

Pension (1899) Department.

ORDINARY MS.

G.O., No. 426

DATED 3-7-99

[Despatch Abstract.]

Stating that Govt agrees with the Accountant General in considering that in the 2 cases of Simmlal & Simmlal Rao & Hallimull & Khan the pension should be borne according to the rate of proportions by the Mysore & British Govt Revenue.

BACK PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.	G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.
	190	Gen	8-3-97				
	150	do	10-1-97				
	916	do	12-12-97				
	1455	do	17-12-97				
	1200	do	3-11-97				
			20				

FURTHER PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

BACK PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.
"	190	Gen.	2-97
"	53	do	20-1-99

FURTHER PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

Letter No. 2670 dated 11th November 1889 from the Comptroller Mysore to Accountant General, Madras.
 Reply of Accountant General No. 1AE 294 dated 22nd December 1889.
 Letter No. 3178 dated 11th December 1889 from Comptroller Mysore to Accountant General — the latter's reply No. 1AE 368 dated 21st December 1889 and
 Accountant General's Memo to Resident Mysore No. 1AE 344 dated 13th January 1890.
 Resident's reply No. 5719 dated 13th January 1890.



No. 649. Eue

FROM

THE FIRST ASSISTANT TO THE RESIDENT IN MYSORE.

TO

The Accountant General, Madras.

Dated Bangalore, 15th February 1899.

SIR,

I am directed to invite a reference to the Correspondence noted on the margin — regarding pension to one Kalimulla Khan. It will be remembered that this individual served 9 years 7 months and 14 days in the Amrit Mahal Department under the British Government, that his services were then transferred to Mysore (which was at the time under British Administration) with the sanction of the head of his Department, the Commissary General, and that he served in Mysore for 6 years 6 months and 29 days. The Mysore Comptroller wrote to your office enquiring whether the British Government would agree to

be...

bear a share of Kalimulla's pension proportionate to the period he had served under that Government, and he referred to the case of one Ghulam Mahomed whose pension the G. of India had decided to grant according to the rule of proportions. The Accountant General replied that under the rules Kalimulla was entitled to no pension from the British Government for service rendered to it prior to his transfer to Mysore, and that the orders of the Government of India in Ghulam Mahomed's case could not be considered as a general ruling. The Mysore Comptroller asked for a reconsideration, and in support of his argument quoted the case of one Mr Marchant, drawing attention to the remarks of the G. of I in their letter No 762 G dated the 9th April 1886 to the Resident in Mysore, but the Accountant General was unable to alter his opinion, and drew attention to the case of one Tirumal Rao which he stated was similar to that under reference, and which had been settled in this office letter No $\frac{3873}{4629}$ dated the 13th Nov: 1897 (1899)

to the Dewan. The Durbar next addressed this office in their letter No $\frac{9703}{464}$ dated the 24th November 1890, a copy of which (together with a copy of the first enclosure thereto) is attached. No reply was apparently sent to this letter, and it has been ascertained that the Durbar are anxious for a ruling as to how Kalimulla's case and others similar to it are to be treated.

2. I am next to invite attention to my letter No 752 dated the 3rd March 1896, on the subject of pension to a Mr Mascarenhas. With that letter was forwarded a copy of a communication No $\frac{9402}{P. 246}$ of the 13th February 1896, from the Durbar, in which they explained the difficulty they experienced by reason of contrary rulings in dealing with these cases, and in paragraph 2 of which they referred to their letter No $\frac{9703}{464}$ of the 24th November 1890, of which, as already stated, a copy is attached. What the Durbar desired was a general ruling which would enable cases like those of Mr Mascarenhas, Kalimulla Khan and others to be decided on a uniform principle. Mr (now Sir) Macworth Young in forwarding to you this representation from the

Durbar

Durbar remarked that Mr Mascarenhas' case seemed to him to fall under articles 427 (a) and 462 of the C.S. Regulations, and the Government of India ruling in the case of Mr Marchant which was in his opinion of general application. He therefore enquired if he might inform the Durbar accordingly. In reply Mr Harrison in his letter No. $\frac{1AE}{544}$ of the 24th March 1896 — stated that he thought his predecessor had been wrong in holding that the views expressed by the G. of I in the case of Mr Marchant could not be applied to similar cases, and he therefore enquired whether the Durbar would bear a share of Mr Mascarenhas' pension proportionate to his service in Mysore. The purport of the Durbar's reply was communicated to your office in my letter No. 1469 of the 21st April 1896.

Mr Harrison held the same view exactly as his predecessor!

3. It would thus seem, unless indeed you should hold views different to those of Mr Harrison expressed in his letter above quoted, that the case of Kalimulla Khan and others similar to it are cases of settlement on the lines of ^{the} ruling of the G. of India in Mr Marchant's

case, and I am ~~desirous~~ to enquire whether you are prepared to accept on behalf of the G. of India a share of pension in such cases. Their number is not known and it would perhaps be desirable to ask the Durbar to furnish as accurate a list as possible. It would seem that there are at any rate two, viz the cases of Kalimulla Khan and Tirumal Rao.

I have the honor to be,

Sir,

Your most obedient servant,

K. S. Eusene

First Assistant Resident

Hf.



No. 689 *I.a-ε* Fort Saint George.
 Accountt. Genl's Office
 17th March 1899.
 Exp 18. 3. 99

Submitted to Government for
 orders agreeably to the Govt of India
 ruling No 119 P. dated 9. January/97,
 a true copy of which was furnished
 to Govt with this office ^{letter} No *I.a-ε*
 500 dated 2. February/97. I am of
 opinion that in the case referred
 to in the letter under reference,
 pensions should be borne
 according to the rule of proportions
 by the Mysore and the British
 Govt. Revenues as was ordered
 in the case of M. R. Ry D. Namasal
 Row disposed of in G. O. No 53 dated
 30. January/99.

W. K. B. P.
 Accountt General.

To The Secretary of Govt.
 Pension Deptt.

No. *Pea 47*
 820

True copy forwarded to the Under Secretary
 to Government, Pension Department, with
 reference to his memo No. 246 dated 20. April 99.

Fort St George
 Accountant General's Office
 25th April 99.

M. L. L.
 Assistant Accountant General



To

The Secretary to Government
 Pension Department.

W. K. B. P.

A.

No 2670.

Office of the Comptroller of Mysore

Bangalore. 8 November 1889
11-11-89.

From

A. Rangaswami Iyengar Esquire

Comptroller of Mysore

To

The Accountant General

Madras.

Sir

With reference to the correspondence ending with your No. $\frac{I.A.E.}{66}$ dated 18th June 1888, regarding the pension case of Mahamed Kallimulla-Khan, I have the honor to forward herewith a copy of the Proceedings No. $\frac{4825-7}{518}$ dated 14th September 1889 since passed by the Mysore Government and his pension application, from which it will be observed that the applicant had served for ^{years into days} 9-7-14 in the Amrut Mahal Department under the British Government and for ^{years into days} 6-6-29 under the Mysore Government, and that he had been transferred from the former service to that of Mysore with the sanction of the Commissary General. This service in the British Government has been verified by the Comptroller of Military Accounts Madras and admitted by him to count towards pension.

(vide copy of his letter No. 2839 dated 1st September 89 enclosed). But he has not paid contribution subsequent to the Rendition. I request to be informed whether you will agree to bear a proportionate share of his pension for the period he served in the British Government.

I may add that the case in question is analogous to that of Gulam Mahomed, late head clerk in the Plantation office at Bangalore whose pension the Government of India has decided to grant according to the rule of proportions - Vide Extract of para. 1 of letter No. $\frac{3326}{4539}$ dated 27th September 1889 from the Assistant Resident in Mysore to the Dewar of Mysore herewith enclosed.

I have, etc.

(Sd) A. Rungaswami

Comptroller

Proceedings of the Government of Mysore.

Read

Letter No. $\frac{1503}{324}$ dated 18th September 1888 from the Inspector General of Police in Mysore.

Order thereon:

No. $\frac{4825-7}{518}$

Dated Bangalore 14th September 1889

The Inspector General of Police submits for orders on certain point the Pension papers of Kallimullu Khan late Police Inspector of the Channarayana Taluk, who was removed from service on such pension as he might be entitled to under the rules in Proceedings No. $\frac{8334-367}{367}$ dated 17th March 1887.

2.

The history of his service shows that he has put in services both under the British and Mysore Governments. Excluding the period Sick leave 1-5-23 Break (case not explained) $\frac{4-11}{1-10-4}$ of sick leave and break entered under column "Period not reckoned as service," the total service rendered by him amounts to 16-2-13 of which $\frac{9-7-14}{25 \text{ 9th 80}}$ were in the Amrit Mahal Department under the British Government and 6-6-29 under the Mysore Government. The reason for the termination of his service under the British Government assigned in his service Register and attested by Major B. Elbe. Inroy who was then in charge of the Amrit Mahal Department

Department is that he was transferred to Mysore Forest Department with the sanction of the Commissary General conveyed in Memo No: 3805 dated 31st July 1878.

3. The only point submitted for decision is whether the service of Darogah in the Amrit Mahal Department is to be treated as superior or inferior, the same not having been either defined in the Civil Pension Code or decided when the Department was transferred from the British to the Mysore Government.

4. From the papers noted in the margin 1. Letter No. 11 dated 22nd March 1851 (para 8) from Amrit Mahal Darogah was regarded the Assistant Commissary General as superior and pensions were granted in charge of Public Works for such services in the British Department to the Commissary Government. The Government of General Hume, being desirous of his highness the Akha Raja direct to letter No. 1350 dated 14-6-5 therefore that the case of Kallimalla Khaw be disposed of accordingly. From the Secretary to the Government of Mysore.

5. It is noted that Kallimalla Khaw's service in the British Government involves the question of his pension being debited to the British and Mysore Governments according to the rule of proportion, which the Comptroller will arrange and report to this office. 2. Extract from the Minutes of Consultation Fort St George No. 193 dated 14th July 1852 to the Commissaries of Mysore. 3. Proceedings of the Madras Government Military Department No. 1866 dated 16th March 1849.

(50) C. Madiah
to Chief Secretary.

No: 2839.

Fort St George, 1st September 1888.

From

The Comptroller of Military Accounts
Madras.

To

The Comptroller
Mysore Government
Mysore.

Sir,

As requested in your letter No. 1053 dated 29th June 1888, I have the honor to inform you that the services of Abahomed Kallionella Khaw have been verified from the records of this office as marginally indicated. As Darogah from 22nd October 1868 to 30th November 1872 at Rupees 21 per mensem. do do from 1st December 1872 to 27th August 1878 at Rupees 24-8-0 per mensem.

2. The enclosures received with the above letter are herewith returned.

3. The above service counts for pension under the Civil Pension Rules.

I have etc.,

(20) C. F. Thomas.

Lt Colonel

offg Comptroller of Military Accounts

No 3326

4538.

From

The Assistant to the Resident in Mysore.

To

The Dewan of Mysore

Dated Bangalore 27th September 1889.

Sir

In continuation of my letter No. 1670
4538
dated the 18th May 1889, I am directed to state
that the Government of India has no objection
to the grant of a pension according to the rule
of proportions to Ghulam Abahomed, late Head
clerk in the Plantation office at Bangalore.

I remain etc.

(20) J. a. Crawford.

Assistant to the Resident.

Copy

(20) H. Y. Eagles
Chief Assistant

No. J. A. E.

297

Pension Department.

Fort St. George

Accountant General's Office

2nd December 1889.

From the Accountant-General, Madras
To the Comptroller of Mysore.

Sir,

With reference to your letter No. 2670 dated
8th November 1889 enquiring whether I am ready
to admit a proportionate share of the pension
of M^r Khomed Kallimulla Khan, as a charge
against the British Government, I have the
honour to state that under the rules as
they stand, Kallimulla, is not entitled to
claim any portion of his pension from the
British Government for the service rendered
to it prior to his transfer to Mysore.
A share of his pension cannot therefore
be borne by the British Government.

With reference to the observation
contained in para 2 of your letter,
I beg to say that the sanction accorded
in the letter from the Govt. of India
quoted therein applied to the individual

case

Case of Gulam Mahomed; If the Mysore Government desire a general ruling it will be necessary for the Resident to move the Government of India in the matter.

The Register of application received with your letter under reply is herewith returned.

~~(True Copy)~~

No. 3172.

Office of the Comptroller of Mysore.

Bangalore 12th December 89

From

A. Rangaswami Iyengar Esquire.

Comptroller of Mysore.

To

The Accountant General

Madras.

Sir

With reference to your letter No. I. A. E. of the 2nd Instant 297 stating that you are precluded under the rules, as they stand from admitting a proportionate share of the pension of Kalla Mulla Khaw, as a charge against the British Government. I have the honor to enclose for your information copy of letter No. 1324 of the 12th May 1886 from the Assistant to the 5155 Resident in Mysore to the Dewan of Mysore, and to invite your attention to para 4 thereof. The Government of India wish that officers resigning their appointments in the British Service for entering that of Mysore prior to the rendition should be treated in the same way as one who resigned the Mysore service for entering the British service would be and in para 3 they quote the case of Rengachariar as one in point; and I would on the strength of this opinion of the Government of India request you if

if possible to reconsider your decision

No. I.A.E. dated 24-1-90.
368

I have, etc.
A. Rangaswami
Comptroller.
Mysore Government

Office of the Accountant General
Fort St. George.
14th Decr '89.

Forwarded in original (to be returned) to the
Assistant to the Resident in Mysore, for favor of remarks.

The case is precisely similar to that of Yarnal Rao.
referred to in this Office letter No: I.A.E. dated 1st November '89.
275

I.A.E.
344 dated 21st Decr '89

(Sd) F.C. Harrison

Assistant to Accountant General.

Vide letter from the Assistant to The Resident in Mysore
No: 82 dated 13th January 1890. and reply to this
letter (i.e) letter No: 3178 dated 12-12-89. from the
Comptroller of Mysore.

No. 1324
5155

From

Major E.A. Fraser

Assistant to The Resident

The Dewar of Mysore.

Dated Bangalore 12th May '86

Sir,

In letter No: 3752-206 dated 28th September 1885
from your office the question was raised as to whether
the Mysore Government should bear a portion of the
pension granted to Mr. S. Marchant of the Hyderabad
Service on account of his service in the Mysore Commissioner's
office from 6th December 1853 to 31st October 1858 and in
the letter No: 1952 dated 13th October 1885 from this office
you were informed of the Officiating Resident's views
in this matter - views which I may explain have
necessarily been modified by the altered aspect and
conditions of the case as it is now presented.

The Mysore Darbar, it will be remembered, objected
to bear any share of Mr. Marchant's pension according
to the ruling of the Government of India in the case of
Mr. Rangachariar and others who similarly resigned
British Service for employment in Mysore. But since
then the Resident at Hyderabad has submitted the case to
The

the Government of India for orders and it has been referred to this Residency for the reconsideration of the Mysore Durbar under the following explanations

3. The Government of India observe that the principle which it is proposed to follow in the case of Mr Marchant is exactly the same as that which has been followed in the case of Mr Rangachariar and the other officers to whom reference is made. Mr Rangachariar resigned the service of the Government of Madras to join the service of the Mysore Government, and it has been decided that his pension should be calculated on the combined services, the British and the Mysore Government bearing their proper share of the pension. In this case the Government of India point out, the British Government did not accept liability on account of Mr Rangachariar's Mysore service, but the British Government did not object to pay a share of Mr Rangachariar's pension proportionate to his service under the British Government.

4. The Government of India states that the decision was passed in view of the consideration that when Mysore was under British Administration it was natural that Officers in Government service proper should have felt no hesitation in resigning their appointments to join Mysore service and vice versa under circumstances in which similar resignation of one Government appointment to join another would not have affected their pensionary claims. If under such circumstances the previous service, whether in Mysore or under the

the British Government should be rejected, the result would, the Government of India considers, be unequal hardship to the Officer concerned.

5. Under these circumstances the Government of India request that the Mysore Durbar may be moved to reconsider the question of its liability to pay a share of the pension of Rupees 100, granted to Mr Marchant amounting to Rupees 5-1-5 as specified on the Margin, and I am therefore to request the favour of an early reply to this reference.

Government of India - 16-11-11

distributed Assigned
to the General
revenues - 59-2-2

included Local
Funds - 19-11-6

Mysore State - 5-1-5
100-0-0

I have, etc.,

(80) H. Clarke.

for Assistant to the Resident

Copy.

Hy Eagle

Chief Assistant.

No. J. A. E.
368

Pension Department.

Fort St. George,
Accountant General's Office
24th January 1890.

From the Accountant-General Madras,
To the Comptroller of Mysore.

Sir,

With reference to your letter No. 3178 dated 12th December 1889, I have the honour to state that in the absence of any general ruling by the Government of India admitting the claim of Officers who resigned the British Service in order to take up appointments in Mysore to payment of a pension from British revenues proportionate to their previous service. I am unable to take a different view from that already expressed in my previous letter on the case of Kollimulla Khan.

I would ^{ad} that Kollimulla Khan's case is similar to that of Tirumal Row, the decision on whose case was communicated to the Dewan of Mysore by the Asst^t to the Resident in

Mysore in his letter No. 3873 dated
4629

13th November 1889, a copy of which
I presume has been communicated
to you by the Dewan.

(Signed) J. W. Rawlinson.

Accountant General

(True Copy)

No. 82
5719

From

The Assistant to the Resident in Mysore.

To

The Accountant General, Madras.

Dated Madras: 13th January '90.

Sir

I am directed to acknowledge the receipt of your
(presently returned) memorandum No. J. A. E. 344 dated the 21st December '89
forwarding for remarks a letter from the Comptroller
of Mysore relative to the claim of Kallimullakhan for
a proportionate share of his pension from the British
Government, and remarking that the case is precisely
similar to that of Terumal Rao, late Amildar of
the Hoskote Taluq.

2. In reply, I am to forward a copy of a
communication noted on the margin containing
the opinion of the Resident on the case of Terumal
Rao.

No. J. A. E. 368
Dated 24-1-90.

I have etc.
J. L. S. New March

Assistant to the Resident

No. 3873

4629

From

The Assistant to the Resident in Mysore

To

The Durbar of Mysore

Dated Bangalore, 13th Nov^r 89.

Sir

In reply to your letter No. 4781-338 dated the 11th September 1889, I am directed to forward a copy of the correspondence cited on the margin, and to state that for the reasons therein given the Resident is of opinion that Jemmal Rao, late Amildar of the Hoskote Taluq is not entitled to claim any portion of his pension from the British Government for service rendered under it prior to his transfer to Mysore.

2. The Durbar will observe from the case of V. S. Rangachari referred to in the correspondence ending with your letter No. 280 dated the 15th June 1886 and from the

Marginally noted letter, that the principle of

No 2390 dated the 10th August 1885 from the Government of India in the Financial Department to the Assistant General's Madras communicated to the Durbar under cover letter No 4084-1996 dated the 4th December 1888.

of the rule of proportion is only applicable to the pensions of those British officers serving in all

who have paid pensionary contribution to the British
Government since 1st October '82

3. The original enclosures of your letter are herewith
returned.

I have etc

(sd) L. S. Newmarch

Assistant to the Resident

Copy

(Signed)

Registrar

no. Pen 1402.

2744

Forwarded to the Under-Secretary
to Government, Pension Department
with reference to his memo no 246 dated
31st May 1899 with the exception of letter
no $\frac{2703}{464}$ dated 27th November 1890 which
is not forthcoming.

Fort St. George.

Accountant-General's office

15th June 1899

H. Dawson
offg. Accountant General

So.

The Under Secretary to Government
Pension Depto.

Letter no 752, dated Bangalore 3rd
March 1896 from the First Assistant
to the Resident in Mysore, to the Ac-
countant General at Madras.

In reply to your letters noted on
the margin, regarding the pensionary
claim of Mr J. R. Mascarenhas, late
Superintendent of Sea-Customs at
Mangeshwar, I am directed to forward
for information a copy of a letter
no 9402. P 246 of the 13th ultimo from
the Mysore Durbar on the subject.
For some of the references quoted in
para 2 of the Durbar's letter, a refer-
ence is invited to the correspondence
quoted below:-

no. I.A.E-275 dated the 1st November
1889 from your office.

no. 82/5719 dated the 13th January 1890
to your office.

2 Mr. Mascarenhas's case seems to the Resident to fall under Articles 1,27(a) and 462 of the Civil Service Regulations and the ruling in Mr. Marchant's case contained in the Foreign Department's letter No 7624 dated the 9th April 1886 (a copy of which is enclosed for ready reference) Mr. Mackworth Young considers that this ruling was of general application and would be glad to inform the Mysore Durbar accordingly if you agree, otherwise it will be necessary to refer the matter to the Government of India as suggested by the Durbar. It has been in consequence of the doubt raised on this point that the Durbar have hesitated, not unnaturally the Resident thinks, to accept responsibility in the case under reference.

(True copy)

Chief of the Department

13
Letter No 9602/1246 dated the 13th February 1896 from the General Secretary to the Government of Mysore, to the 1st Assistant Resident in Mysore.

I am directed to acknowledge the receipt of your letter Camp No 27 dated 4th February 1896, in regard to the pension case of Mr J. X. Mascarenhas, late Superintendent of Manjeshwar in the South Canara District, and to state in reply that the case of Mr. Mascarenhas is analogous to that of Mr Marchant of the Hyderabad service towards whose pension the Mysore Government contributed under the orders of the Government of India communicated in your office letter No 1324/5155 dated the 12th May 1886.

2. Para 4 of the ^{above} letter lays down the principle by which such cases should be governed, and is as follows.

"The Government of India states" "that that decision (Rungachariar's)" "was passed in view of the consider-" "ation that when Mysore was under" "British administration it was" "natural that officers in Government" "service proper should have felt no" "hesitation in resigning their appoint-" "ments to join Mysore Service and" "vice versa under circumstances" "in which similar resignation of one" "Government appointment to join" "another would not have affected" "their pensionary claims. If under" "such circumstances, the previous" "service whether in Mysore or under" "the British Government should be" "rejected, the result would, the Govern-" "ment of India considers ^{be} unmerited" "hardship to the officers concerned."

This ruling of the Government of India is prima facie of general applicability and was accepted as such by the Durbar and carried ^{out} in the case of Mr. Marchant. The Government of India also quoted in this connection and as illustrative of the ^{above} principle, the case of Rungachariar who had resigned the British Service and joined the Mysore Service under the Commission and in whose favour the British Government sanctioned proportionate pension for the period of his service under that Government. The Accountant General of Madras, however, declined to accept the above ruling of the Government of India as having any validity except in regard to the particular case of Mr. Marchant and declined to accept liability for proportionate

share of pension in the marginally noted and other cases on the ground that the officials did not pay pensionary contribution under the code to entitle them to the concession. Adopting the argument of the Accountant General, the Durbar is not liable to contribute towards the pension of Mr Mascarenhas, while adopting the ruling of the Government of India, the Durbar is liable in respect of the services of Mr Mascarenhas rendered to the Mysore Government. I am directed to request therefore that the early orders of the Government of India on the question raised by the Accountant General and referred to the British Resident in the Durbar's letter dated 27th November 1890 No 9703/464, may be obtained so as to decide the case of Mr Mascarenhas and all similar cases on a uniform principle.

3. The delay of 8 months in this

1. Prinsep Rao, late Auditor of the Associate States, Bangalore District.
2. B. Kingiah, late accountant of the Mysore Durbar, Bangalore District.
3. Kallanur Chakravarti, late Police Inspector of the Channarayana District, Mysore District.

this office was partly due to the careful search made in the Nagar Commissioner's old records of nearly half a century back and the rest is regretted.

4. The Service Book of Mr Mascarenhas and the two original enclosures of your letter under acknowledgment, are herewith returned.

(True Copy)

Chief Superintendent.

72

13/2

Copy of letter No 762 G dated the 9th April 1886 from the Under Secretary to the Government of India, to the Officiating Resident in Mysore.

I am directed to forward herewith copy of a letter from the Resident at Hyderabad, No 45 G, dated the 15th February 1886 and of its enclosures regarding the liability of the Mysore State to pay a share of the pension granted to Mr. Marchant, late a Superintendent of the office of the Comptroller of Hyderabad.

2. Mr. Marchant was in the Service of the Government of Mysore before he joined the Service of the British Government. He resigned the former service in 1859 and immediately joined the latter Service. There was

was no interruption of Service and under such circumstances there would have been no difficulty about his pension, if he had resigned an appointment in the British Service.

3. The Mysore Durbar has, however, objected to bear any share of Mr. Marshall's pension. According to the ruling of the Comptroller, to the Government of India in the case of Mr. Rungachariar and others who similarly resigned British Service for employment in Mysore. "I am, however, directed to explain, that the principle which it is proposed to follow in the case of Mr. Marshall is exactly the same as that which has been followed in the case of Mr. Rungachariar and the other officers to whom reference is made. Mr. Rungachariar resigned the service of the Government of

of Madras to gain the service of the Mysore Government and it has been decided that his pension should be calculated on the combined services, the British and the Mysore Government bearing their proper share of the pension. In this case the British Govt. did not accept liability on account of Mr. Rungachariar's Mysore Service, but the British Government did not object to pay a share of Mr. Rungachariar's pension proportionate to his service under the British Government. This decision was passed in view of the consideration that when Mysore was under British administration it was natural that officers in Govt. Service proper should have felt no hesitation in resigning their appointments to gain Mysore Service and Vice Versa under circumstances

circumstances in which similar resignation
of one Govt. appointment to join another
would not have affected their pen-
sionary claims. If under such cir-
cumstances the previous service, ~

whether in Mysore or under the British
Government, should be rejected, the
result would be unmerited hard-
ship to the officers concerned.

4. on these grounds I am to request
that you will be good enough to
move the Mysore Durbar to recon-
sider the question.

(True Copy)

Chief Superintendent,

Pension DEPARTMENT.

FORT ST. GEORGE,

Accountant-General's Office,

24th March 1896.

No. PA. 5
544

From

The ACCOUNTANT-GENERAL TO THE
GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS,

To

THE First Assistant to the Resident in
Mysore.

SIR,

With reference to para 2 of your
letter no 752 dated the 3rd instant I have
the honour to state that I think this office
was wrong in holding that the views
expressed by the Government of India
in the case of Mr Marchant (vide Govt.
of India letter no 762 G. dated 9th April 1896)
could not be applied to similar cases.
I shall, therefore, be obliged by your
informing me whether the Mysore
Durbar are prepared to bear a
share of Mr. Magesen's share of

tion proportionate to his service
rendered under that Government.
An early reply is requested.

I have etc
(sd) F. C. Harrison -
Accountant General.

~~(True Copy)~~

~~Chief Superintendent~~

Copy of letter No 1469 from the 1st As-
sistant to the Resident in Mysore, to
the Accountant General, Madras,
dated Bangalore, 21st April 1896.

With reference to your letter
No S.A. 2 dated the 26th ultimo, I am
524
directed to inform you that in the
circumstances mentioned therein
the Durbar is prepared to bear a
share of Mr. Mascarenhas's pension
proportionate to his service rendered
under the Mysore Government.

(True copy)

J. S. Power
Chief Superintendent.

When given for copying _____
 When copied _____
 When examined _____
 When signed _____

189 .

READ AGAIN G.O. No. _____, DATED _____
 189

CURRENT No. _____

ENCLOSURES TO C. No. _____

ORDER OF GOVERNMENT A A A A A A A

LETTER OF GOVERNMENT.

STATEMENT WITH DITTO.

PAPERS NOT FILED UP, BEING MEANT FOR DESPATCH
 IN ORIGINAL.

N.B. -
 A = Copy in full.
 B = Not to be copied.
 P = Copy abstract only.
 Q = Copy heading only.