

1. Number of pages. 14
2. Date of repair. 30.8.35
3. Initials of Referencer. *Ed*
M.R.O. 1-82,400-22-11-20.

MADRAS RECORD OFFICE.

Government of Madras.

Pension DEPARTMENT.

G.O. No. 408	~~Press~~ Mis.
Dated 1. 10	1864

Not to be folded or roughly handled

my

War Department

N^o 93

Fort St. George

Civil Commission Office

3^d August 1864.

Official Memorandum

Your Register of 1st April 1864
for Pension N^o 30 dated 25th March
on behalf of W. Wapawigwa.

It is that W. Wapawigwa
will have to submit a Medical Certificate
to show his incapacity to serve. In view of
any longer agreement to the Notification
published at page 206, 2^d Volume, of the
Gazette for 1863 as his service qualification
for Pension does not amount to 50 years.

(Signed) C. M. Lodwick

Civil Commission

To, The Collector of
South Arcot.

(True Copy)

C. M. Lodwick

Collector

Port St George

Civil Paymaster's Office

11th August 1864

Official Memorandum

Upper Memo No. 31, dated 29th June 1864, states that service in appointment the pay of which is Rs. 10 does not qualify for Pension.

Signed / C. M. Edmunds
Civil Paymaster

To the Deputy Collector
Collector.

True copy /

Charles Leake
Collector

As per Memo No. 31, dated 29th June 1864, states that service in appointment the pay of which is Rs. 10 does not qualify for Pension.

Signed / C. M. Edmunds

Civil Paymaster

Recd 1864 Sept 15
L. 1864

31/8/64
1864

D

T.

The Civil Paymaster
Fort St. George

Dated Calcutta 15th August 1864
N^o 79.

Your Memo dated the 11th instant

1 Your attention is called to the
N^o 12. appended to the list circulated with
the Board's standing Circular dated 3rd July
1863 N^o 79, in which it is worded as follows:

"Servants receiving less than 10 Rs.
per mensem are not entitled to Pension
or to reckon service on such pay towards
Pension."

2 From the above it is clear that
Servants receiving Rs. 10 per mensem are
entitled to Pension, and their service on
such pay can be reckoned towards it.
It is under this provision that Rajana
Gyengar was recommended for Pension, and
how the Conclusion that service in
appointments the pay of which is 10 Rs.
does not qualify for Pension is arrived at,
I am unable to conceive. The provision
above quoted does not appear to have
been cancelled by any subsequent order
of Government.

3 Under these circumstances I
am decidedly of opinion that Rajana

To the Honble
Secretary of Govt
of Bengal
Calcutta

N^o 52

Subscribed

For the Paymaster

(Signature)

11th August 1864

Walter, W. & Co. Secy
to the Govt. of Bengal
Calcutta

For the Paymaster

(Signature)
15th Aug 1864

My son has a claim to pension.
Please let us know your opinion
on this reference about the matter.

For each Mr. & Mrs. Hammy
Bry. Collector

(Mus. copy)

Accepted
C. C. C. C.

Callie, a letter from
Catharine Goodrich
Green has been the
the theme in which
Green was in some
for the occasion. I
who have in addition
left than 100000.

Salut / Cher ami / M. G.

Wm. L. Bayard
J. J. Wood

Dear Sir,

Mr. C. W. Smith
College of Arts &
Sci. Hartford
Conn.

Hand 1864 Defect
A. 1863.

529628
720457

N^o. 108

Fort St. George

Civil Paymaster's office

19th August 1864

Official Memorandum

Your letter of 23 dated 1st instant states that Para 119 of Chap III Civil Auditor's Manual distinctly lays down that service in situations the salary of which is Rs 10 and less does not accrue towards pension, and it is further stated in para 1 of the Revised Unconvenanted Service Pension Rules that those rules are applicable only to persons drawing more than 10 Rs a month.

2 The S. D. at foot of the List
appended to the Proceedings of the Board of
Revenue quoted by you is at variance
with the above rules, and does not appear
to be borne out by any order of Government

Signed, R. M. Loewich

Lucas Brynner & Co.

9th. The Dy. Collector
in Charge of the Revenue
South Arcot

/ True copy /

Charles Keith
Collector

F

To The Civil Auditor

Dated 29th August 1864. 1896

Your official Memo. 1: 23 dated
16th March 64.

Please refer the question
involved in this correspondence with
my Deputy Collector as it seems to
me that Service is receiving 10 Rs. and
upwards per mensem for out of the
house and to receive services from
Pension. If you decline to refer the
question to Government, I will
do so.

Signed / C. H. Reader
Collector

(For copy /
Charles Hinde
Collector

Mr. C. H. Reader, Esq.
Collector of District, Sec.
Madras District, Sec.
1864 No 52
Madras 18

Madras 1864 No 110
Madras 1864 No 110
Madras 1864 No 110
Madras 1864 No 110
Madras 1864 No 110
Madras 1864 No 110
Madras 1864 No 110
Madras 1864 No 110
Madras 1864 No 110
Madras 1864 No 110

Madras 1864 No 110

Madras 1864 No 110

Madras 1864 No 110

G

Nº 118

Fort St. George

Civil Paymaster's Office

1st September 1864

Official Memorandum

Your Memo. Nº 86 dated 27th ultimo states that the question is not one which requires a reference to Government on the part of this Department. The Collector is, of course, at liberty to report it if he please.

(Signed) R. W. Lodwick
Civil Paymaster

To The Collector of
North Borneo

(True copy)

Charles Head
Collector

Mr. C. Head
North Borneo
19 September 1864
Received of Mr. R. W. Lodwick
Civil Paymaster
the sum of £100
for the month of September 1864
and acknowledged the receipt
of the same.

Received of Mr. R. W. Lodwick
Civil Paymaster

100 £ 0 0
100 24 57

52

Mr. C. W. Peavess
Milit. Secy. M. Genl.

To J. J. Sim Esq
Secy to Government
Fort St. George

Sir,
I have the honor
to submit for the decision of
Government a question that has
arisen between myself and the
Civil Paymaster on the subject
of the construction of one of
the Pension Rules.

2
I recently had occasion
to submit to the Civil Paymaster
an application for pension, in
the prescribed form, of one
Rafana Syngar a Revenue
Inspector whose service in
Government employ amounted
to about 41 years. Rafana
Syngar had originally served
in

In a letter from the
Civil Paymaster
dated 16th July 1852
he has said that
the pension rules
do not apply to
Revenue Inspectors
who are not
in the service of
the Government.

Recd 18th July 1852
J. J. Sim Esq
Fort St. George

in the grade of peon and was
so substantiated for nearly 4 years,
after which he was raised to
the Post of a Revenue Inspector
in which he continued for
about 37 years till his present
retirement. In the Post of
Revenue Inspector Rajana
Lyengar was, for nearly 33 years,
in receipt of a salary of
only 10 Rupees per month,
and it was only after the
introduction of the revised
Establishments that his pay
was increased to 20 Rupees
and which he has drawn
during the last 4 years. The
period during which he served
in the grade of peon has
been deducted from his
total service, but the remainder
amounts to 37 years which
renders him eligible, according
to my reading of the Rules,
to a pension as now recommended.

3. But the first Paymaster,
on the contrary, is of opinion
that the 33 years during which
Rajana Lyengar was in receipt
of only 10 Rupees cannot be
reckoned as service towards
pension because, in para 119,
Chapter III, of the first Auditor's
manual it is laid down
that "service in situations
the salary of which is Rs. 10.
and less does not reckon
towards pension" and because
in para 1 of the Revised Pen-
sion Rules it is stated that those Rules
are applicable only to servants
drawing more than 10 Rupees
a month.

4. But I desire to
draw the attention of the
Government to the NB appended
at the foot of the list of
Unrecommended

Unnumbered servants declared
to be entitled to pension in the
Revenue department and which
was circulated by the Board
of Revenue under date the 3rd
July, 1863 No. 79. The Note runs
thus: "Servants receiving less
than 10 Rupees per mensem are
not entitled to pension or to
reckon service on such pay
towards pension." From this
it is quite clear that servants
receiving from 10 Rupees &
upwards are clearly entitled
to the benefit of pension, and
under this provision Rajana
Sengupta was recommended
by me.

I pointed this
out to the Civil Paymaster,
and he replied simply that
the quotation which I
have just given is not borne
out by any specific order
of government, neither is it in

the Civil Auditor's manual.
The Civil Paymaster
lays stress on the Rules in
force prior to the revised
pension Rules, which, I presume,
superseded all other orders
of a previous date, and
therefore it seems to me that
Rajana Sengupta's service during
which he happened to be on
receipt of the salary of only
10 Rs. can be reckoned towards
pension, and I therefore submit
the question for the final order
of government accompanied
by copies of the correspondence
between my own office and
that of the Civil Paymaster
marked consecutively from
A to G. —

With much
C. M. S. Chatterjee
C. S. Chatterjee
6th Sep 1863

I have the honor to be
Sir,
Yours most obedient servant

Charles Deade
C. M. S.

Pension Department

Proceedings of the Madras Government
Read the following letter

From The Collector of South Arcot (here entered September 1864)

Order Madras 1st October 1864

The Collector of South Arcot
contains that service in
under a delay of Rs 10
the pension should count
for pension.

The Revised Rules under
which alone pensions
are now given, distinctly
state that ~~in~~ the Rules
apply to officers "on the
receipt of more than ten
Rupees a month" hence
excluding from their operation
those in receipt of ten Ru-
pees or less. — The ques-
tion, thus put, admits
of no doubt.

The Circular Order
of the Revenue Board, issued
by Mr. Meade, is apparent-
ly erroneous, certainly ambi-
guous, and the Board
will be so good as to

* It is also observed that the
old rules ~~also~~ contained
a similar restriction.

* Pending - No 79 of the
3rd July -/63

1864 Sept 17
The Collector of South Arcot
The Secretary to Government
Madras
Dated 6th Oct 1864
Received 10th Oct 1864
No 52
Enclosures 1
The Secretary to Government
Madras
Dated 6th Oct 1864
Received 10th Oct 1864
No 52
Enclosures 1

18-10-1864

1864
1864

Correct it in accordance
with the Revised Rules for
Principles.

C.W.

To

Prof. of Mathematics
at the Board of Marine
Department.

Dec 1/10/64

Dated 1st October 1864

Board of Government

A. H. 1008

London 1864 & 1865