

(1) Number of pages 50
(2) Date of repair 28-6-48
(3) Initials of the Referencer _____

MADRAS RECORD OFFICE.

Government of Madras.

Pension DEPARTMENT.

G.O. No.

604

Press
Mis.

Dated

10-7-

1884.

Not to be folded or roughly handled

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS.

PENSION DEPARTMENT.

READ—the following papers:—

TO THE HON. E. F. WEBSTER,

Chief Secretary to Government, Ootacamund.

The humble petition of V. LUTCHMUN
ROW, late Treasurer, Currency department, Madras, and now out of employ.

MOST RESPECTFULLY SHOWETH,—That your honor will see, from the enclosed three petitions, the circumstances under which petitioner was removed from his appointment of Treasurer of the Currency office at Madras.

2. That on one of these petitions the Government have been pleased to pass the following endorsement, dated 28th October 1880, No. 1568:—

“There seems nothing to preclude the petitioner's employment in any other post for which his services may be required, and it does not appear that his former service would not count for pension.”

3. That petitioner thereon endeavoured to re-enter Government service preparatory to retiring on pension, but failed of success. Some of the appointments he hoped to obtain were the office of manager or serkele at Tanjore, and the appointment of Registrar in the Tanjore district. He had acted several times for the District Registrar of Tanjore, having been recommended for the place by H. S. Thomas, Esq., the then Collector of Tanjore. But on his recent applications for the grant of that appointment Mr. Hamnett, the present Inspector-General of Registration, held that petitioner had no possible claim to it.

4. Petitioner also applied to Mr. Clogstoun, Accountant-General, for an appointment, but he replied that “there were no vacancies which he could offer petitioner.”

5. That petitioner being at present sensible of his declining age and broken health has resolved to retire from active life. He comes of a family which has rendered honorable service to Government. In recognition of his father's long and meritorious service in connection with the Tanjore Raj Government, made him a present of an honorary palanquin and granted him a palanquin allowance in 1857 with a pension for his life.

6. That petitioner, in the confidence that Government would sooner or later render him justice, has not hitherto troubled them to grant him even the compensation allowance to which he is entitled for the period from January 1880.

7. That the petitioner under the foregoing circumstances most humbly prays that your honor will be graciously pleased to consider favorably his unfortunate case and favor him with the one-third pension to which he is entitled from the date of his removal from office. He has got only 15 years qualifying service after deducting all breaks. The Government have been pleased in other similar cases in 1877, 1882, 1884, viz., in the case of one B. Ramappa, late Head Gumastah of South Cannara, G. Veerasawmy Naidu, late Deputy Accountant, Madura district, Kristna Iyengar, late Sheristadar of District Court of Trichinopoly, to grant such pension.

8. The original service list of the petitioner is in the Accountant-General's office in the Currency department, and it may be called for when necessary.

10TH JULY 1884, No. 604, PENSION.

9. For this act of charity and humanity your petitioner and his whole family will, as in duty bound, ever pray.

MADRAS, 17th April 1884.

(Signed) V. LUTCHMUN ROW.

No. 34.

Referred to the Accountant-General for report.

OOTACAMUND,
15th May 1884.

(Signed) E. S. LAFFAN,
Ag. Under Secy. to Govt.

To the Accountant-General, with papers.

From H. F. CLOGSTOUN, Esq., Accountant-General, to the Secretary to Government, Pension department, dated Fort St. George, 20th May 1884, No. J.A.E-60.

Pension department.

With reference to Mr. Under-Secretary Laffan's endorsement, No. 34, dated the 15th May 1884, referring to me for report the petition from V. Lutchmun Row, late Treasurer, Currency department, Madras, praying that he may be granted for his service such pension as is admissible under the rules, I have the honor to state that Lutchmun Row's service, from 1st December 1860 to 15th February 1880, after deducting all breaks and periods of absence on leave, amounts to 15 years 4 months and 11 days. On the 15th February 1880 he was dismissed from the public service. Against this dismissal he appealed to Government, who in their endorsement, No. 1568, dated 28th October 1880, while declining to interfere in the matter, observed that there was nothing to preclude the petitioner's employment in any other post for which his services might be required, and added that it did not appear that his former service would not count for pension. Under section 101 of the Civil Pension Code removal from the public service for causes therein stated entails forfeiture of past service, and rule 2 thereof which permits appellate authorities to declare that the past service of the dismissed officer shall count for pension, would seem to apply to those officers only who may be reinstated in their original appointments or in some other appointments under Government.

2. The petitioner states that on account of his broken health and declining age, which is about 46 years, he has resolved to retire from active life on pension. Should Government be pleased to deal with the case exceptionally, it would be necessary to direct him to procure a medical certificate of permanent incapacity for further service. On receipt of such certificate, it will be open to Government to recommend to the Government of India the grant to him of a pension not exceeding one-third of his average emoluments.

3. The endorsement under reply, and its enclosures, are herewith returned.

ORDER—dated 10th July 1884, No. 604, Pension.

The applicant should produce a medical certificate of complete unfitness for further service, on the receipt of which his case will be considered.

(True Extract.)

E. S. LAFFAN,
Ag. Under Secy. to Govt.

To the Accountant-General.

Copy of order to the petitioner.

Exd. J. Wright.

THE MOST NOBLE

RICHARD PLANTAGENET CAMPBELL TEMPLE NUGENT BRYDGES
CHANDOS GRENVILLE, DUKE OF BUCKINGHAM AND CHANDOS,
G. C. S. I., C. I. E., COUNCILLOR TO THE EMPRESS OF INDIA,
GOVERNOR OF THE PRESIDENCY OF FORT SAINT GEORGE AND
ITS DEPENDENCIES.

The humble Petition of V. LAKSHMAN RAO, the
Currency Treasurer, Madras.

MAY IT PLEASE YOUR GRACE,

1. That your Petitioner was employed as Treasurer at the Head Quarters, Tanjore District, in which capacity he always discharged his duties in a manner satisfactory to his superiors and that he has served Government for a period of nearly 17 years.

2. That on the 22nd April 1879, there appeared a notice in the *Fort Saint George Gazette*, signed by the Commissioner of the Paper Currency Department, calling for applications for the Office of Currency Treasurer at Madras, and stating that a security of Rupees 50,000 in Government Promissory Notes was required. It was further notified that the salary of the Treasurer would be "Rupees 200 rising to Rupees 250." Your Petitioner at once applied for the post, offering the required security. At the time he made this application, your Petitioner as Government Treasurer, Tanjore, was drawing a salary of Rupees 125 per mensem; and having lodged only a security of Rupees 5,000, and being frequently put on to act as Registrar of Assurances, your Petitioner was in a comparatively satisfactory position. On the 21st May 1879, a communication was addressed to him by the Commissioner of the Currency Department, informing him "that the pay of the Treasurer will be Rupees 200, (and not Rupees 200 rising to Rupees 250); and that, in consequence, the security will be reduced to Rupees 40,000, half in Government Promissory Notes and half personal." Your Petitioner communicated his readiness to accept the appointment with the reduced salary, and on the 2nd June 1879, he was ordered to join the Currency Office. Your Petitioner gave over charge of the Tanjore Treasury on the 14th June, joined the Currency Office on the 17th and deposited the security in due form on the 23rd. The Commissioner deprived your Petitioner of his pay for nine days, from the 14th to the 23rd June and this notwithstanding the facts that he was transferred from one place to another with the consent of his previous employer, on public grounds; that all public servants are entitled to joining time when undergoing a transfer; and that there was unavoidable delay in filing the security. The Commissioner looked upon the appointment, as one made at the Petitioner's request and for his own benefit and refused pay in accordance with that view. Your Petitioner most respectfully submits that though the stoppage of pay for nine days is a comparatively trivial matter, it causes a grievance which the Petitioner does not deserve to suffer.

3. That your Petitioner even though the security had been reduced to Rupees 40,000, one-half being allowed to be personal, preferred to deposit a Government Promissory Note worth Rupees 50,000, as he did not wish to split up the Note into parts, and as he was anxious to avoid being beholden to any body for standing as personal security. About the end of September 1879, your Petitioner was called upon to sign an "Indemnity Bond," holding himself responsible for all accounts, books, securities, writings and papers, and binding himself to do any additional work that may be imposed on him. This was a new requisition. His predecessors did not give any such Bond though their security was very small; nor was the Petitioner aware when he accepted his office that he would have to sign any such Bond. Your Petitioner informed the Commissioner through the Assistant Accountant-General in charge of Currency that in the interests of Government he was ready to hold himself responsible to any reasonable extent, but that each and every employé in the Department for whose work he was to be held responsible should be under his control, subject of course to the order and supervision of the Commissioner and the Assistant in charge, should be directly responsible to him and should be liable to share with him all penalties incurred by the neglect or misconduct of such employé. Your Petitioner further urged the necessity for defining in the Indemnity Bond the work

and the responsibilities of the Treasurer in accordance with the practice prevailing in the other Presidencies, thus both consulting the interests of Government and securing his own safety. The Commissioner, however, peremptorily insisted on the Indemnity Bond being signed. Your Petitioner, afraid to commit himself by signing a Bond which rendered him subject to undefined responsibilities, begged permission to take legal advice, which permission was refused him. His most reasonable prayer, that he should be put on the same footing as regards formalities and responsibility as the Currency Treasurers in Bengal and Bombay, was not complied with, and he was threatened with serious consequences for hesitating to hold himself responsible for the acts of others who were in no way responsible to him.

4. That your Petitioner went to Tanjore during the Christmas holidays to see his wife who was there in a very infirm state of health. That on the 2nd January 1880 he received a telegram from the Accountant-General ordering his 'return to Madras by first train,' which order was duly obeyed. That on the ground of his having absented himself during the Christmas holidays, the Commissioner passed an order "that Lakshman Rao (your Petitioner) having been absent without leave from Madras from the 24th December, having locked up the Currency vaults, and taken the keys with him so as to prevent Mr. Groves from taking charge on the 3rd as directed, is deprived of all pay and allowances from that date, and the period till he rejoins duty will reckon as a break in his service, unless his absence is fully and satisfactorily explained." On the 6th January, your Petitioner submitted the following explanation:—that on the 24th December the last working day in 1879, Dr. Cline, the Assistant in charge of Currency, told him that he was going to Pondicherry, and that no instruction was given to him not to leave Madras during the sanctioned holidays; that he left the station like other Government officials in Madras, and that he left the keys at his house with his brother, who is the Acting Deputy Commissioner of Police, to be handed over to the Currency Officer, if wanted, and requested that on these grounds the punishment inflicted on him might be concealed. The order passed by the Commissioner on this explanation, states among other things that "no officer of any grade has any right to leave his station without the permission of his immediate superior";—that "the fact that others left Madras without leave instead of excusing his absence shows how necessary it is to put a stop to the practice";—that "the holidays merely mean that officials need not attend the office, and do not imply that they may render it impossible for them to attend even if required"; that "Heads of Departments are ordered by Government to provide for the transaction of emergent business during the holidays, but it is impossible for them to do so if their subordinates quit the station without leave." Your Petitioner would most humbly submit that he does not venture to call in question the soundness of the Commissioner's doctrine as to what the holidays mean and what they do not imply; it may as the Commissioner thinks be necessary to put a stop to such practice; but as this is the first time officials at Madras are told that even during holidays they should not leave the station without special permission, as there is no rule on record that he is aware of to this effect, as the Commissioner cannot enforce rules which have no existence, and as the practice of leaving the station unless specially required to stay has hitherto prevailed, unobjected to, as the Commissioner himself admits, your Petitioner would urge upon the consideration of Your Grace in Council the gross injustice and oppression of your Petitioner being singled out for punishment among a multitude of offenders, if offenders they are, and that, by giving retrospective effect to a rule not known to exist formerly. As regards the order of Government to provide for the transaction of emergent business, your Petitioner would respectfully submit that the very meaning of the order is that special arrangements should be made, requiring some of the officials to remain at the Station for transacting emergent business, and that is precisely what is now done in all offices including the Accountant-General's Office. If as the Commissioner emphatically lays down, no official is to leave the Station during the Christmas holidays without special leave, there does not seem to be any necessity for making a previous provision. However this may be, your Petitioner, in leaving the Station inasmuch as he was not ordered to remain at it, did nothing more than thousands had done in former years and as other Officers and Assistants in the Accountant-General's Office did this year and in previous years; and he, therefore, humbly entreats Your Grace in Council to save him from suffering from an arbitrary rule made most improperly to have

retrospective effect. Your Petitioner further submits for the information of Your Grace in Council that on his explanation being given to the Commissioner, the Commissioner imposed on him a fine of Rupees 50 in addition to all the penalties previously inflicted, almost as if it was a fresh offence to render an explanation, especially when such explanation was called for.

5. That on the 6th January, he was again required to execute the Indemnity Bond at once, and that on his explaining that he could not do so,—firstly, because, he was told nothing about such a Bond when the appointment was conferred on him and his security accepted,—secondly, because, the Bond would make him responsible for the acts of subordinates who were in no way responsible to him,—thirdly, because, the matter was serious and he wished to have legal advice,—and on his stating that he was willing to sign a Security Bond of the form in the Commissioner's Offices at Calcutta and Bombay, if the system adopted there should be followed in full detail here, defining the duties and responsibilities of each and giving the Treasurer due control over his Department, the Commissioner insisted on his either signing the Bond or resigning his appointment. Thereupon your Petitioner submitted to the Commissioner an application for the usual leave on forfeiture of full pay as he wanted time to secure another appointment and as he would deprive himself of 17 years' service if he was forced to resign his post. The Commissioner granted him leave for one month only, and required him to report at the end of that time whether he had succeeded in securing another appointment.

6. That on the 14th February your Petitioner put in an application to the Officiating Commissioner in charge of the Currency, requesting for further leave for two years on forfeiture of full pay on the grounds that he required time for obtaining redress of his grievances from Government and that the one short month already given him was not enough for securing another appointment. In answer to this, the Officiating Commissioner was pleased to observe that "Lakshman Rao's, application for two years' leave is simply a piece of great impertinence." He concludes his order with the words,—"having shown no cause for granting further leave to a person who appears not to intend to return to the Department if he could and who would not be allowed to return if he wished it, Lakshman Rao is struck off the list of the Currency Department from this date."

7. That your Petitioner most earnestly prays that Your Grace in Council will, after giving a due consideration to the circumstances stated above, take pity on him for the severity and injustice with which he has been systematically treated, and order

First,—that his pay from the 14th to the 23rd June should be allowed him, the same being admissible under the Rules.

Second,—that his pay from the 25th December to the 4th January, both days inclusive should be allowed him, so that there might be no break in his service, and that the fine of Rupees 50 might be remitted.

Third,—that if the Indemnity Bond is to be signed, the system prevailing at Calcutta and Bombay should be adopted here, or that your Petitioner should not be required to sign the Bond.

Fourth,—that the order of the Officiating Commissioner striking his name off the list of the Currency Department be cancelled; and that in case of there being insuperable difficulties in the way of his rejoining the Currency Department, leave on forfeiture of full pay be granted to him until he secures another appointment. He humbly submits for the consideration of your Grace that by such arrangement his successor will in no way be prejudiced, as regards the tenure of his appointment, inasmuch as he can, under the Rules in force, be allowed full pay and can count his service in full from the date of his substantive *pro tem* appointment.

For which act of kindness your Petitioner as in duty bound

MADRAS, 23rd February 1880.

WILL EVER PRAY.

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS.

PETITION DEPARTMENT.

Endorsement on No. 453 of 1880.

The Government will not interfere.

(By Order.)

(Signed) J. A. DAVIS,

Assistant Secretary,

Ag. Under-Secy. to Govt.

[FROT ST. GEORGE, }
5th June 1880. }

(True Copy.)

V. LUTCHMAN ROW.

To

The Most Noble Richard Plantagenet Campbell
Temple Nugent Brydges Chandos Grenville,
Duke of Buckingham and Chandos, G. C. S. I.
C. I. E., Councillor to the Empress of India,
Governor of the Presidency of Fort Saint
George and its Dependencies.

*The Humble Petition of LAKSHMAN RAO,
the Currency ex Treasurer, Madras.*

MAY IT PLEASE YOUR GRACE,

That your Memorialist addressed an humble petition concerning his grievances to your Grace in Council on the 23rd February 1880, and earnestly hoped that the injuries he had sustained would be redressed, but the only endorsement vouchsafed to him was that "the Government will not interfere."

2. That your Memorialist most humbly entreats your Grace to reconsider his case on the further grounds stated herein. Copies of the correspondence that passed between him and his official superiors, the Commissioner in charge of the Currency and his Assistant are sent herewith to give your Grace an opportunity of judging to what extent he was recalcitrant and insubordinate, and whether under the circumstances of the case he was not reasonable in refusing to sign the Bond with its most stringent and dangerously comprehensive conditions that the Commissioner insisted on his signing.

3. That from first to last, your humble Memorialist, having given a large security of Rupees 40,000, and having been told that he would only have to sign the USUAL BOND, was simply anxious to avoid committing himself by yielding to conditions of an *unprecedented* character; that the Bond he was peremptorily called upon to sign was very different in nature from any signed by his predecessors in office who had given a much smaller amount of security, and drew the salary of Rupees 250 as Currency Treasurer.

4. Since your Memorialist accepted the post, depôts of small Silver Coin and Copper, and also Reserve Treasury to an enormous amount were added to the former duties. This statement will be corroborated by the Deputy and Assistant Accountants General.

Per. W. L. Row

5. In 1872-73, it was recommended that the maximum salary of both the Treasurer and the Head Accountant and Manager should be the same, but the Government of India sanctioned, as your Memorialist is informed, the maximum salary of Rupees 300 to the Treasurer only.

6. That whereas the Government of India intended that the Treasurer's salary should rise from Rupees 250 to Rupees 300, and the Head Accountant and Manager's remain stationary at Rupees 200, the Commissioner has fixed the salary of the Treasurer at Rupees 200, and has made the salary of the Head Accountant rise from Rupees 200 to Rupees 250 by annual increments of Rupees 10. The Commissioner in his advertisement in the *Fort Saint George Gazette*, dated 22nd April 1879, offered a salary of Rupees 200, rising to Rupees 250, but he subsequently informed your Memorialist that the salary would be only Rupees 200, and that he wanted only a Security of Rupees 40,000 instead of 50,000, as originally required. But seeing that the responsibilities of the Treasurer have been increased of late by the Depôts of small Silver Coin and Copper and the Reserve Treasury, there is need for a larger Security, than Rupees 50,000, which larger amount may be fairly demanded, if the Treasurer's salary is allowed to be Rupees 200 rising to Rupees 300. Further, the Head Accountant, drawing according to the Commissioner's arrangements, a larger salary than the Treasurer, is invested with authority over the Treasurer and his subordinates. It is easy to see that the Treasurer can have but little control over his Subordinates in this state of things, and must be very unwise if he undertakes to hold himself responsible for their conduct.

7. That he could not therefore accept a Bond involving such fearful responsibility without proper legal advice and a definite understanding as to his rights and obligations, and that the Commissioner mindful only of burdening your Memorialist with heavy and undefined liabilities, would take no notice of his reiterated remonstrances and requests that the matter should be fairly discussed and defined.

8. That your Memorialist would draw the attention of your Grace more especially to two points in this novel Bond, firstly, that your Memorialist was to be held responsible for the conduct of all his Subordinates, even though there was no provision rendering those Subordinates responsible to him by giving him the power of control over them or by authorizing him to take securities from them. This your Memorialist naturally objected to, and he leaves it to your Grace to decide whether his objection was not reasonable and proper. The other point your Memorialist would urge upon the consideration of your Grace is that the Bond gives the Commissioner *Carte Blanche* to deal with the Treasurer (your humble Memorialist) in any manner he pleases; invests him with the powers of dismissing, suspending or in any other way punishing the Treasurer, making such decision final and giving the Treasurer no right of appeal. This is a condition peculiarly severe and likely to be attended with most disastrous consequences. Your Memorialist was of course unwilling to place himself at the absolute mercy of the Commissioner, especially after paying a large Security and accepting heavy responsibilities more than what appertained to the office when conducted by others.

9. Your Memorialist learns that the Commissioner has since recommended to Government the nomination of another Treasurer in his stead taking from him a security of 20,000 Rupees only, and that the Commissioner has so far recognized the necessity of giving the new Treasurer control over his subordinates and has allowed him to nominate them—a privilege denied to the Memorialist.

10. The accompanying printed Pamphlet will convince your Grace that your Memorialist belongs to a good and respectable family whose members have been high in the service and in the confidence of the old Rajahs of Tanjore and your Memorialist's father as one of them has served the British Government with great fidelity and energy in carrying out their policy as will be seen from the Proceedings of Government, dated 9th July 1860, and your Memorialist has himself served the Government for upwards of 17 years, and in consequence deserves your Grace's favorable consideration and protection.

11. That all the other circumstances connected with his most painful case are stated explicitly in his first petition, a copy of which is sent herewith, and that your Memorialist most fervently prays that your Grace will peruse that communication.

12. That in conclusion your Memorialist most humbly prays that your Grace will pass orders as to the form of Bond he is to sign, and direct that he should be reinstated in office.

For which act of kindness, as in duty bound, your Memorialist

SHALL EVER PRAY,

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS.

PETITION DEPARTMENT.

Endorsement on No. 1568 of 1880.

The Government still decline to interfere in the matter. There seems nothing to preclude the Petitioner's employment in any other post for which his services may be required, and it does not appear that his former service would not count for pension.

(By Order.)

(Signed) G. S. FORBES,
Acting Assistant Secretary
for Ag. Under Secy. to Govt.

FORT ST. GEORGE, }
28th Oct. 1880. }

Pension 1000 Rs

note

117.

May this be sent
to the Pension Dept
in Madras?

Alh

Yes. for precedents. It
must be remembered
however that since the
decentralization all pension
are Paid. A precedent from
the decentralization would
be conclusive. *Alh*

137

... on 1st. ...
... was that the
... in ...
... I am under the
... that at ...
... the A.G.'s office
... to India? Do ...
... office ...
... we ...
... to
... 1877

Note for Under Secretary

Sir, I beg to state that although the Accountant General's Office and the Paper Currency Department which forms a portion of it are under the management of the Govt of India still applications for pensions and gratuities on behalf of non-Gazetted servants of those Establishments are always disposed of by the Local Govt and not by the Govt of India; who grant pensions only to the Gazetted officers of the Financial Department in the same way as they grant leave of absence to those officers.

In support of my application I can point to several precedents. A few of recent date are, however, put up for reference.

Yrs.

To

His Excellency the Right Honorable
the Governor of Madras
in Council.

The humble Memorial of TANJORE VENKATA
LAKSHMAN ROW, late Treasurer of the
Paper Currency Office, Madras.

MOST RESPECTFULLY SHEWETH,

Petition to Madras Govern-
ment, dated 23rd February 1880.
Do, do. 24th August 1880
(with enclosures).
Government Endorsements
on the above Petitions.
Copy of correspondence.

That Memorialist respectfully submits for the considera-
tion of your Excellency in Council the papers marginally
noted, connected with his suspension from the Public Service,
and prays for a reconsideration of his case.

The circumstances under which your Memorialist was suspended are fully
detailed in his Petitions to the Madras Government; and your Excellency will
observe that the sole cause thereof was his refusal to execute an Indemnity Bond of
a very arbitrary character, making him individually responsible for the conduct of
all his subordinates.

Acting under legal advice, your Memorialist declined to undertake the respon-
sibility, inasmuch as he had no control over his subordinates, nor was he indemnified
for any remissness on their part. Such a Bond, moreover, had not been taken from
any of his predecessors, nor had he, at the time of his engagement, any notice of being
required to give such indemnity.

Had the Bond been limited in its terms to the individual acts of your Petitioner,
or had his subordinates been placed under his own immediate control and held res-
ponsible to him, as is the practice in the other Presidencies, he would not have
objected to it.

In justice to himself, however, he could not execute a Bond that held him liable
for the acts of men who were practically free from all responsibility, and over whom
he exercised no authority.

This constituted the offence, for which the Commissioner, Paper Currency
Department, dismissed him.

Memorialist therefore prays your Excellency to inquire into the practice obtain-
ing in the other Presidencies and to render him justice.

Your Memorialist would most respectfully add that although the appointment of
Treasurer is one of grave pecuniary responsibility, and one which it is highly desirable
should be held by men of pronounced respectability, and probity, neither were his
predecessors nor is his successor in office men of substance.

The former rose in the Government Service, while the latter had never been previously in Government employ, and in order to give the required security of 20,000 Rupees, was obliged to arrange with a merchant to advance him that amount, on condition of paying him a large sum out of his salary, in consideration of the accommodation.

Moreover, the son of the merchant aforesaid, has been entertained as Deputy Treasurer to watch over the Treasurer and to insure his father against any loss. Such an arrangement, Memorialist submits, cannot be to the interests of Government. It was nevertheless inevitable because no one of position would consent to take up the appointment under the stringent and, it may be added, unreasonable provisions of the Indemnity Bond, dictated by the Accountant-General of Madras.

Memorialist's minor grievances are, briefly, that he was deprived of pay for the period that elapsed between the date of his vacating his appointment at Tanjore and that of his taking up the Treasurership at Madras; and that his pay was stopped during the Christmas vacation, when he proceeded to Tanjore on account of his wife's illness, a fine of fifty Rupees being also imposed for his so-called absence without leave.

In the latter case Memorialist would respectfully observe, that heads of Departments are required to make arrangements for the transaction of emergent business during the vacation; and that as he received no notice that his services would be required during the vacation, he naturally concluded that his presence was not needed at Madras, and that he was free to leave the station, which he did in common with many other Government employés.

Memorialist would humbly beg further to urge that he has been in Government employ for 18 years,—a period qualifying him for one-third pension,—and that he has been summarily suspended for no fault, but simply because he respectfully remonstrates against his being held pecuniarily responsible for the misconduct of subordinates over whom he had no control.

He was willing, and always expressed his readiness, to continue at his post and execute the Bond, provided he was placed on the same footing in respect of responsibility as Currency Department Treasurers in the other Presidencies. This he is still prepared to do.

Up to the time of Memorialist's entertainment, a small collateral security only was taken from the Treasurer, and consequently no question of responsibility presented itself. But now that a large amount of money security was taken from Memorialist, and an Indemnity Bond was also required of him, he very naturally felt anxious to secure himself from all loss by having his responsibilities and duties properly defined, and those whose work he had to supervise and be answerable for, placed entirely under his control.

Your Excellency will observe that while the Madras Government declined to interfere in Petitioner's behalf in this particular case, they did not consider him disqualified from holding any post in the Public Service to which heads of Departments might be willing to employ him. But this decision unhappily leaves Memorialist

without any appointment for the present, and causes a break in his service that may seriously affect his future prospects in securing a pension.

Memorialist, therefore, earnestly prays that your Excellency will give due consideration to the circumstances above stated, and, taking compassion on his unfortunate case, mercifully grant him relief in the following manner:—

First.—That pay from the 14th to the 23rd June, the time intervening between vacating one appointment and taking up another, be passed to him in accordance with the rules of the service.

Second.—That pay from 25th December to the 4th January, both days inclusive, should be allowed him, so that there might be no break in his service, and that the fine of Rupees 50 might be remitted.

Third.—That if the Indemnity is to be signed, the system prevailing either in Bengal or Bombay should be adopted here.

Fourth.—That the order of the Commissioner striking his name off the list of the Establishment be cancelled, and that he be restored to his appointment.

Fifth.—That in case this last request cannot be complied with, he be provided with a suitable appointment of equal or very similar emolument to that recently held by him as soon as a vacancy occurs at Madras.

Sixth.—That until he is so re-employed, he be placed on the Pension list and granted a one-third pension subject to the Pension rules, for which he is qualified, having served the prescribed time.

For which act of grace, your Excellency's Memorialist, as in duty bound,

WILL EVER PRAY.

MADRAS,

14th March 1881.

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS.

PETITION DEPARTMENT.

Endorsement No. 64 of 1881.

The Government having passed one order on any appeal made to it, will not notice a second Petition on the same subject, unless it contains some new and important matter.

(By Order.)

(Signed) G. S. FORBES,

Ag. Under-Secy. to Govt.

FORT ST. GEORGE,
27th April 1881.

(True Copy.)

V. LUTCHMAN ROW.

*Permit to 400 7/11
at 10/11*

Read the following papers:-

Madras 17th April 1884

To

*The Honorable E. F. Webster
Chief Secretary to Government
Que / Que / Que
Ootacamund*

*The humble petition of V. Lutchman
Row late Treasurer, Currency Depart-
ment Madras and now out of employ*

Most Respectfully Sheweth,

*1. That your honor will
see from the enclosed three Petitions
the Circumstances under which petitioner
was removed from his appointment
of Treasurer of the Currency Office
at Madras. -*

*2. That on one of these
Petitions the Government have been
pleased to pass the following Endorse-
ment dated 28th October 1880 No 1568
There*

1881
" There seems nothing to
" preclude the petitioner's employ-
" -ment in any other post for
" which his Services may be
" required and it does not appear
" that his former service would
" not count for pension". -

3. That Petitioner thereon endeavoured to re enter Government Service preparatory to retiring on pension but failed of success. Some of the appointments he hoped to obtain were the Office of Manager on Serkela at Tanjore and the appointment of Registrar in the Tanjore District. He had acted several times for the District Registrar of Tanjore having been recommended for the place by H. S. Thomas Esq^r the then Collector of Tanjore. But on his recent applications for the grant of that appointment, Mr. Hannet the present Inspector General of Registration held

2 P 231
held that Petitioner had no possible claim to it. -

4. Petitioner also applied to Mr. Clogston Accountant General for an appointment but he replied that there were no vacancies which he could offer Petitioner. -

5. That Petitioner being at present sensible of his declining age and broken health has resolved to retire from active life. He comes of a family which has rendered honorable service to Government. In recognition of his father's long and meritorious service in connection with the Tanjore Raj Government and the present of an honorary Palangam and granted him a Palangam allowance in 1857 with a Pension for his life. -

6. That Petitioner in the confidence that Government would sooner or later render him justice has not hitherto troubled them to grant him even the compensation allowance to which he is entitled for the period from January 1880. -

7. That the Petitioner under the foregoing circumstances most humbly prays, that your honor will be — graciously pleased to consider favorably his unfortunate case and favor him with the one third pension to which he is entitled from the date of his removal from Office. He has got only 15 years qualifying service after deducting all breaks. The Government have been pleased in other similar cases in 1877, 1882, 1884 viz. in the case of One B. Ramappa late Head Gymastah of South Canara, by Veeraswamy Naidu late Deputy Accountant Madras District Krishna Cyngan late Sheristadar of District Court of Trichinopoly to grant such pension. —

8. The Original Service List of the Petitioner is in the Accountant General's Office in the Currency Department and it may be called for when necessary. —

9. For this act of charity and humanity your Petitioner and his whole family will as in duty bound ever pray

N. Lutchman Row

Pension 400 204

Pension

Pens. (1884) DEPARTMENT.

h: 400

From

V. Lutchman Row

Occupation Late Treasurer

Village Currency Dep.

Taluk Madras

District

Dated 17 } April / 84.

Received 21

Enclosures - 3.

SUBJECT.

Prays for a pens.
equal to $\frac{1}{3}$ his Average
Emoluments.

For

With Endorsement

Pension Department

Fort Saint George

Accounts General's Office

20 May 1884.

N. 34
60

From
H. F. Hogston Esq.
Accountant General

To
The Chief Secretary
to Government
Pension Department.

Sir,

With reference to Mr. Under Secretary
Safford's Endorsement N. 34 dated the 15th
May 1884, referring to me for report the petition
from V. Lutchman Row, late Treasurer,
Currency Department, Madras, praying that
he may be granted for his service such
pension as is admissible under the rules,
I have the honor to state that Lutchman
Row's service from 1st December 1860 to 15th February
1880 after deducting all breaks and periods
of absence on leave, amounts to 15 years 4 months
and 11 days. On the 15th February 1880 he
was dismissed from the public service.
Against this dismissal he appealed to
Government, who in their Endorsement N. 1568
dated 28th October 1880, while declining to
interfere in the matter, observed that there
was nothing to preclude the Petitioner's
employment in any other post for which
his

Petition No. 4264 d/27-4-81.
 - 91 of 18-80.
 - 86 A d/18/10/80.
 - 830 d/2-12-82.
 23-7-88

Pension (188) DEPARTMENT.
 No. 580
 From THE ACCOUNTANT-GENERAL,
 Madras,

To THE Chief Secretary
 to Government
 Pension Dept
 No. 346
 60
 Dated 20th May 1886.
 Received

No. 604 of 1886-7-87
 Subject.

Reports on the
 petition of V. Laksh-
 man Rao for
 Renewer Currency
 Dept praying for
 the grant of a
 pension for his
 past services
 of complete unfitness
 for further service
 The applicant should
 produce a medical certi-
 ficate on the receipt of
 which his case will be
 considered.
 (From record) H.L.
 1886-7-87

In order
 The A.C. is to state
 the facts. In reply to one
 of the applicant's petitions
 the Govt said that it did
 not appear that his former
 service would be forfeited
 by his removal from the
 public service. This opinion
 seems to be opposed to sec. 101.
 of the Code, but perhaps
 it was the opinion of Govt.
 that the applicant's dis-
 mission was not due to
 "misconduct" or "inefficiency".
 The facts of the ^{dismissal} are given
 in the A.C.'s letter of
 7th May 1880, read with R.O.
 45-3. of 1880. In that letter
 the A.C. speaks indifferently
 of the applicant's having
 resigned the service, and having
 been removed from it. The
 cause being that he refused
 to sign the security bond
 demanded from him on
 taking up his appointment.
 It is perhaps for consideration
 whether this refusal was "mis-
 conduct".

Supposing that the service
 can be held to count, it would
 still not appear that any means
 is due unless, as the A.C. suggests,
 the applicant should produce
 a medical certificate which might
 justify exceptional treatment. The ap-
 plicant is a man of enormous
 wealth. H.L.