

Pension (1897) Department.

CURRENT No. 548

List

Ord. 14 July 1897 No. 532.
Order

The Memorial will be withheld under
Section, rule 3(10) of the S. I. Memorial rules.
quoted below.

Section, Rule 3(10) Ord.

12.7.97

12.7.97

From

K. Varadaraja Mudali
Pensioned State Examin.
Super Currency Dept.
Madras
No.

Dated 21 June 97 -

Received 3rd July 97

Registered 3rd July 97

Enclosures 2

Spare copies.



SUBJECT.

The memorial is an appeal against No. 1135 P.
14-9-96
It is submitted nearly 3 years after the go. was communi-
cated to him. So it seems liable to be withheld under
the rule quoted above.

Submitting a memorial to
the Govt. of India praying
for an increased pension

BACK PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.
"	224	Pension	17. 3
"	423	do	11. 4

FURTHER PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.
"	809	Pen	22-10-97



His Excellency the Right Honorable
the Governor-General of India
in Council, Calcutta.

Thro: His Excellency the Right Honorable
the Governor in Council, Fort-Saint-Joseph,
Madras.

The humble petition of K. Varada
Raja Mudali, Pensioned Note Examiner,
Paper Currency Dept., Madras.

Most humbly sheweth,

That your Excellency's humble
petitioner was a Note Examiner, Paper Currency
Department, Madras, having entered the Deptt
on the 15th January 1877.

2. That your Excellency's humble
petitioner on being Certified by the Medical
Board to be unfit for further service owing to
Short-Sight and deafness, the result of his
peculiar departmental work of a Note Examiner
was obliged to retire on a small pension of Rs 11.5.4
being $\frac{1}{10}$ of his average emoluments with effect
from 14th February 94 (Vide G.O. No 423 dated 11 April
1894).

3. That your Excellency's humble
petitioner having entered Government service
in 1877 long before the new rules came in force
applied on the 25th June 94 and 8th March 97 and
prayed upon the Madras Government, the
Concession of an increased pension of $\frac{1}{3}$ of his
average emoluments i.e. Rs 13.5.4 may under
Note 2, article 7(a) of the Civil Service Regulation
be granted to him with effect from 14th February
94. The Local Government has summarily
rejected to grant your Excellency's humble
petitioner an increased rate of pension vide
order No: 1135 dated 14 September 94 and

endorsement.

17 March 1897

Copies enclosed.

4. That your Excellency's humble petitioner begs most respectfully to submit that the duty he has performed is a responsible one in comparison to the other appointments. As a Note Examiner your Excellency's petitioner has during his service worked without a blot and detected a Ten Rupee and 100 Rs Note (Forged) of the Madras Circle of issue, presented to him for encashment in the office.

5. That your Excellency's humble petitioner got the Short-Sight as the duty he was discharging required close and steady use of his Sight. He, during his service had on most of the days in a month, to forfeit his sight as his business generally continued till late in the evenings. Hence deafness.

6. your Excellency's humble petitioner begs to submit that he had to deposit Cash Security, the appointment being a monetary one, and that he faithfully continued to discharge the duty for a period of 17 years.

7. Under the above Circumstances, your Excellency's humble petitioner being handicapped able to support a large family on a small pension in these hard days of scarcity and distress, humbly craves that his case may be considered under the old rules Rule 2. art. 7. a of the Civil Service Regulations and an increased rate of pension of $\frac{1}{3}$ of his average emoluments i.e Rs 13. 5. 4 with effect from 14 February 94 may be given him as is done and granted in many Cases.

For which act of kindness, your Excellency's humble petitioner shall ever pray.

24 June 1897

C. Naradarajulu Mudali
No. 1. Paripurana Vinayagar
Coil Street, Mylapore
Madras.

No. 2444 V.
Government of India.
Finance and Commerce Department
Cinnala, the 31st May 1897

The undersigned is directed to inform K. Varada Raja Mudali, Pensioned Note Examiner, Paper Currency Department, Madras, that his petition of 12th May, 1897,

নিম্ন স্বাক্ষরকারী আদিক ইইয়া

কে জানাইতেছেন যে

তারিখ
প্রাপ্ত

তারিখ
প্রাপ্ত

will not be considered by the Government of India because he has not complied with No. 1 of the rules prescribed by the Government of India in Notification No. 1812, dated the 11th October 1889, of which a summary is given overleaf.


ভারত গবর্ণমেন্টের বিবেচনাধীন ইইবে না ; কারণ তিনি ১৮৮৯ সালের ১১ই অক্টোবর তারিখের ভারত গবর্ণমেন্ট নির্দিষ্ট নং ১৮১২ বিজ্ঞাপনে প্রচারিত নিয়ম সকলের নং নিয়ম অনুসারে কার্য করেন নাই। এ সকল নিয়মের সংক্ষিপ্ত বিবরণ পরপৃষ্ঠায় দেওয়া হইল।

The petition (and enclosures) are herewith returned.

দরখাস্ত (এবং কাগজপত্র) ইহার সহিত ফেরত দেওয়া হইল।

R. G. Gable

Under Secretary to the Govt of India.



A.—A petition to the Government of India against the orders or action of a Local Government must—

- (1) be submitted through the Local Government;
- (2) if emanating from an official, also be submitted through the Head of his Department or Office, must not be in the nature of a joint petition, and must refer to matters in which the petitioner has some personal interest;
- (3) be signed and dated by the petitioner;
- (4) if in the form of an appeal against an order, contain the original or an authenticated copy of the order appealed against, and be presented within 6 months of the date of that order;
- (5) conclude with a specific prayer;
- (6) be prepared in loyal, temperate and respectful language.

B.—Petitions in which these rules are not complied with will not be considered.

(ক)—স্থানীয় গবর্ণমেন্টের আদেশ বা কার্যের বিরুদ্ধে ভারত গবর্ণমেন্টের নিকট দরখাস্ত—

- (১) স্থানীয় গবর্ণমেন্টের হস্ত দিয়া দাখিল করিতে হইবে;
- (২) যদি কোন সরকারী কর্মচারী দরখাস্ত করেন তবে তিনি যে বিভাগে অথবা আফিসে কর্ম করেন সেই বিভাগের অথবা আফিসের প্রধান কর্মচারীর হস্ত দিয়া দাখিল করিতে হইবে; অনেকে একত্র হইয়া যে ভাবে দরখাস্ত করে, ঐ দরখাস্ত সে ভাবে করা হইবে না, ও যে সকল বিষয়ে দরখাস্তকারীর স্বার্থ সম্বন্ধ আছে, কেবল সেই সকল বিষয়ের উল্লেখ করিতে হইবে;
- (৩) দরখাস্তকারীকে স্বাক্ষর করিতে ও তারিখ লিখিতে হইবে;
- (৪) যদি কোন আদেশের বিরুদ্ধে আপীল হয়, তাহা হইলে, সেই আদেশের আসল অথবা তাহার বিশ্বাস যোগ্য প্রতিলিপি দাখিল করিতে হইবে, এবং যে আদেশের বিরুদ্ধে আপীল হইতেছে তাহা বাহির হইবার তারিখ হইতে ছয় মাসের মধ্যে দরখাস্ত করিতে হইবে;
- (৫) দরখাস্তটি একটা বিশেষ প্রার্থনাতে সমাপ্ত হওয়া আবশ্যিক;
- (৬) দরখাস্ত খানি রাজভক্তিপূর্ণ, বিগীত ভাবে ও সম্মানসূচক, ভাষায় লিখিতে হইবে;
- (খ)—যে সকল দরখাস্ত পূর্বোক্ত নিয়মানুসারে লিখিত না হইবে, তাহা গ্রাহ্য হইবে না।

To,

His Excellency the Right Honorable
the Governor-General in Council,
Calcutta.

The humble petition of K. Varada
- Raja Madali, Pensioned Note Examiner
Paper Currency Department,
Madras.

Most humbly sheweth,

That your Excellency's humble petitioner was a Note Examiner, Paper Currency Department, Madras, having entered the Deptt on the 15th January 1877.

2. That your Excellency's humble petitioner on being Certified by the Medical Board to be unfit for further service owing to Short Sight and deafness, the result of his peculiar departmental work of a Note Examiner was obliged to retire on a small pension of Rs 11.5.4 being $\frac{1}{2}$ of his average emoluments with effect from 14th February 94 (Vide G.O. No 423 dated 11th April 1894)

3. That your Excellency's humble petitioner having entered Government Service in 1877 long before the new rules came in force applied on the 25th June 94 and 8th March 97 and prayed upon the Madras Government, the concession of an increased pension of $\frac{1}{3}$ of his average emoluments i.e. Rs 13.5.4 may under Note 2. article 7(a) of the Civil Service Regulations be granted to him with effect from 14th Feb 94. The Local Government has summarily rejected to grant your Excellency's humble petitioner an increased rate of pension vide Order No. 1135 dated 14th Sep: 94 and Indr 224 D/17. March 1897.

4. That your Excellency's humble
petitioner begs most respectfully to submit
that the duty he has performed is a responsible
one in comparison to the other appointments. As
a Note Examiner your Excellency's petitioner has
during his service worked without a blot and
detected a Ten Rupees and 100 Rs Note
(Forged) presented to him for encashment
in the office.

5. That your Excellency's humble
petitioner got the Short-Sight as the duty he
was discharging required Close and Steady
use of his Sight. He, during his service
had on most of the days in a month, to forfeit
his tiffin as his business generally continued
till late in the evenings. Hence deafness.

6. Your Excellency's humble petitioner
begs to submit that he had to deposit
Cash Security, the appointment being a monetary
one and that he faithfully continued to
discharge the duty for a period of 17 years.

7. Under the above circumstances,
your Excellency's humble petitioner being hardly
able to support a large family on a small
pension in these hard days of scarcity and
distress, humbly craves that his case may
be considered under the old rules rule 2, art. 7,
of the Civil Service Regulations and an
increased rate of pension of $\frac{1}{3}$ of his average
emoluments i.e. Rs 13.5.4 with effect from 14th
Feby. 94 may be given him as is done and
granted in many cases.

For which act of kindness
your Excellency's humble petitioner shall
ever be

L. Varadarajulu Mudali
Paripurana Vinayagar Coil
Sriat, Mylapore, Madras.

12th May 1897.

Proceedings of the Madras Government.
Read again f.o. 7 11. April 1894 No 423. Pursim
Read the following petition

From K. Vaidarajulu Mudali. } dated 25th June 94.
Late a Note Examiner, Paper
Currency Office, Madras. }

Read also letter from the Accountant General
Madras, 7 4. August 1894 No ³⁴² 195.

Order thereon 14 September 1894. No 1135.

(Vnp A) The Government of India has
recently ruled in the case of one Muresasa Mudali
that sufficient grounds did not exist for sanctioning
a special rate of pursim. The present case is of exactly
similar character to that of Muresasa Mudali, and
the Govt is not prepared to recommend any increase
of petitioner's pursim.

2. The petitioner will be informed accordingly.
True & Faith.

Dr. R.L.C. Carr.
Under Secretary to Government.

Government of Madras.
Revenue Deptd.

Indorsement No 224.

The petition is rejected under rule 5. (3) of
the petition rules below

(5) Petitioner addressed to Govt. will be liable to summary
rejection in the following case:-

(3) When a previous petition has been disposed of
by the Madras Government, the Governor-General, in
Council or the Secretary of State and the petitioner
discloses no new facts or circumstances which
afford grounds for a re-consideration of the case.

(By order)
(Signed) Lionel Daineson
Under Secy to Government

For-Stamp
17 March 1897 }

By K. Vaidarajulu Mudali

No 125