

Pension 1898 department
Government {1898} of Madras.
FINANCIAL.

Current no 657



Recd.

Enclosures

1898.

Regd.

Spare copies

1st
9.5.98

G.O., No. 626, 18th July 1898.

JULY.

Casual Leave.

Stating that the period of absence of a subordinate directed by the head of his office to absent himself from his duties in consequence of the prevalence of infectious disease in his house shall be reckoned as —, but shall not be counted against — that may be due.

List

Order, 15th Aug. 1898 No 608.

1st
9.5.98

Recorded
11.8.98

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS.

FINANCIAL DEPARTMENT.

Read—the following paper :—

From E. A. DENNYS, Esq., Examiner of Public Works Accounts, to the Secretary to Government, Public Works Department, dated Madras, 27th May 1898, No. 649-A-2.

Please see the accompanying correspondence, copy of which is enclosed.

2. Mr. DeMonte — a clerk in my office whose case gave rise to that correspondence—was absent from duty from 25th April to 5th May, both days inclusive. He is not entitled to privilege leave under the rules, and under G.O., No. 853, Financial, dated 17th October 1894, casual leave cannot be granted for a longer period than five days at a time.

3. As, however, the present case is a very special one, I would recommend that Government be moved to grant Mr. DeMonte casual leave for the period of his absence, viz., eleven days.

4. I take this opportunity to suggest that, if Government think it necessary, the general question of how enforced absences of this nature from duty should be dealt with may also be considered, and orders passed thereon for the future guidance of heads of offices.

ENCLOSURES.

COPY of letter from E. A. DENNYS, Esq., Examiner of Public Works Accounts, Madras, to the Accountant-General, Public Works Department, dated 6th May 1898, No. 573-A.E.

I have the honour to request that you will favour me with your opinion as to how the absence of a clerk from duty, owing to the prevalence of infectious disease in his house, is to be treated, i.e., whether he should be considered on duty or on casual leave (under the special orders of the Local Government) or be granted such other leave as may be admissible to him under the Civil Service Regulations.

2. The case that has given rise to this reference is that of Mr. DeMonte, a clerk of my office, who, having reported on the 25th of April 1898 that his son was attacked with small-pox, was directed not to attend office until he could produce a medical certificate to the effect that there was no further fear of his bringing infection to office.

3. Mr. DeMonte having returned to duty on the 4th April 1898 from three months' privilege leave, is not now entitled to privilege leave, nor can he, under the existing orders of this Government, be granted casual leave for a longer period than five days at a time.

4. If, therefore, the clerk is not treated as on duty, there will be no option but to grant him such "long leave" as is admissible under chapter XIV, Civil Service Regulations, and to regulate his allowances, while absent, accordingly.

COPY of letter from A. R. BECHER, Esq., Accountant-General, Public Works Department, to the Examiner of Public Works Accounts, Madras, dated 14th May 1898, No. 611-E.

In reply to your letter, No. 573-A.E., dated 6th May 1898, I have the honour to state that the Government of India have ruled that a clerk who is forced to be absent from office, under the Examiner's orders, owing to small-pox in his family should be granted any casual leave which his official superior may consider admissible, and if no such leave is thought admissible, he should be granted such leave as may be admissible under the rules, for the period of absence from duty, together with the allowances, if any, also admissible. The period of absence may however, reckon, if necessary as a *dies non*, that is, it will not count for or against any other leave that may have been earned or may be earned in future.

Endt. No. 417-D.

Transferred to the Financial Department for consideration.

(Signed) W. B. DEWINTON,
Secretary to Government, P.W.D.

6th June 1898.

ORDER—No. 626, Financial, dated 18th July 1898.

The period of absence of a subordinate directed by the head of his office to absent himself from his duties in consequence of the prevalence of infectious disease in his house shall be reckoned as casual leave, but shall not be counted against casual leave that may be due.

(True Extract.)

[Signature]
for Chief Secretary.

To the Public Works Department.
„ all other Departments of the Secretariat. (Pension)
„ Heads of Departments under the Chief Secretary.