[R. F. / 45.]
1,000 -10-8-96.

Pension (1898) Department.

CURRENT No. 188

From D. Narasimhulu.
Late Te Sheristadar of Rep
Nellore Dt.

Order, 22d March 1898 No. 231

20/3/98

The Govt sees no reason to reconsider the orders already passed.

16-3-98

16/3/98

No. nil

Dated 7/3.

Received 11/3

Registered do

Enclosures 14

Spare copies. nil

To
The Petr
with 14 enclos. rtd.

Note

Please see note under G.O. $\overset{C}{\frac{137}{21-2-98}}$ which explains why the pension was reduced

16-3-98

SUBJECT

Praying that he may be granted the full amount admissible to him under the rules in lieu of the reduced pension sanctioned in G.O. $\frac{137}{21-2-98}$ Revenue

BACK PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.
"	137	Rev.	21-2-98

FURTHER PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

To

His Excellency the Governor in Council
Fort St George

The humble memorial of Dharyat
Narasimhalu, retired Taluq
Serishtadar of Rapur, Nellore District

Most Respectfully Sheweth

1. That your Excellency's memorialist was the permanent Taluq Serishtadar of Rapur till the latter end of the year 1897, and that, all on a sudden, he received an order from the Collector of the District (Ref. No 1734) No $\frac{645}{Sup}$ dated 6th November 1897 (submitted herewith – Enclosure 1), directing him to appear at once before the District Surgeon as it was doubtful in the Collector's opinion if he was fit for further service.

2. That your memorialist accordingly appeared before the District Surgeon Nellore and that he was granted a certificate dated 16th November 1897, which in general terms stated that he was suffering for a long time from chronic asthma during the rainy season, that the native and European medicines had been tried without a permanent effect, and that from general debility and [illegible] unfit for further service.

thereupon recommended for pension by the Collector, which was subsequently sanctioned in G.O. No $\frac{137 \text{ Invalid}}{21-2-98}$, with a reduction of Rs 5 from the Rs 30 recommended by the Collector, viz Rs 25, apparently for the fact that the Collector did not pronounce your memorialist as having borne good conduct in his official service.

4. That your Excellency's memorialist humbly attributes the sudden issue of the Collector's order to the personal representation by the Tahsildar of the Taluq (one Mr K. Lakshminarasu Nayudu) before the Collector, when he went to Nellore for the purpose of attending as a witness in the Subordinate Judge's Court during the latter part of October 1897, to the effect that your memorialist had been suffering from asthma, that he was unable to transact the duties connected with his office, and that he was negligent in such duties.

5 That your memorialist begs to state that of a time he has been subject to asthma for 3 or 4 months in the rainy season; that, as it happens in 2 or 3 fits every year, there has not been much real disturbance from it in the ~~ordinary~~ transaction of ordinary official business, [illegible] the time of the fits he used to attend [illegible]

for full days; and that he further had no occasion to obtain sick leave throughout the period of his whole service extending over 31 years.

6. That your memorialist had been holding the office of Taluq Serishtadar in the same district since August 1873, that he also served in various taluqs under several Tahsildars, and that no complaint arose of his inability to do work from asthmatic affection.

7 That your memorialist ascribes the present complaint by the Tahsildar of Rapur to the ill-will which arose between them some time before under the following circumstances —

In the latter part of June or July 1897 an old pauper as well as invalid woman was brought to the Taluq Cutchery by the Police of the Dachur station in a [illegible] Your memorialist saw her being carried in front of the Cutchery inside the compound, when he went out of his seat to examine [illegible] the Cutchery [illegible] in the evening. She was taken back to the Dachur Police Station where she expired 2 or 3 days afterwards. [illegible] Police then reported the matter to higher authorities.

8 That your memorialist here [illegible] relate the

About a month afterwards the Tahsildar wrote a chit to the memorialist to ask if any pauper old woman was ever brought there in a doly and the memorialist replied on the very back of the chit in the affirmative, saying that he only did not remember the date exactly. The Tahsildar, however, reported to the District Magistrate to the effect that the woman was never brought, but only a mere report from the Police was received by him on the day in question. Then Mr Campbell the Assistant Collector came for enquiry as to the truth of the case in September 1887, under orders of the Collector, and the memorialist upon being called as a witness deposed what had really transpired. The Tahsildar, on learning this and since then was not in good terms with your memorialist.

8. That your Excellency's memorialist now begs to draw the attention of Your Lordship to the question of his conduct, on which the reduction of his pension allowance is said to have taken place, by giving a short sketch of his official service —

From the beginning of his service up to 18th June [illegible] explanation [illegible]

appointments held by the memorialist during the time involve of promotions and reversions to permanent posts on the termination of the acting vacancies. In June 1883 the memorialist was transferred from the Sheristadarship of Nellore Taluq which he held for about 10 years to that of

(enclosure 2). Kanigiri in the interests of public service. In ~~June 1885~~ November he was again transferred from Kanigiri to the Sub-Divisional Headquarter station of Ongole on the recommendation of Mr [illegible] the then Acting Sub-Collector (vide enclosure 3). He held the appointment at Ongole from 1st November 1885 to 18th June 1886 and he was then promoted to act as Deputy Tahsildar of [illegible] which he held up to 12th June 1887. Since the latter date up to [illegible] September 1887 he remained under suspension. Whilst he was under suspension the memorialist was transferred as Sheristadar of Addanki (enclosure 4) and he [illegible] charge there on the 1st October 1887 where he remained till January 1892 until his transfer to Rapur.

9. That your memorialist here begs to relate the

circumstances connected with his suspension, so as to clear all doubts regarding his official integrity —

The suspension was sanctioned by the Collector, pending enquiry as proposed by the Acting Sub Collector Mr Moberly. On the reports of that gentleman the Collector finally transferred your memorialist from the permanent Taluq Sheristadarship of Ongole to that of Udayagiri, with orders to join the new appointment at once. Subsequently the Collector communicated an order to the memorialist dated 19th October 1887 No 446/Camp Magl Enclosure No 5 together with translation thereof in English) in which it was decided that the suspension referred to was to be cancelled and the memorialist was to draw pay for the period of suspension. Thereupon full pay of the Deputy Tahsildar's post was allowed to your memorialist by the Treasury Dy Collector in November 1887 for the period referred to. But in auditing the memorialist's salary for the period of suspension the Accountant-General had doubts as to the propriety of his being granted full pay for the period of suspension as he did not seem to have been honorably acquitted.

Consequently, he asked the Collector to report on the matter, to which a reply seems to have been sent from the Collector's Off[illegible] to the effect that the memorialist was not honorably acquitted. Thereupon full pay previously allowed to the memorialist was retrenched as per Dy Accountant General's Audit Slip to the Treasury Officer Nellore No A.B.N./40 N dated 10th May 1888, granting only the subsistence allowance to which he was entitled under the rules. The amount thus retrenched was recovered from the memorialist's subsequent salary. Your memorialist then submitted to the Collector an appeal petition addressed to the Board of Revenue dated 19th October 1888, in view to its transmission in the usual course. The petition was however returned to the memorialist with the Collector's order No [illegible] dated 30th November 1888 (Enclosure 6) to be resubmitted along with a duplicate copy. The memorialist resubmitted the appeal petition on 6th December 1888 as directed. Subsequently the Collector was pleased to communicate the true state of [illegible] per Accountant General Circle letter No 77 dated 10th January 1889) requesting him to withdraw the retrenchment, and he also forwarded a copy of the order No 446 (enclosure 5) with letter dated 6th February 1889 ~~July 1889~~ No 465/acc.

But the Accountant General replied in his letter No 9 A/7 N dated 14th February 1889 that, as the wording of the order issued by the Collector showed a negation of an honorable acquittal, he was unable to pass the full salary as desired, under the rules in force. Copy of the Accountant-General's letter was communicated to the memorialist with the Collector's order No 920/acc of 1889, (Enclosure No 7 with English translation) which state that endeavours were made in regetting the salary due to the memorialist without any effect though; and that, [illegible] still desires to have the Board appeal petition submitted, it should be revised and resubmitted to the Collector. The memorialist accordingly submitted a fresh appeal petition with the necessary revisions, to be submitted to the Board of Revenue on 22nd April 1889. This appeal petition was also [illegible] with the Collector's order No 167/[illegible] of 25th May

to the address of the Udayagiri Tahsildar (Enclosure 8 with English Translation). The order of the Collector was to the effect that the memorialist was to be allowed half pay for the period of suspension under the Pay and Acting Allowance Code Section 58 III (I) (2); and that he was not willing to consider otherwise than that decided by the Accountant General. The Collector further decided in order No 1480/Rev dated 2nd July 1889 (enclosure 9 with English Translation) that the period of suspension shall be counted for pensionable service. Your memorialist did not then insist on the submission of the appeal petition to the Board, as he thought it would cause the displeasure of the District Officer.

10 That your Excellency's memorialist begs to state that from a perusal of the records in the Collector's Office connected with his suspension as the acting Dy Tahsildar of Addanki and subsequent transfer to the Sarishtadarship of Udayagiri Tahq, it would be apparent he was fully acquitted of the cha