1. Number of pages 36
2. Date of repair 27-5-36
3. Initials of Refe[illegible]

5-7-36

M.R.O. 1—32,400—22-11-30.

MADRAS RECORD OFFICE.

Government of Madras.

Pension DEPARTMENT.

G.O. No. 128 Press Mis.

Dated 19-3-1870

Not to be folded or roughly handled

Proceedings of the Madras Government, Pension Department, 19th March 1870.

Read the following papers :—

From the Officiating Collector of Madura.

(Here enter 4th August 1869.)

From the Examiner of Claims.

(Here enter 7th February 1870, No. 100.)

ORDER THEREON, 19th March 1870, No. 128.

Pichuvayer, late Sub-Magistrate of Chinnamanur Division in the District of Madura, was first employed as a temporary Rayasum on Rupees 12 in December 1836, and then as Devastanam Gumastah in the Sevagunga Estate under attachment for, in all, seven years, nine months, and one day, till September 1844, when the estate was restored to the Zemindar. This service has been rightly rejected by the Examiner of Claims.

2. He was next entertained on a permanent establishment as Police Rayasam on the 1st May 1850, and served continuously till the 8th January 1865, a period of fourteen years, eight months, and eight days; but of this the last four years only were passed in grades qualifying for pension. He was fifty-eight years of age in June 1869, when the medical certificate submitted in support of his application was obtained.

3. The applicant was appointed a Sub-Magistrate on Rupees 70 on the 15th June 1864, but was removed from that post on the 8th January 1865, for gross ignorance of the Criminal Procedure Code. In the order of dismissal the District Magistrate declared that the applicant would be re-employed on the occurrence of a suitable vacancy. In 1866 he appealed to Government who considered that the Magistrate was justified in dismissing him, but directed that the promise made in 1865 should be fulfilled. This, however, was not done, and in March 1869, Pichuvayer petitioned for a gratuity. Inquiry was made as to his service, and on the 30th June 1869 he was declared unfit for further service from old age and infirmity, rheumatism, and impaired vision.

4. The Examiner of Claims reports that the applicant having been removed for ignorance and not re-employed is not entitled to any gratuity.

5. The Government observe that Pichuvayer was not finally dismissed, and, under all the circumstances, consider that he ought to be allowed a gratuity. They resolve, therefore, to grant to him, subject to the confirmation of the Government of India, a gratuity of Rupees 150, being equal to three months' pay of the post held by him for nearly three years previous to his short tenure of the office of Sub-Magistrate.

6. Pichuvayer's Petition No. 777 of 1869 will be endorsed accordingly.

(True Extract,)

Under Secy. to Govt.

To the Officiating Collector of Madura.
,, Examiner of Claims.
,, Accountant-General.
,, Financial Department.

Exd. J. Wright.

Govt. of {1870} Madras.

PENSION.

To

THE COLLECTOR OF MADURA.
&c., &c., &c.

Dated March, 19th.

Recd. Encl.

G. O., 19th March 1870, *No.* 128.

MARCH.

Granting, subject to the confirmation of the Government of India, a gratuity of Rupees 150 to Pichuvayer, late Sub-Magistrate of Chinnamanur Division in the District of Madura.

3

1 Register of application for gratuity on behalf of Pitchowra

1 Medical Certificate dated 30 Jany /69

2

No. 48—26-4-69—200.

PENSION REPORT DEPARTMENT.

Fort Saint George,
Accountant General's Office,
The 15th January 1870.

To

THE Collector of Madura

The undersigned has the honour to return the papers connected with the

~~Pension~~.........
Gratuity.........
~~Compassionate Allowance~~..

case noted in the margin, received with letter ~~Memo.~~ dated 5 Augt 1869 No. 1265 for want of Nos. 23 – & 24

It is particularly requested that an EARLY reply may be sent, and that this Memo. be re-transmitted.

W Donald

Examiner of Claims.

---

1. Detail, with dates, of local posts. } Vide paras. 133-134-135 and 141, of chapter III of the
2. ,, ,, of pay. } Civil Auditor's Manual.
3. ,, of leaves enjoyed other than Privilege or preparatory, during the whole period of Service, vide Government Notification, published at page 540, 2nd Volume of the Gazette for 1863.
4. Full name in item 1 of the Register of application.
5. Certificate of age attested by Head of Department.
6. ,, that alleged services from to are proved from the records.
7. ,, of past character, vide page 99, 2nd Volume of the Official Gazette for 1862.
8. Explanation of apparent breaks.
9. ,, ,, degradation.
10. Insertion of desired place of payment.
11. Printed form of application for under the new Rules published at page 631, of the 2nd Volume of the Gazette for 1866.
12. Printed form of application for gratuity under the old Rules, which can be had from the Superintendent of Stationery.
13. One Register (printed) of all applications for gratuity should be sent to this Department, as required under the recent Orders of Government, instead of the separate manuscript Registers for each individual, herewith returned.
14. Insertion in item 15 of the Register of all descriptive marks agreeably to Notification published at page 802, of 2nd Volume of the Gazette for 1866.
15. Insertion in the Leave Statement, of the period of absence with loss of full and half pay, respectively, during the period of
16. Insertion (in red ink) in the detailed Statement of service, of the period during which the applicant without employ by
17. Insertion in of the Register, of the proposed amount of Gratuity
18. Information as to whether the applicant received any gratuity for past service in consequence of the abolition of his Office on the if so, a Copy of the order sanctioning such gratuity must be furnished.
19. For deletion of Remarks at foot of the Register, if the applicant did not receive any gratuity.
20. For the deletion of grounds of retirement, &c., other than those required under N. B. at foot of the Register.
21. Discharge Certificate from the Superintendent of Police shewing the period of the applicant's employment in the new Police, and why his services were dispensed with.

Pl No 102

22. Testimonials of character or Certificates given to applicant by the Head of an Office, or, (in the absence of such Certificates,) an affidavit signed before a Magistrate, in support of the applicant's service from to which cannot be proved from the Official records.

23. Explanation of the cause of delay in submission of application until 4th August 1869 when the applicant appears from the statement of service to have ceased to do duty on the 8th January 1865

24. Explanation why the applicant was retained in Government service from to when the Medical Certificate was dated vide Government Notification, published at pages 603 and 473, 1st and 2nd Volumes, respectively of the Official Gazette for 1866.

25. Explanation why the applicant was recommended in of the Register, for a gratuity of Rupees equal to months salary, when he is eligible to the gratuity of Rupees equal to months salary under the

Vide Inspector General's Circular No. 1517, dated 25th April 1868, Indian Medical Department.

26. Medical Certificate in prescribed form shewing the applicant's inability to serve longer.
  - a. Vide Government Notifications, published at page 740 and 632, Volume 1 of Gazette for 1858 and 1863, respectively.
  - b. Agreeably to the Orders of Government, dated 14th June 1866, No. 224, as the applicant's service exclusive of the periods

    amounts to
  - c. Vide Government Notification, published at page 705, 1st Volume, and page 450, 2nd Volume of the Official Gazette, for 1865 and 1866, respectively.

27. Explanation why Medical Certificate is dated 30th June 1869 after the applicant ceased to do duty, instead of on, or before, his retirement from Government service.

28. Transmission of the true Copy of the order of

29. Translation of the orders of under which the applicant as the cause of should be shewn in this Office report to Government.

30. Explanation as to whether the applicant applied for during his life, if so, when he applied, and when he died.

31. Explanation as to whether the applicant's heirs applied for the arrears of due to the applicant up to the date of decease, together with date of application for

32. Insertion in the 1st, and 2nd sides of the Register, of the correct periods of years.

as pencilled, instead of years.

33. Insertion in the Register of application as to whether the applicant for Compassionate allowance has been employed since the date of the abolition of Office in , and whether holds any employment at present.

34. English translation of affidavit to be given, on the back of the same (herewith returned,) so as to enable this Department to report its tenor to Government.

35. Signature of the applicant, to be affixed at foot of affidavit in

Pens Lr No 100/70

36. Transmission of the Printed Memo. from this Department dated as requested therein, as the cannot be disposed of without it.

37. Insertion in Clause 3 of item No. 7 in the 1st side of the Register, of the date, and No. of the Order of Government, under which the applicant was thrown out of employ by reduction of Establishment.

38. For deletion of the applicant's service of years before 22 years of age in item No. 9 of the 1st side, and at foot of the 2nd side of the Register, as the entire service rendered by up to

are required to be shewn in the case of Compassionate allowance.

I. F. Fletcher officiating Zillah Surgeon Madura, do hereby certify that I have carefully examined Pichuvier late Submagistrate of Chinnamanoor in the Madura District, that his age is 58 by his own statement and by the appearance about the same, and find him to be unfit for further active service from old agê, Rheumatism and infirmity, impaired vision & loss of teeth, not in my opinion attributable to intemperance or other irregular habits.

Madura }
30th June 1869 }

F. Fletcher
Offg Zillah Surgeon

Vide certificate attached, an opinion of the Committee
[illegible] M.D.
Dy. Insp. Genl. [illegible]
& Presidt. of Committee.

Trichinopoly
23rd July 1869
J. Kendall M.D.
Dy. Insp. Genl. [illegible]

Order on Petition No 2876 of 1866 from Pichoovien, late Deputy Tasildar & Sub. Magistrate of Chinnamanur Division, Madura District.

The Government are of opinion that the Magistrate was justified in dismissing Petitioner from his post of Sub. Magistrate.

The Magistrate will however endeavour to provide the Petitioner with a Situation fitted to his capacity as promised in his order of the 10th January 1865.

Fort Saint George
19th November 1866

By Order

(Signed) J. Grose
Under Secretary
to Government

(True Copy)

Offg Collector

Enclosure in a letter from the Offg Collector of Madura to the Acct General, Madras dated August/69 No

From
The offg Zillah Surgeon of Madura

Dated 30 June
Recd 6th a. Aug 3 1869

Pens. In No 99/70

Certifying that Pichuvier late Sub Magte of Chinnamanur is unfit for further service —

We, the undersigned President and Members of a Special Medical Invaliding Committee assembled at Trichinopoly this the 23rd day of July 1869, do hereby certify that we have carefully examined Pichuvaiyar, late Deputy Tahsildar and Sub Magistrate of Mannamadura Madura District, and find that he is aged, worn out, and Rheumatic, with loss of many teeth, and is, in our opinion, incapacitated for any further service, and that such incapacity is not, to the best of our belief and judgment, attributable to intemperance or other irregular habits.—

J. Kennedy M.D.
Dy Inspector General
Ind. Med. Dept. S.D. President

H. Duckworth M.D.
Assist. Surgeon
26th Regt. N.I.

J. H. Ritchie M.D.
Assist. Surgeon
9th Regt. N.I.

Members

Copy

Enclosure in letter
from the Offg Collector of
Madura, to the Acct
General, Madras dated
4 Aug 1869 No 1265

Petition papers relating
to this
(Copy)
Government Order
dated 17 November
1886 on Petition No 2876
of 1886.
Passed No 99/70

Enclosure in a letter
from the Offg Collector
of Madura to the
Accountant General
Madras dated 4th
August 1869 No 1265

Medical Certificate
of Pichuvier dated
23d July/69.

Pens Lr No 99/70

---

696 44 F. 91. 31.

Deposition of Pichuvenier late Sub Magistrate of Chinnamanur; given before the Madura Taluq Sub Magistrate on Solemn affirmation on the 30th July 1869.

I held the office of head "Rayasam" in the office of Police Ameen of the Sivagunga Firka from May 1850 till June 1853. I was on receipt of 10 Rs. per mensem all that time. I was first appointed to the said office on the 16th June 1849 but I was ~~officia~~ only acting till ~~May~~ April 1850 – ~~when~~ I was confirmed in May 1850.

Taken by me this 30th day of July 1869.

[illegible]
Actg. Sub Magte

Pens of No 99/70

No 103

Collector's Office
Madura
21st January 1870

EXAMINER OF CLAIMS
1870
JA 23
MADRAS

From

I. R. Arbuthnott Esquire
Offg Collector of Madura

To

W. Donald Esquire
Examiner of claims
Madras

Sir,

In returning your letter (with enclosures) dated 15th Instant regarding the application for gratuity in favor of Pichuvian, I have the honor to inform you that the applicant was dismissed from the office of Sub Magistrate under date the 8th January 1865, as being incompetent to hold it with a promise that he would "be provided with a situation more fitted to his capacity," but as he was not appointed to a situation until 12th April 1869, the Govt. on that date ordered the submission of "Petitioner's "application for such pension or gratuity "as he may be entitled to."

2. On the receipt of the above-mentioned Order, a search was made in

in the records to ascertain whether the Appellant was entitled to gratuity or pension and thereupon he was directed on the 24th June to appear before the Zillah Surgeon for the purpose of obtaining a Medical Certificate. This he obtained on the 30th and then proceeded to Trichinopoly to get the countersignature of the Dy Inspector General of Hospitals, who furnished him with a fresh certificate on the 23rd July. Hence the delay in obtaining the Medical Certificate and the submission of this application for gratuity

I have the honor to be
Sir
Your most obedt. servt.

Offg Collector

From 133 Dept
The Coll of Madura

To
The Examiner of Claims
Madras

Dated 21st } January 1870
Recd 3 }

No 103

Encl one

Returning his letter with its enclosures dated 15th instant regarding the application for gratuity in favor of Pitchu Iyer with the required information in connection thereto.

Sent L Le 100/70

17

Extract from the Proceedings of the Magistrate of Madura dated 10th January 1865.

On the 4th November one Minachi complained that she had been raped on the 1st November by one Mallyan Chetty of Tavarum; the Sub Magistrate on that date issued a warrant for the apprehension of the accused and summons for the attendance before him of the witnesses on the 7th on the 5th November; the Sub Magistrate received a referred charge sheet from Mr. Taylor the Inspector of Police setting forth fully the result of his enquiries into the complaint made by Minachi against Mallyan Chetty of rape - Mr. Taylor had found the evidence to be unworthy of any credit that Minachi was a common prostitute and Mallyan Chetty a respectable wealthy trader of Tavarum - On the 7th Mullyan Chetty was apprehended in Chinnamanur he having heard of the charge came voluntarily to Chinnamanur to protest against it and to save himself the disgrace of being arrested & marched across the country fettered and kept in custody in an open Choultry exposed to the gaze of every passer

by

by in the Town of Chinnamanoor - Under the circumstances of Mr. Taylor's report the Sub Magistrate should have held Mullyen Chetty to bail under the provisions of Section 181 of the C. P. Code instead of doing which he remanded him to Custody. The Sub Magistrate on being questioned by the Magistrate why he did not act according to the provisions of Section 181 shewed by his answers that he was quite ignorant of that section and of Chapter 12 of the C. P. Code. On the 7th the witnesses were present but were not examined till the 9th - the Sub Magistrate's excuse is that Mullyan Chetty was sick on the 8th. The Sub Magistrate's explanation is unsatisfactory in a preliminary enquiry into a case triable by the Sessions Court the presence at it thro' every stage of the accused is not necessary. The Sub Magistrate should have examined the witnesses on the 7th or 8th (as on the 9th he rejected the whole of the evidence adduced by the Prosecutrix as contradictory and unworthy of credit) could have on either of those days discharged Mullyan Chetty under Section 225 without even requiring him to answer to the charge -

On

On the 9th when the Sub Magistrate rejected the evidence of the alleged eye witnesses of the outrage as false he did not discharge the accused as he was bound to do, but remanded him to further custody pending the appearance of further witnesses as to Character who were summoned on the 9th to appear on the 12th. Their evidence was not required the charge having broken down completely but if it had been the Sub Magistrate was bound under section 212 of the C. P. Code to admit Mullyan Chetty to Bail instead of remanding him to custody - the wording of that section is peremptory on that subject, in such a case no discretion is left to the Magistrate the wording is not he may at his discretion but he *shall* admit to bail the accused. The Sub Magte was unable to give any satisfactory answer regarding his not having acted in accordance with the provisions of that section and his answer shewed he was ignorant of that section of the Criminal Procedure Code.

The

The periods allowed in the Summons for the appearance of the witnesses are excessive the distance between Chinnamanoor and Tavarum where the witnesses reside is 9 miles and the Sub Magistrate gives no satisfactory reason for granting such long periods. The witnesses summoned the 4th are directed to appear the 7th they might have appeared the 5th or 6th they were not examined till the 9th. The witnesses summoned on the 9th were directed to appear the 12th they might have appeared the 10th or 11th - they did not make their appearance till the 15th on which day they were examined and the accused discharged. The Sub Magistrate on finding on the 12th that the witneſses did not appear should have discharged the accused their evidence was not required either for the prosecution or defence

or

or he should have iſsued his warrant for the apprehension of the witnesses and punished their contempt, but he allowed the prisoner to be fettered exposed in custody and waited till the witnesses pleased to appear. In excuse the Sub Magistrate says the witnesses only delayed 2 days it is very evident he did care how long they treated his summons with contempt or how long he unnecessarily and illegally detained and exposed the accused in custody. The Magistrate finds Mallyan Chetty was unnecessarily and illegally detained in custody by the Sub Magistrate for 9 days from the 7th to the 15th that the Sub Magistrate is unable to give any satisfactory explanation of his conduct and that he after being 3 years Sub Magistrate with the Procedure Code for his guide is grossly ignorant of it that in Mullyan Chetty's case he acted contrary to every one of its simplest and plainest directions which directions he has constant occasion to use and thereby caused grievous wrong and injustice to an innocent man the victim of a malicious conspiracy

27

Mullyen Chetty asserts he was the viction of the malice of the Tavarum Zemindar and therefore considers he is not fit to be trusted with the office of Sub Magte any longer removes him from that office and directs him to wait till he can be provided with a situation more fitted to his capacity.

(Signed) V. H. Levinge
Magistrate

(True Copy)

Offg Collector

Enclosure in a letter from the Offg Collr of Madura to the Accountant General Madras dated 4th August 1869 No 1265

(Copy)
Extract from the Procgs of the Magistrate of Madura dated 10th January 1865

Recd L No 99/70.

No 1265

Collector's Office
Madura
5th August 1869.

From,

J. R. Arbuthnott Esqre
Offg Collector of Madura

To.

F. Lushington Esqre
Accountant General
Fort Saint George.

Sir,

Under the orders of Government dated 12th April 1869 passed on Petition No 777 of 1869 (herewith forwarded), I have the honor to submit with reference to Para 763 & 767 of the Uncovenanted Servants Vade Mecum published in 1868, a Register of application for Gratuity under the old Rules on behalf of Pichoo Iyer, late Deputy Tasildar & Sub Magistrate of Chinnamanur.

With two Medical Certificates

D A & A G. Office
Recd 9/8 1869
Ansd

2. The first appointment of Royasam held by the applicant was created as a temporary measure under Extract Minutes of Consultation dated 10th January 1837

3. A copy of the Order of the Magistrate dismissing the applicant from the Public Service and of that of Government passed on appeal are herewith forwarded.

I have the honor to be,
Sir,
Your Most Obedient Servant

Offg Collector

~~1869~~ 1870 Pension Deptt.
No. 99
From,
The Offg Collector of
Madura
To,
The Accountant General,
Fort Saint George,

Dated 4th } August ~~1869~~.
Recd 9th } February 1870.
No 1265
Enclosures. 6
Submitting a Register of application for gratuity on behalf of Pichuvier late Tasildar & Sub-Magte of Chinnamanur Madura District.

5950

O.D. 128.
19th March /7

PENSION 1870 DEPARTMENT.

No. 100.

From the Examiner of Claims

Fort Saint George.

To the Chief Secretary to Government,

Civil Pension Department.

No. 124.

Dated 7th
Received 9th } February 1870

Enclosures

Verifies the service of Pichaniga late Sub-Magistrate of Chinnamanur individuals borne on the establishment [illegible] of the Collr. of Madura.

O No. 128.
19th March /70

PENSION 1869 DEPARTMENT.

From the Offg. Collector of Madura

To the Accountant General, ~~or~~

~~Controller of Military Accounts~~

Fort Saint George.

Dated 4
Received } August 1869.

Enclo. 1.

Register of an application for Gratuities in behalf of Pichanier, an individual borne on the establishment of the Collector of Madura.

ORDER OF GOVERNMENT.

(G.O. No 102)

Register of an Application for Gratuities under the old Rules from the Establishment of the Collector of Madura

Name of the persons for whom the gratuities is applied.	Statement of total period of Service.											Total period of service of each person.			How long unemployed, and under what circumstances, and under what authority reinstated.	Explanation of any degradation.	Abstract of the grounds of application.	Remarks by the Heads of the Office on the past character and conduct of the applicants.	Proposed amount of gratuity.			Accountant General or Controller of Military Accounts' Remarks.
	Establishment.	Post.	Pay.			Period.																
			Rs.	A.	P.	From	To	Yrs.	Ms.	Ds.		Yrs.	Ms.	Ds.					Rs.	A.	P.	
Pichoo Iyer	Police office of Ramnad & Shevaganga	Royasam	12	–	–	11th December 1836	15th February 1838	1	2	5	A				The applicant was unemployed during two intervals, Viz.: between 11th September 1844 and 15th June 1849, & between 1st July 1853 & 30th September 1853. The first is due to his services in the Shevaganga Zemindary having been dispensed with on the Estate being restored by Government to the successful party under the order of the late Sadr Court dated 2nd September 1844. On the second occasion he was thrown out of employment in consequence of the abolition of the Office under Extract Minutes of Consultation dated 24th June 1853.		Inability to serve longer.	The applicant appears to have conducted himself well except in the case which resulted in his dismissal; and subsequently to that the Government sanctioned his re-employment.	420	–	–	A Cannot count as it was of a temporary nature
	When Shevaganga was under Zuft.	Devastanam Royasam	12	–	–	16th February 1838	10th September 1844	6	6	26	B											B Cannot count as the applicant was not on the Permanent Establishment prior to 16th February 1838
	Police office of Shevaganga Divn.	Ag. Royasam	10	–	–	16th June 1849	30th April 1850	–	10	15												
	Do	Ad Do	10	–	–	1st May 1850	30th June 1853	3	2	–												
	Police office at Tripattur	Royasam	8	–	–	1st October/53	25th September 1856	2	11	25												
	Do at Anyur Divn.	Ag. Peshkar	19	5	4	26th Septr./56	27th April/57	–	7	2												
	Do at Tripattur Divn.	Royasam	8	–	–	28th April/57	4 March/59	1	10	5												
	Do at Ranur Divn.	Do	8	–	–	5th March/59	12th February 1860	–	11	8	C											C Cannot reckon for pension as permanent appointment was in a grade that does not qualify therefor
	Do at Shevaganga Division	Do	10	–	–	13th February 1860	21st August 1860	–	6	9												
	Tripatur Division	Ag. Police Amin	35	–	–	22d August 1860	26th Septr. 1860	–	1	5												
	Ramnad Divn.	Ag. Do	35	–	–	27th Septr. 1860	9th January 1861	–	3	14												
	Vadakku Vattakai Divn.	Police Amin	35	–	–	10th January 1861	15th June 1861	–	5	6												
	Do	Do	50	–	–	16th June 1861	14th June/64	2	11	29	D											D This 4 years Service qualifies for pension under the new rules.
	Chinnamanur Divn.	Sub. Magistrate	70	–	–	15th June/64	8th January 1865	–	6	25												
								3	6	5		* 23	–	24								C. D. Verified from the records of this office
								4	0	0												Examiner of Claims Fort St George Acctt Genl's Office 7 Feby/70

*This Service is proved by the Records except that portion of it which intervenes between 1st May 1850 and 30th June 1853 regarding which an Affidavit is enclosed.

Madura Collector's Office,
4th August 1869.

The

It is hereby certified that no gratuity was drawn by the applicant on reduction of Establishment in the years 1844, 1853 and 1865.
It is certified that gratuity having been granted was refunded to the amount of Rs. —— A. —— P.
Order sanctioning payment of gratuity was
Amount of gratuity granted was Rs. As. P.
Refund of gratuity was credited to the account for the month of ——

Offg Collector.

No. 124

Report of the Examiner of Claims

Service qualifying for pension under the new rules amounts to 4 years which would have entitled him to a gratuity not exceeding Rupees 280; but, having been removed from the Office of Sub Magistrate for ignorance of the duties devolving upon him as such, and not having been reemployed, the applicant is not eligible to Pension or gratuity under any rules.

W. Donald

Examiner of Claims

Fort Saint George,
Accountt. General's Office,
7 February 1870.

To

The Chief Secretary to Government,
Civil Pension Department.

31

Pension Department.

PROCEEDINGS *of the* MADRAS GOVERNMENT.

Read the following letters

From the Offg. Collector Madura Revenue 4th August /69

From the Examiner of Claims —— " —— 7 Feby. /70 No. 100.

Order thereon 19th March 1870 No. 128.

Pichuvayer, late Sub Magistrate of Chinnamanur Division in the district of Madura, was first employed as a temporary Rayasam on Rs. 12 in Decr. 1836 and then as devastanam Gumasta in the Sevagunga Estate under attachment for, in all, 7 years 9 months and 1 day, till Septr. 1844 when the Estate was restored to the Zemindar. This service has been rightly rejected by the Examiner of Claims.

N.

S. D. S.

2. He was next entertained on a permanent establishment as Police Räyasam on the 1st May 1850, and served continuously till the 8th Jany 1865, a period of 14 years 8 months and 8 days; but of this the last 4 years only were passed in grades qualifying for pension. He was 58 years of age in June 1869 when the Medical certificate submitted in support of his application was obtained.

3. The applicant was appointed a Sub-Magistrate on Rs 70 on the 15 June 1864 but was removed from that post on the 8th Jany 1865, for gross ignorance of the Criminal Procedure Code. In the order of dismissal the District Magistrate declared that the applicant would be reemployed on the occurrence of a suitable vacancy. In 1866 he appealed to Govt who considered that the Magistrate was justified in dismissing him, but directed that the promise made in 1865 should be fulfilled. This however was not done, and in March 1869, Pichuvayar petitioned for a gratuity. Enquiry was made as to his service and on the 30th June 1869 he was declared unfit for further service from old age and infirmity, rheumatism, and impaired vision.

4. The Examiner of Claims reports that the applicant

applicant having been removed for ignorance and not reemployed is not entitled to any gratuity.

5. The Govt. observe that Pichuvayar was not finally dismissed, and, under all the circumstances, consider that he ought to be allowed a gratuity. They resolve therefore to grant to him, subject to the confirmation of the Govt. of India, a gratuity of Rs. 150, being equal to three months pay of the post held by him for nearly 3 years previous to his short tenure of the Office of Sub-Magistrate.

6. Pichuvayar's petition No. 777 of 1869 will be endorsed accordingly.

This man's case is a somewhat hard one. If he had been re-employed as the magistrate promised & the Govt. ordered, he would not have lost his services. He is one of the old school, who though not fit to work the C.C.P. was possibly a good Police Ameen. The full gratuity is Rs 280.

12 Copies

Despd. 29/3.

To the Offg Collector of Madura
— Examiner of Claims
— Accountant General
— Finl Department

Pens. Pros. No. 221 d/23d May/70.
1

Gratuity to Pichavayy
late Sub Magist
in the Madura Dist

13/5/85

Govt. of {1870} Madras.

Pension

To

The Collector of Madura

F. No. 364

Dated March 19th }
Recd. } 1870, No 128

~~Nos.~~ March.

Granting subject to the confirmation of the Govt. of India a gratuity of Rs. 150 – to Pichavayer late Sub-Magistrate of Chinnamanur Division in the District of Madura.

C: 22 Feby
R 15 March