months subsequent to Petitioner's transfer to Conjeveram he was, on a report made by the Tahsildar to Mr. H. R. Farmer, reduced to 3rd Class Revenue Inspector from that of 2nd Class. The degradation was based on the ground that Petitioner omitted to collect Interest of nearly 5 or 6 Rupees on the arrears realized by the sale of certain distrained property in the village of Pichevaukum, he begs to state that he omitted to collect the Interest as the other Revenue Inspectors and Tahsildars did in accordance to Hoozoor order issued suspending the collection of Interest. When a Kypith was taken from Petitioner by the Tahsildar respecting the omission of the collections of the Interest, he stated, that he omitted to collect the Interest as per the order received by him from the Tahsildar suspending the collection of Interest but he wrote down as if Petitioner did so through forgetfulness, and obtained his signature through compulsion, Petitioner addressed a registered Urzee to the Sub-Collector that the Tahsildar took a false Kypith or memo. from him, and further informed that the Tahsildar in conjunction with the Deputy Tahsildar Kistna Row of Streepermatoor, concocted certain records to ruin him, but the Sub-Collector without taking any notice of it returned it to him with an endorsement that it bears no adhesive stamp of 8 Annas value. Petitioner is not aware of any rule that an Urzee addressed by a public servant should have an adhesive stamp affixed. The enclosure V is the copy of the endorsement passed by Mr. H. R. Farmer returning the said Petition. That the Appeal which Petitioner had made to the Collector, and the Board of Revenue respecting his degradation had no effect. Mr. H. R. Farmer took no notice of the other Revenue Inspectors who also omitted to collect Interest at the same time with the Petitioner. Nor was the said Tahsildar questioned why he himself omitted to collect Interest on the sum of 255 Rupees. A reference to the chitta in the Taluk Cutcherry will testify to the truth of Petitioner's assertion. It is your Excellency alone who should consider this which presents glaring act of injustice.

That it is stated in the Collector's proceedings, enclosure marked B, that the Petitioner in less than 3 years has been severely warned, reduced once for six months, fined 8 times and permanently reduced. It is no matter of surprise that one like helpless Petitioner who was placed under the tyranny of a superior as Seethapathce Naidu, the Tahsildar should have been treated so. It is true, that Petitioner was fined 8 times by the said Tahsildar, 2 Annas 4 times, and 8 Annas 4 times, in all Rs. 2-8-0, but it must be for your Excellency in Council to consider from the

circumstances explained above whether such an imposition of fine is right or wrong. Nothing can do greater injury to the public interest than by harassing an innocent public servant like helpless Petitioner by detaining him in the Taluq Cutcherry for days *together preventing him from attending to his duties* and thereby fining him frequently for acts involving no real fact, and asking him to resign his post after shutting him up in the Treasury room at night at 10 o'clock, and threatening him to commit him to Sessions Court, and taking deposition whenever the Tahsildar pleased. Cries of justice, and voice of reason have no effect upon the conscience disposed to ruin one. Petitioner does not exaggerate things, but he solemnly asserts as they really occurred. The copies of the several registered Petitions which he addressed to the Collector Mr. J. F. Price, and Sub-Collector Mr. H. R. Farmer on each occasion, and which accompanies this Petition will testify the truth of his assertions. That it is stated in the Proceedings of the Collector, that Petitioner not only refused to sign the Kypith given before the Tahsildar, but also remarked in an insolent tone to that officer in open Cutcherry, that all the papers in the Cutcherry was being wasted in taking Kypith from him, it is true, that the Petitioner refused to sign the Kypith on two or three occasions, the reason of Petitioner's refusal was because the Tahsildar used to write whatever he chose, but he never made the remark in such insolent tone, it was an invention of the Tahsildar; the evidence of two witnesses adduced to support the allegation is unworthy of credit, they being the Tahsildar's own subordinates. The several allusions made in the Sub-Collector's decision, and the Collector's proceedings respecting Petitioner are untenable, inasmuch as they were led to do so by the implicit confidence, they placed in the alleged truth of the charges which were artfully and ingeniously prepared by the Tahsildar Seethapathee Naidu. That the unfair means employed by the Tahsildar Seethapathee Naidu to bring your poor Petitioner into scrape, was very great and various. That what the helpless Petitioner craves your Excellency in Council is to judge whether Petitioner could be so blind to his prospects as to wilfully just at the close of his official career for the long period of 24 years, to do any unjustifiable acts which he knows would draw on him punishment. He humbly trusts, that he should be punished after a service of 24 years without legitimate cause is what your poor Petitioner fully believes, that the justice and generosity of the just administration of your Excellency in Council will not permit.

4th Charge.—That Petitioner failed to prove his allegation, that the Tahsildar was making cases against him.

That with reference to the allusion made in the Sub-Collector's decision, that Petitioner failed to prove his allegation, that the Tahsildar was concocting cases against him, he begs to be permitted with the greatest modesty to state, that had the Sub-Collector taken proper notice of it, Petitioner would have been then able to prove it in as much as some correspondence have been formed between the Tahsildar, and the Deputy Tahsildar, Petitioner, and the Sub-Collector. That when the Acting Sub-Collector Mr. H. R. Farmer, took a statement from Petitioner in the presence of the Tahsildar respecting the matter, he does not know what he wrote in it, Petitioner asked to read it out to him, the gentleman said never mind, but he was however obliged to sign it, lest he would incur the displeasure of the Sub-Collector. That the matter of the fact is

simply this, that Petitioner collected arrears of revenue in the village of Sommun-galum and Nuduveraputt, and credited the same in the Thandal account, while so, Kistna Row, Deputy Tahsildar, at the instigation of the Tahsildar Seethapathee Naidu, sent a memo. to the Tahsildar as if no arrears was collected in these two villages by the Petitioner, but that he had simply credited in the said account as if really collected, and consequently that he (Kistna Row) was obliged to collect it, and credit it in the account, upon this a report was submitted by the Tahsildar to the Sub-Collector, who sent an order calling upon the Tahsildar to submit to him the said Thandal account, but the Tahsildar on examining the said account found that there was no collection whatever made by Kistna Row, or credited in those 2 villages as averred in his report to him, the Deputy Tahsildar observing, that his assertion was proved untrue, began to say that Petitioner destroyed the account in which he entered the collections and substituted another, and thus they both wanted to concoct a charge against Petitioner. The evidence adduced by the village officials who were also examined on the subject by the Tahsildar went to show, that Kistna Row had not made any collections, but that Petitioner was the person who did so, and upon this the matter was left unnoticed by the Tahsildar to shelter the Deputy Tahsildar, and burk the charge altogether. That upon this Petitioner addressed a registered Urzee to the Sub-Collector on the 16th December 1879, bringing to his notice respecting the exortions on the part of the Tahsildar and Deputy Tahsildar in concocting a case against him, and requesting that he should be transferred to another Taluq. The translation of the Urzee marked **K**, is herewith submitted for your Excellency's inspection. That this Deputy Tahsildar was a very short time after this reduced to a gomastah's post for gross misconduct, *viz.*, for having submitted a false report against his Registration gomastah. That the Collector in his proceedings states, that Petitioner was idle, careless, inefficient, and insubordinate. Petitioner humbly trusts, that he shall be held excused by asking your Excellency in Council's attention whether it may reasonably be conjectured that he might be so. Were he found in want in the requisite qualifications to discharge the duties that devolved on him, would it be possible that he should have remained in the Government service for a period of 24 years. Petitioner ought to have in justice obtained a higher post, partly by his possessing sufficient qualifications required for it, and chiefly by having passed the Special Test as will be seen by the enclosure marked **M**.

He humbly trusts under the circumstances and grounds set forth above, that your Excellency in Council will be graciously pleased to take his deplorable case into your merciful consideration, and order his restoration to his former post.

The endorsement passed by the Board of Revenue on Petitioner's Appeal and other papers connected with the subject of the Petition are herewith sent with a list.

For which act of charity your Excellency's Petitioner as in duty bound,
Shall Ever Pray,

14 August 1882

24th September 1883, No. 860. Pension

19W

17W

Government of Madras.

Pension Department

Read - the following papers:-

G.O., dated 8th September 1882, No. 216 Revenue

From the Collector of Chingleput, dated 20th July 1883.

Certificate and report from the Accountant-General, to the Acting Under Secretary to Government, Pension Department, dated Fort St. George, 27th August 1883, No. A.D.J.-193.

Certified that service in superior grades has been duly proved for twenty three years, ten months and five days. The Applicant's age on the date from which he ceased to be borne on the establishment, viz, 10th June 1880, was about fifty four years. To award a pension to a Government servant of that age, it is necessary that the claim for pension should be supported by a medical certificate of permanent incapacity for the public service. But the present application is not supported by such a certificate, and hence no pension would seem to be admissible under the strict provisions of the Civil Pension Code.

3. Further, from a perusal of the accompanying correspondence, and upon reference to the history

A
C. C. C.

1. 517

of service, it will be seen that the applicant was first absent without leave from 16th April to 4th May 1880, and was then suspended from employment in consequence of certain charges brought against him. The suspension eventually resulted in dismissal from the public service. A person who is dismissed from the public service on account of misconduct or inefficiency is barred from getting a pension or gratuity for his service under Government - vide Section 97 of the Civil Pension Code. The Collector is already aware of this rule, but he justifies the submission of the application by referring to G.O. No 216. Dated the 8th September 1882. Revenue Department.

3. Under ordinary circumstances a pension of Rs 7-15-10 per mensem would be admissible, subject to any reduction which the Government might think proper on account of the character and past conduct of the applicant, which are reported to be bad.

4. The delay in the submission of the application is explained in the 3rd page.

Petition from S. V. Seshadryengar, Dated 6th September 1883.

Order - Dated 24th September 1883, No 860. Pension.

The applicant's dismissal from misconduct was set aside by Government who directed the submission of his pension application in the usual course. As, G.O. No 216, Dated 8th September 1882.

19W
however, he appears to be under fifty five years of age and is not declared incapacitated for further service, he must be provided with a suitable post in which he can remain until he qualifies for a pension under the rules.

(True Extract)

(Signed) J. D. Rees,
Acting Under Secy to Govt.

To the Accountant-General.
Collector of Chingleput.

Ed. J. O'Connor.

Govt. of 1883 Madras.

PENSION

(Dated 3rd Sept)

Issued

Recd.

Encl.

G.O., 24th September 1883.
No. 860.

September

S. V. Seshadry Iyengar?

Directing the Collector of Chingleput to provide with a suitable post in which he can remain until he qualifies for a pension under the rules.

To

Sarilamadu Seshadri Iyengar
Revenue Inspector
Conjaimam Taluq
Chingleput
District

In No.

A list showing the total period of interval intermediate between Petitioner's dismissal and restoration

71W

	Date		
The date of Petitioner's dismissal by the acting Sub-Collector A. R. Harman Esqr	11 th June	1880	
The do of appeal preferred to the Collector J. H. Prier Esqr	2 nd July	1880	
The do of petition presented to the collector soliciting the disposal of his appeals dated 2 nd July 1880	22 nd Jan	1881	
The do of petition presented to the Collector requesting speedy disposal of the said appeal	23 rd Jan	1881	11 months and 16 days had elapsed in the disposal of the appeal preferred by the collector
The do of an Endorsement passed by the Collector apprising the petitioner the disposal of his appeal	17 th June	1881	
The do of an application to the Collector to furnish the petitioner with a copy of the proceedings passed on his appeal	12 th Aug	1881	
The do on which the copy of the Collector's proceedings was furnished to the petitioner	30 th Sep	1881	
The do of the presentation of appeal to the Board of Revenue		Oct 1881	
The do of the Endorsement passed by the Collector apprising the petitioner that his appeal to the Board of Revenue was confirmed	15 th Dec	1881	
The do of the order of the Board of Revenue, no 2014, informing petitioner that the records which accompanied his appeal was returned to him as requested by him	18 th Apr	1882	

A list showing the total period of interval intermediate between Petitioner's dismissal and restoration

The date of appeal made to the Government - 14th Aug 1882

The DO of the Government order, no 216, directing the collector to submit pension application in the usual course

The DO of Collector's letter to the Accountant General submitting the pension application of the petitioner

The DO of Accountant General's report to the Government respecting the claims of the petitioner's pension

The DO of Government order, no 860, directing to provide the petitioner with a post - 21st Sep 1883

That although the Government order, no 860, was passed on the 21st September 1883 to provide him with a post. yet he was out of employment till he got a Guwahati ship on the 20th November 1883

The period of interval intermediate between the petitioner's dismissal and restoration is -

3 5 6

10 months and 12 days had elapsed in submitting pension application to the Accountant General by the Collector

19th Dec 1883

9th July 1884 Late 3rd Class Revenue Dept

25W

List of the documents accompanying
the Petition dated the 9th July 1884.

- A Copy of the appeal petition presented
to the Government 24th August 1882.
- B Copy of the Government order dated
24th September 1883 No 860
- C List showing the total period of
interim intermediate between Petitioner's
dismissal and restoration

C
Custodian

9th July 1884

Chrysothamnus
Late 3rd Class Revenue Inspector

me

44

1884

27W

REVENUE DEPARTMENT.

No. 877.

From

Leharri Ryngers.
Pens? Rev. Reporters.

Dated

188

FOR ORDERS.

This man has not been
pensioned in G.O. 25-8-84
to 810, for an account of
his case reference is cit-
ed to 810 for orders
in G.O. 8-4-82. to 216.
He was ordered to be pen-
sioned from the date of
his dismissal, and
this order would have
been carried out but
that it was found that
he had not served for
pension - He was therefore
allowed to serve the few
months necessary to make
up the deficiency - On this
"misstatement" he bases his
present claim for pay for
the interval "not of employ-
ment" clearly he cannot reasonably
expect to profit by the
fact that his service was
deficient in the first
instance - Submitted etc
he should be told that
the Govt. declines to comply
with his request -

[Signature]

27-8-87

Pen. G. O. 25: Augt 1884 No 810

Pension/1884. DEPARTMENT.

No 817

From Keshadri Syengar

Occupation Late Revenue Inspector

Village

Taluk Cojnewar

District Chingleput

Dated 9 } July/84

Received 16 }

Enclosures Four.

Encl. 7: Oct/84 No 1075

The petitioner will be informed that the Govt. declines to comply with his request.

(P. Ma. order)
M

10/27-10-84

SUBJECT.

Praying to issue orders directing the payment to him in arrears, the amount of his salaries for the period between the date of his dismissal & restoration for the reasons set forth.

Will order

[Faint handwritten notes at the top of the left page]

[Faint handwritten text, likely bleed-through from the reverse side of the page]

M. 26
11/5/84