1. Number of pages. 32
2. Date of repair. [illegible]
3. Initials of Referance:

M.R.O. 1—82 400—22-11-80

MADRAS RECORD OFFICE.

Government of Madras.

Pension **DEPARTMENT.**

G.O. No. 303 **Press** ~~**Mis.**~~

Dated 1st May 1872.

Not to be folded or roughly handled

[illegible]

Proceedings of the Madras Government, Pension Department,
1st May 1872.

Read the following papers :—

From the Collector of Malabar, dated 31st May 1871.
,, the Acting Accountant-General, Madras, dated 2nd February 1872, No. 559.

ORDER THEREON, 1st May 1872, No. 303.

Perumal Pillai, late Sub-Magistrate of Chevashery, Malabar District, applies for retiring pension of Rupees 31-10-0, equal to half his average salary for the past five years.

2. His total service amounts to thity-six years, eight months, and four days, of which five years, five months, and ten days do not reckon towards pension, making his net period of service thirty-one years, two months, and twenty-four days. On the 15th January 1858, he was appointed Stamp Darogah and served on a fixed salary, debited to stamp sales, for two years, three months, and seventeen days, after which there was a break in his service of seven months and seventeen days, owing to the abolition of the post.

3. Under a strict interpretation of the rules, the applicant's service as Stamp Darogah should not only be excluded from the computation, but constitutes a break entailing the forfeiture of his former service, amounting to twenty-two years, ten months, and fourteen days. Owing to the break in question, the applicant's qualifying service amounts to only eight years, four months, and thirteen days, and he is entitled to a gratuity of eight months' pay.

4. The Honourable the Governor in Council, however, taking into consideration the fact that the period of service forfeited in the present case amounts to more than twenty-two years, whilst the term of disqualification was so brief, is pleased to overlook the break, and to grant to Perumal Pillai a retiring pension of Rupees 31-10-0 equal to half his average salary for the past five years, with effect from the 1st February 1871, subject, however, to the confirmation of the Government of India.

(True Extract.)

Acting Secretary to Government.

To the Collector of Malabar.
,, Accountant-General.

Exd. J. Wright.

Govt. of 1872 Madra

PENSION.

To

THE COLLECTOR OF MALABAR,

&c., &c.,

Dated May, 1st.

Recd.

Encl.

G. O., 1st *May* 1872, *No.* 303.

MAY.

Granting, subject to the confirmation of th
Government of India, a pension of Rupees 31-10-
per mensem to Perumal Pillai, late Sub-Magis
trate of Chevashery, Malabar District.

---

(45)

1 Regr of application for Pension
for Mr. Perumal Pillay d/ 31st May/71

TDC

PENSION REPORT DEPARTMENT.

P.A.COLE
7 DEC
1871
U.C.S.

Fort Saint George,
Accountant General's Office
The 4th Decr 1871.

To

The Collector of
Malabar

THE undersigned has the honor to return the papers connected with the

Pension .... ~~Gratuity~~ .... ~~Compassionate Allowance~~... } case noted in the margin, received with ~~letter~~ Memo.

dated 21 May/71 No. for want of Nos. 5, 27 & 37.

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

Offg Asst. to the
Accountant General.

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 of the Register, of the proposed amount of Gratuity.
17. 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.
18. For deletion of Remarks at foot of the Register, if the applicant did not receive any gratuity.
19. For the deletion of grounds of retirement, &c., other than those required under N.B. at foot of the Register.
20. Discharge Certificate from the Superintendent of Police showing the period of the applicant's employment in the new Police, and why his services were dispensed with.

Recd 16/7/2.

1. 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 the Head of the Department, in support of the applicant's service from to which cannot be proved from the official records, and a statement of contemporary employés as required by the Notifications published at page 995, 2nd Volume of *Fort St. George Gazette* for 1868, and at page 1,576, 2nd Volume of do. for 1870.

22. Explanation of the cause of delay in submission of application until when the applicant appears from the statement of service to have ceased to do duty on the

23. 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.

24. 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. 1,517, dated 25th April 1868, Indian Medical Department.

25. Medical Certificate in prescribed form shewing the applicant's inability to serve longer.
   a. Vide Government Notifications, published at pages 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.

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

× dated 31st May/71

— 27. Transmission of the True Copy of the order of Govt. dated 10th May/65 No 965 and true copy of Proceedings of the Bd of Revenue dated 29th May/65 No 2809 and 5 Feby/70 No 840 referred to in the Collr's Memo + under which the

28. Translation of the orders of applicant

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

30. 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

31. Insertion in the 1st and 2nd sides of the Register, of the correct periods of years. as pencilled, instead of years.

32. 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.

33. English Translation of affidavit to be given, on the back of the same (herewith returned), so as

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

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

36. 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.

37 The Bills or Vouchers in which the applicant is shewn as 4th Goomastah in the Collr's Office from 29th Augt 1856 to 14 January /58 on a Salary of Rs 30 per mensem, should be pointed out, as P. Kistna Row is shewn in the Return for 1857 on record in this Office as 4th Goomastah in the Collr's Office on a Salary of Rs 30 per mensem —

No. 2,809.

Proceedings of the Board of Revenue, dated 29th May 1865.

Read the following letter from G. A. BALLARD, Esq., Collector and Magistrate of Malabar, to R. A. DALYELL, Esq., Acting Secretary to the Board of Revenue, dated Calicut, 27th April 1865, No. 64:—

1. I have the honor to submit an original letter (and its enclosure) from the Acting Joint Magistrate, reporting his removal of Perumal Pillai from the post of Sub-Magistrate of Tellicherry.

Dated 22nd March 1865.

2. Perumal Pillai was appointed "Acting" Sub-Magistrate of Tellicherry on the 1st December 1863. He was appointed "Acting" as he had not passed any Test Examination; but as his former appointment was filled up, the new one was, I consider, to all intents and purposes a substantive appointment, and I doubt whether the Acting Joint Magistrate was justified in dismissing the man without reference through this Office to the Board of Revenue, or to the High Court.

As most Tahsildars and Sub-Magistrates have been since the re-organization of Establishments.

The Joint Magistrate's remarks impute general misconduct, as well as misconduct in a particular case. Vide Government Order, dated 24th December 1863.

3. Perumal Pillai has appealed to me, but I do not conceive that I have authority in the matter. I beg therefore to submit it for orders.

Enclosure No. 1.

From J. H. GARSTIN, Esq., Acting Joint Magistrate of Malabar, to G. A. BALLARD, Esq., Magistrate of Malabar, dated Tellicherry, 22nd March 1865, No. 41.

In forwarding the enclosed copy of my reasons for removing Perumal Pillai from the post of Sub-Magistrate here, I have the honor to request that you will correct a clerical error in my letter of the 20th instant, No. 38, in which the period during which no entries were made in the Sub-Magistrate's diary is entered as one week instead of five days.

Reason for the removal of Perumal Pillai from post of the Acting Sub-Magistrate of Tellicherry.

1. On the night of the 9th instant a woman named Lakshmi, a prostitute by profession, was arrested by Police Inspector MacIntosh for screaming out very foul and abusive language in the vicinity of a public road to the annoyance of the neighbours. She was conveyed to the lock-up, together with her nephew who had been abetting her. They were both very drunk at the time. After being locked up for the night, they were discharged in the morning on bail to appear at 10 A. M. before the Sub-Magistrate. They appeared accordingly, and the Sub-Magistrate at once ordered them to go away as he had given no orders for their detention. They then preferred a complaint before the Sub-Magistrate against the Inspectors for false imprisonment. This charge the Sub-Magistrate refused to take cognizance of, because he had no jurisdiction over Europeans.

2. The same afternoon (the 10th) a Charge Sheet and the bail-bond for the appearance of Lakshmi and her nephew reached the Sub-Magistrate's Office, as he alleges, about 3 P. M.; but he took no notice of it that day, owing, as he says, to press of work, nor on the next day. On the morning of the 12th, on arriving at my office at about 11 o'clock, I found the Sub-Magistrate waiting there. On asking him what he wanted, he said "nothing." So I ordered him to return to his office, and he went away. This occurred at my first entry into the office and just as I was going to receive Petitions, and at this time Lakshmi and her nephew were outside the office waiting to prefer their complaint, (which they did immediately afterwards,) of wrongful confinement and assault against Police Inspectors MacIntosh and Matcher.

3. These two Inspectors were summoned accordingly, and the case was inquired into by me on Monday the 13th, and was dismissed as false, and Lakshmi was ordered to pay 50 Rupees as amends to the two accused parties.

4. Just about half an hour before the case was over, and just as the witnesses who had been summoned on behalf of the prosecution had deposed to knowing nothing of the charge, a report was sent to my office from the Sub-Magistrate's (about 300 yards off) reporting that a Charge Sheet had been sent in against Lakshmi, and requesting orders as to its disposal. The ink of this report was almost damp, so it had evidently only been written the minute before, and hastily despatched to my office.

5. The next morning, a charge was preferred by the two Inspectors against the Head Quarters Inspector of having instigated the woman Lakshmi to prefer the false complaint knowingly, and of having openly boasted in the Tellicherry Sub-Magistrate's Court that he would assist her to the utmost of his power, and that he had caused the sending of the Charge Sheet against Lakshmi to be delayed.

6. The fact that the Head Quarters Inspector raised this affair speaks for itself. The Head Quarters Inspector will be reported to the Superintendent. As to the Sub-Magistrate, his conduct is, to say the least of it, most suspicious. On inspection of his Police Diary on the 17th (yesterday) showed that for five days he has kept no Police Diary at all, the last day written up being the 11th. He was perfectly well aware that Lakshmi had gone to prefer a charge before me against the Inspectors, while he was also well aware that a previous charge against her was pending in his own office, yet instead of disposing of it without delay or informing me of the fact and asking for orders, he wastes his time hanging about my office, and waits till the evidence for the prosecution breaks down, and then sends in a report which he had written himself some hours before, but copied in a great hurry (so great that the Gumastah who copied it forgot to sign it) asking for orders regarding Lakshmi's case.

7. The only conclusion I can come to from his conduct is, that he wilfully delayed the investigation of the charge against Lakshmi in order to let her take out a summons against the two Inspectors and have them pulled up before me and tried. I have long had reason to be dissatisfied with the Sub-Magistrate's conduct as a Magistrate, and have received numerous complaints against him of bribery and corruption, of which however I never took any notice because they were anonymous; but the manner of his disposal of one or two cases alluded to by the anonymous writers, and the presumption that a series of complaints would not be made without some sort of ground for them have led me to suspect his honesty, and the present case so confirms my impression of his want of integrity that I do not consider it advisable to allow him to remain any longer in the responsible post of Sub-Magistrate, and shall therefore remove him.

8. The Acting Sub-Magistrate of Tellicherry, Perumal Pillai, is therefore removed from his acting appointment.

(True Copy.)

TELLICHERRY,
18th March 1865.

(Signed) J. H. GARSTIN,
Acting Joint Magistrate.

ENCLOSURE No. 2.

ABSTRACT.—Petition of Perumal Pillai, Sub-Magistrate of Tellicherry, dated 21st March 1865, alluded to in the above letter.

The Board observe that the Joint Magistrate had the power to remove the Sub-Magistrate of Tellicherry from his post without reference to the Collector or the Board. On the Sub-Magistrate appealing against the Joint Magistrate's decision, it was the duty of the Collector to hear and dispose of the case as he deemed right and proper. Mr. Ballard is requested now to adopt this course.

(True Copies and Extract.)

(Signed) R. A. DALYELL,
Acting Secretary.

To G. A. Ballard, Esq., Collector of Malabar,
with original letter returned.

Exd. R. H. Lee.

1865. Department.

No.
PROCEEDINGS OF THE BOARD OF REVENUE,

Dated 29th May 1865.

No. 2,809.

Requesting the Collector to hear and dispose of the Petition of Perumaul Pillay appealing against the decision of the Acting Joint Magistrate dismissing him from his post of Sub-Magistrate of Tellicherry.

Revs 161/72.

Proceedings of the Magistrate of Malabar.

Read appeal petition from Perumal Pillai late acting Sub Magte of Tellicherry, d/ 21st March 1865.

Read records of the cases connected with Perumal Pillai's removal from his appointment. Calender Cases Nos 17, and 20 and 202 (J. P.) of 1865.

Examination of Perumal Pillai, Sub: Magte of Tellichery.

Examination of Parapurat Poken, Dufter Band to the Sub: Magistrate.

Joint Magtes letter No 41 dated 22d March 1865 with enclosures.
Do Do Do No 70 dated 8 June 1865.
Do Do Do No 70 dated 12 June 1865.
Copy of Do Do order to Perumal Pillay d/ 28 March 1865. No 25.

It seems that one Lakomi a prostitute at Tellicherry was locked up by Police Inspectors Mc Intosh and Matcher for using abusive language on the night of the 9 March last. She was discharged on bail to appear before the Sub: Magistrate on the morning of the 10 idem. She appeared, but no charge having been received, the Sub: Magte ordered her to go away. He declined to entertain a charge of false imprisonment against the Inspectors as they were Europeans. That afternoon he received the Charge Sheet against Lakomi, but he took no action thereon till the 13, when he wrote to ask the Joint Magte what course to pursue as meantime Lakomi had lodged her charge of wrongful confinement against the Inspectors before the Joint Magte.

2. It seems that immediately after this, a charge was preferred by the 2 Inspectors against the Head Quarter Inspector of having instigated Lakomi to prefer her charge, and of having boasted in the

Sub: Magte's

Sub: Magte's Court that he (the Head Quarter Inspector) would assist Lakami and had caused the sending of the charge sheet to be delayed.

I observe that this charge was compromised, in a manner which does not appear to me at all satisfactory; but which does not leave ground to assume that its allegations were in all respects correct.

3. It appears to me that the Sub: Magte was reprehensively careless. but I do not think the conclusion warranted "that he wilfully delayed the investigation "of the charge against Lakami in order to let her take "out a summons against the 2 Inspectors & have them "pulled up and tried" before the Joint Magte

4. The Joint Magte remarks that numerous anonymous complaints have been received against the Sub: Magte but that they have not been enquired into - anonymous complaints may fairly lead to the presumption that a man has enemies; but hardly, unless supported, that he is correct. As these complaints do not appear to have been sufficiently supported to become subjects of enquiry, objection may justly be taken to their being brought forward now.

5. I do not consider that what has come to light in these records warrants the dismal of Perumal Pillai. I observe that the Joint Magte: himself did not intend dismissal but merely removal from the post of Sub: Magte of Tellichery, as he was under the impression that Perumal Pillai had the substantive appointment of Sub: Magte of Chowghaut.

This was a mistake. The removal of Perumal Pillai from the Sub: Magtcy of Tellicherry under the circumstances
would

would, in fact, be his dismissal from that grade of service. a punishment certainly out of proportion to any offence proved against him.

Under these circumstances, the Joint Magte's order for the removal of Perumal Pillai from the Sub: Magistracy of Tellicherry, is cancelled.

(Sd) C. A. Ballard
Magte:

Malabar Magte's Court
Calicut 21st June 1865

(True Copy)
P. A. Cole

True Copy
Dy Collr

Revs 161/72.

U.S. 22 FEB 1870

No. 840.

Proceedings of the Board of Revenue, dated 5th February 1870.

Read the following letter from A. McC. WEBSTER, Esq., Acting Collector of Malabar, to the Acting Secretary to the Board of Revenue, dated Calicut, 7th January 1870, No. 12:—

With reference to the Board's endorsement, dated 12th October 1869, on petition from V. Perumal Pillay, Sub-Magistrate of Chavasherry, I have the honour to enclose copy of a letter from the Sub-Collector, reporting his reasons for transferring Perumal Pillay from Tellicherry to Chavasherry.

2. The Board will perceive, that Mr. Logan has, ever since he joined the Sub-division, considered Perumal Pillay neither competent nor trustworthy. That his incompetency was prominently displayed in the course of an inquiry held by him in the early part of last year. During the absence of Mr. Logan and the Superintendent of Police from Tellicherry, Perumal Pillay appears to have licensed certain persons to gamble during the Mohorum festival. Mr. Logan ordered his Sheristadar to inquire into the case, and as it appeared that his explanation was unsatisfactory, he was directed to retire. He consequently applied for pension, but appealed to the Collector, stating that he was forced to send in his application, and the Collector, thereupon, allowed it to be withdrawn.

3. As Mr. Logan considered the man was unfit for the important Office of Sub-Magistrate of Tellicherry, he transferred him to Chavasherry, the easiest charge in the Sub-division, but of lower pay. Perumal Pillay appealed to the Collector, Mr. Thomas, who saw no reason for questioning the expediency of the transfer.

4. I have the honour to return the petition.

Enclosure No. 1.

From W. LOGAN, Esq., Sub-Collector, to the Officiating Collector of Malabar, dated Tellicherry, 21st December 1869, No. 280.

As requested in your Memorandum, No. 2,328A, dated 19th October last, I have the honour to return Board's Petition No. 2,827 of 1869, and to report that I have, ever since I joined the Sub-Division, considered Perumal Pillay, the present Chavasherry Sub-Magistrate, neither competent nor trustworthy. I may add that I formed this opinion of him quite independently, for until lately, I was ignorant of what opinion my immediate predecessor, Mr. Thomas, held with respect to him. And I have reason to think that Mr. Garstin, who knew him very well, entertained a similar opinion to Mr. Thomas' and mine. Indeed Mr. Garstin once transferred him from his post as Sub-Magistrate to a Goomastahship in Cherrakel Talook. On that occasion he was re-instated by the Collector, there being it seemed nothing tangible to bring against him.

2. His unfitness for his office was brought prominently to my notice in the course of an appeal from one of his decisions (Calendar No. 5 of 1869) in the early part of this year. I will here relate shortly what he did in that case.

3. Four individuals were charged by the Police with having blocked up a public lane in the Town of Tellicherry. In the course of the inquiry, two witnesses were called and examined on oath. One of these witnesses, with a view to screen (as the Sub-Magistrate thought and as no doubt was the case) the first defendant, named in the Police Charge Sheet, admitted in his deposition on oath having blocked up the lane; and he was, therefore after a delay of several days put on his trial as fifth defendant, and convicted. The other witness (a woman) in the course of her evidence on oath, implicated the fourth defendant, who on being called on to rebut the charge, produced witnesses in his defence who, in turn, implicated the woman; the woman was then solely on this evidence of the *defence* witnesses put on her trial as sixth defendant, and convicted also. In addition to this, the evidence related to what occurred on two separate days and to what was done by a different set of people on each day, and yet the Sub-Magistrate jumbled the whole up together and disposed of it in the course of a single proceeding, the record of which is both excessively voluminous and confused. There was not only a failure of justice in letting off the first defendant, the really guilty party, who resorted to the shallow artifice of getting another man to come forward to confess, but the proceedings were, I consider, grossly irregular, and a woman was convicted, who ought not to have been convicted at all, and on evidence which would surely have been rejected by any one else.

4. Some time after the disposal of this appeal, and while both Lieutenant Hole and I happened to be out of Tellicherry on circuit, I received the enclosed petition. I immediately wrote to him on the subject, and my Sheristadar who was proceeding to Tellicherry made an inquiry, the result of which I now also forward. The notes taken at the time have been unfortunately lost; the enclosed report is written out from memory, and I can add that it corresponds with what I recollect was reported to me at the time.

5. During the last Mohurrum festival, gambling was carried on in Tellicherry to an unprecedented extent, and quite openly, and so much did it seem to be under the patronage of the authorities, that the petitioner Nubichen applied to me by post to give him a license, promising to pay Rupees 50 as a license fee, as the other had done, and objecting to Rupees 70, which he said had been demanded from him. The Sub-Magistrate was asked to explain why he permitted this public gambling, and in his Report (No. 21, dated 20th April 1869,) he made excuse for doing so, by referring to the endorsements on certain petitions presented to my predecessor in 1865 and 1866, by which the petitioners he said had been permitted to carry on the game, and stated that such had been the practice in 1865 and 1866, before I joined the sub-division. He said nothing about what took place in 1867-68, when I was in Tellicherry, and when there was certainly no such public gambling. The orders* on the petitions referred to could not be construed into authorizing such wholesale public gambling as prevailed, and the Sub-Magistrate should certainly have asked permission before sanctioning it. The fact was, I believe, that in 1865 and 1866, th Chatty gamblers were *not* allowed to carry on the game *in public*, the Police being then under better supervision; but this year, the Police under Mr. Diaz, took advantage of the Superintendent and myself both being absent, to license wholesale public gambling, and I have no hesitation in saying that the Sub-Magistrate for a consideration, gave hi sanction. It was currently reported that he received money for doing so, but it was impossible t get evidence of it from the Town Police men or Chatty men, and with characteristic cunning, h had a plausible answer ready for the objections I had to make. I may add, as an additiona proof of the relations which existed between the Sub-Magistrate, the Police, and the Chatty gamblers that my orders to stop the public gambling which must have reached the Sub-Magistrate in th forenoon was not carried out till late in the evening of the same day.

6. After this, as he was entitled to pension, I suggested to him strongly that he shoul retire. Of the rest you are aware.

7. When Mr. Thomas wrote to say that he should not be removed unless he was willing to go I considered that he could not be put back to Tellicherry which is rather an important Sub-Magistrate's charge, and I, therefore, gave him the easiest charge in my division where he could do leas damage.

(True Copy.)
(Signed) A. McC. WEBSTER,
Acting Collector.

---

* NOTE.—The petitions were not forwarded. The numbers and dates of the endorsements were not mentioned in the report, but two endorsements were given, viz., No. 114 of 1865 and No. 107 of 1866, to the effect there was no objection to the game being carried on *in private*.

Pros 16/7/2

ENCLOSURES Nos. 2 and 3.—Petitions.

ENCLOSURE No. 4.—Sheristadar's report.

THE petitioner will be informed that the Board see no reason to interfere.

(True Copies and Extract.)
(Signed) J. GROSE,
Sub-Secretary.

To the Officiating Collector of Malabar, with report, returned.

Exd. G. A. Turton.

To
The Dy Collector
Calicut
22-2-76

17

81

No. 2616.

Malabar Collector's Office
Calicut 15th December 1871.

From
A. MacGregor Esq.
Collector of Malabar,

To
R. W. Lodwick Esq.
Offg. Accountant-General,
Fort St. George.

Audit

Sir,

In returning your Office Memorandum+ and its enclosures, I have the honor to state that the authority quoted in the 5th & 6th para of this Office Memo: appended to the Register was a clerical error.

The+ applicant was reduced on the 22nd March 1865 from the Post of Sub Magistrate of Tellicherry for negligence in Magisterial duty, and was reinstated by the Magistrate in his proceedings of the 21st June 1865, held under Board's Pro: of the 29th May 1865. Copies of both these documents× are enclosed with a request that the printed Copy of the Board's Pro: may be returned.

With regard to the objection No 37 I have to state that from 1st October 1856 to 30th August 1857, the applicant, while holding the permanent post of the 4th Gumastah of the Huzoor Office, was acting for the 2nd Gumastah.

Of 4th Instant.

+ V. Perumal Pillay.

No 2809.

× as also Bd. Pro: 5 Feby/40 No 840 to be rtd.

DV

(Rs 2 A 15 Ps 8 Hys)

Gamastah, hence the applicants' name appears as 2nd and Krishna Rows as 4th Gamastah in the return of 1857, though they both were then holding Acting appointments.

The certificate of the age of the applicant has been attached.

I have the honor to be
Sir,
Your most obdt Servt
A. M. Winterbotham
Asst for Collector

Accountant General's Office
Recd 19 12 1871
Ansd

1871

From
The Collector of
Malabar
To
The Offg Secy. Board of Revenue
First Dept.

Dated 15 Dec 1871
No. 2616
Enclosures 5

Explains certain discrepancies in the Register for the Pension of Ramal Pillay late Sub Magte. of Cherikal

45
Recd. 16/1/72.
12532

19

Memorandum.

1 In October and December 1841 annas 5 and pies 5 and annas 2 and pies 9 respectively were deducted from the applicants salary in the Column of Pay Bill "Under Savings and Refunds" but there is nothing in the records to show why these deductions were made.

2 The cause of applicants transfer on the 1st April 1865 from the post of Rs 30 to one of Rs 28 per month cannot be traced from records; the applicant explains that this was done at his own request.

3 The break from 1st May to 17th December 1860 was caused by the abolition of the post of Stamp Daroga.

4 The break from 1st October to 31st December 1861 was caused by the applicant having been suspended for 3 months for omitting to report a case of theft of Government property in his Court and allowing one of his clerks to recover the property and levy fines from the Police guards.

5 Applicant was reduced from the 22d March 1865 from the Post of Sub Magistrate of Tellicherry to that of 1st Gumastah of Cherikal Taluq for carelessness in a Criminal Case Vide G. O. 10 May 1865 No. 965. But he does not appear to have done duty or drawn pay in that post. The Salary up to 2d May 1865 was refunded and for the remaining period up to 28 June 1865 one Ishwara Putter acted in the post.

6 Applicant was reinstated in his post of Sub Magistrate of Tellicherry on the 29th June 1865. under the Board's Proceedings dated 29th May 1865 No. 2809.

Dy Collr

Ansd 6 .1871

He however was on the 11th June 1869 transferred to a similar appointment in Chavacherry on the reduced pay of Rupees 50 per month. Vide Boards Proceedings 5th February 1870 No 840.

Copy forwarded

Malabar Colr Office }
Calicut 31 May 1871 }

A. MacGregor
Collector

EGISTER *of an application for Superannuation Pension under Pension Rules published under date* 3rd *May* 1864, *from the* Establishment *of the* Collector *of* Malabar.

1	Full name of Pensioner… … …	Wathiarvittil Permal Pillay			
2	Sect or caste… … … … …	Sudra - Pillay			
3	Residence … … … … …	Calicut			
4	Present post … … … … …	Sub Magistrate of Chavashery			
5	Date of commencement of service… … …	28th May 1834	36 - 8 - 4		
6	Date of retirement from service … … …	31 January 1871	5 - 5 - 10 31 - [illegible] - 24		
7*	Abstract of the grounds of application.	1. Good service … … … ~~2. Inability to serve longer~~ … ~~3. Reduction of Establishment~~			
			Years.	Months.	Days.
8*	How long unemployed, and under what circumstances.	~~1. Resigned the service from to~~			
		2.† Reduction of Establishment from 1 May to 16th Dec/60.	"	7.	17.
		3. Suspended from 1st October to 31st Dec/61.	"	3.	"
		~~4. Dismissed for misconduct from to~~			
9	Total of service before 22 years of age… … … … … … … … … … …		1.	"	"
10	Total of service not in Pension grades … … … … … … … … …		3.	3.	26.
11	Total of leave other than privilege and preparatory leave … … … … …		"	5.	26.
	Grand Total… … …		5.	8.	9.
12	Total period in Pension grades counted as service … … … … … … …		30.	11.	27.
13‡	Age of the applicant at the time of this application … … … … … … …		58.	"	"
				Feet.	Inches.
14	Height … … … … … … … … … … … … … …			5.	5.
15	Descriptive marks.—	Full body. Slightly pock marked. a faint dark spot round the outside corner of the right eye. a small cicatrice on the right cheek. Head nearly bald. top knot small & scanty. Complexion dark.			
			Rs.	A.	P.
16	Average salary of past 5 years … … … … … … … … … … …		62.	"	"
17	Proposed amount of Pension… … … … … … … … … … … …		31.	"	"
18	Date from which to commence …	1st February 1871			
19	Place of payment … … … …	Calicut.			

* *N. B.*—The reason of the applicant's retirement and of his being unemployed for the periods given being left, the other grounds of retirement and reasons of break in employment should be erased with red ink.

† It is hereby certified that no gratuity was drawn by the applicant on reduction of Establishment in the year.
~~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.~~ A. P.
~~Refund of gratuity was credited to the account for the month of~~ 186 .

It is hereby certified that the alleged periods of the applicants Service are borne out by Offl. records.

A. MacGregor
Collector

‡ I do hereby certify, that to the best of my belief the applicant's age above stated is correct.

Dy Collr

Accountant General's Office
Recd 3 6 1871
Ansd

Statement of total period of Service.

Establishment.	Post.	Pay. Rs.	A.	P.	Period. From	To	Yrs.	Ms.	Ds.	Accountant General or Controller of Military Accounts Remarks.
Pymarh Cutcherry	Extra Gomastah	9	„	-	28 May '34	28 Feby '35	„	9.	1.	Need not be verified not counting for superior pension.
Collr's Huzur Treasury	4th Gomasta	14	„	„	1 Mar: '35.	31 Dec: '35.	„	10.	„	Verified, but cannot count for pension, having been vitiated by the applicant's employment as Stamp Darogah drawing pay from the sale proceeds of Stamps from 15th January 1858 to 30th April 1860. Vide G.O. dated 28th January 1870 No. 41 Pension Department.
Huzur Tobacco Gotah:	2d Ditto	14	„	„	1 Jany '36	31 Mar: '38	2.	3.	„	
Collr's Offe	3d Ditto	20	„	-	1 Apl: '38	19 June '41.	3.	2.	19.	
Hd. Aspt. Collr's Offe	2d Ditto	21	„	-	20 June '41	9 Feby '43	1.	7.	21.	
Collr's Offe	7 Ditto	24.	8	-	10 Feby '43	1 Feby '44	„	11.	23.	
Do.	3d Munshi	28	„	-	2d Feby '44	28 Feby '48.	4.	„	27.	
Do.	4 Gomasta	30	„	-	1 Mar: '48.	19 June '55.	7.	3.	19	
Hd. Aspt. Collr's Offe	Hd. Do	30	„	-	20 June '55	31 Mar: '56.	•	9.	12	
Collr's Offe	3d Munshi	28	„	-	1 Apl: '56.	28 Aug: '56	„	4.	28	
Ditto	4 Gomasta	30.	„	„	29 Aug: '56.	14 Jany '58.	1.	4.	17	
Ditto	Stamp Daroga	50	„	-	15 Jany '58	30 Apl: '60.	2.	3.	17	
Break		„	„	-	1 May '60.	17 Decr: '60.	„	7.	17.	
Betutnad Taluk.	Ag Sheristedar	40	„	„	18 Dec: '60	30 Apl: '61.	„	4.	14.	Need not be verified having been rendered only in acting appointments
Chowghat	Ag Sub Magte	35	„	-	1 May '61.	30 Sep: '61.	„	5.	„	
Break		„	„	„	1 Oct: '61.	31 Decr: '61.	„	3.	„	Verified from the Records of this Office. Total period of applicant's qualifying service, less 5 months and 10 days for absence on leave, and 3 months and 8 days from 22nd March to 28th June 1865 during which he did not do any duty nor drew any pay is yrs 8-4-12. The applicant does not appear from the records of this Office to have drawn any Ag Allowance when he retired from service.
Chowghat	Sub Magte	35	„	-	1 Jany '62	30 Sepr '62	„	9.	„	
Cherkal Taluk	Ag Sherr	50	„	„	1 Oct: '62	30 Nov: '63	1.	2.	„	
Tellicherry	Sub Magte	50	„	„	1 Dec: '63	21 Mar: '65	1.	3.	21.	
Cherkal Taluk	1st Gomasta	20	„	„	22d Mar: '65	28 June '65	„	3.	8.	
Tellicheiry	Sub Magte	50	„	„	29 June '65	31 May '66.	„	11.	2	
Ditto	Ditto	70	„	„	1 June '66	10 June '69	3.	„	10.	
Chavacherry	Ditto	50	„	„	11 June '69	31 Jany '71.	1.	7.	20	

appears Page 323 of 1865

		Years.	Months.	Days.			
Total......					36.	8.	6.
Deduct service before 22 years of age		1	„	„			
Deduct service not in Pension grades		×4.	2.	13.			
Deduct leave		„	5.	26	5.	8.	9.
Net period of Service......					30.	11.	27.

× This is composed of the periods marked A, C, E

Explanation of Column 8 with quotations of orders of reinstatement.	Explanation of any degradation.
Vide separate Memorandum	

Detail of leave on half pay and full stoppage of pay. From	To	Yrs.	Ms.	Ds.	Remarks by the head of the Office on past character and conduct of the applicant throughout the service.
20 Mar: '60.	4 Apl: '60	„	„	16	The applicant on several occasions incurred the displeasure of his superiors & was punished. Nothing however against his honesty ever transpired, & he may [illegible] considered as being [illegible]
15 Aug: '63	23d Sep: '63	„	1.	10.	
1 Aug: '69.	30 Nov: '69.	„	4.	„	
	Total of leave...	„	5.	26	

Malr Collectors Office,
The 31 May 1871.

Collector

No. 559

REPORT OF THE Accountant General.

Service qualifying for pension is proved for a total period of... ... ... Years. 8 Months. 4 Days. 12

In the last 5 years of his service the average pay of the applicant's permanent post was ... ... Rs. A. P.

Applicant is eligible only to a Superannuation Gratuity ~~pension~~ of Rupees 400 „ „ ~~per mensem~~, equal to 8 months ~~of his average~~ salary ~~during the last 5 years~~, under ~~Clause~~ Section 56(a) of the Civil ~~Revised~~ Pension ~~Rules.~~ Code.

Fort Saint George
Accountt General's Office,
2d February 1872.

To

The Chief Secretary to Government,
Civil Pension Department.

Pension 1872 Department. No. 161.

From the Ag. Accountant General
Fort Saint George,

To the Chief Secretary to Government,
Civil Pension Department.

559.

Dated 20 February 1872
Received 5

Enclosures.

Verifies the service of V. Perumall Pillay late Sub Magistrate of Charashery borne on the establishment of the Collr. of Malabar.

Pension 1871 Department. No. 161

From the Collector of Malabar

To the Accountant General ~~or Controller of Military Accounts~~.
Fort St George

Dated 31 May 1871.
Received

Register of an application for Superannuation Pension in behalf of Vathvarvitht Permal Pillay late Sub Magt. of Charashery borne on the establishment of the Collec of Malabar

ORDER OF GOVERNMENT.

3181

Pension Dept

25

Memo for Orders

Perumal Pillay, late Sub Magistrate of Charashery, Malabar District, applies for Retiring pension of Rs 31-10-, equal to half his average salary for the past 5 years.

His total service amounts to 36 yrs 8 Ms & 4 days, of which 5 yrs 5 Ms & 10 days do not reckon towards pension, making his net period of service 31 yrs 2 Ms & 24 days. On the 15th January 1858, he was appointed Stamp Darogah and served on a fixed salary debited to stamp ~~[illegible]~~ sales for 2 years 3 Ms and 17 days, after which there was a break in his service of 7 Ms & 17 days, owing to the abolition of the post,

I would follow the precedent of 10 Dec. 70 No 500. which I conclude has not been objected to - i.e. give the pension & report for confirmation

L. W. L.

3187

Under a strict interpretation of the rules, the applicant's service as Stamp Darogah should not only be excluded from the computation but constitutes a break entailing the forfeiture of his former service amounting to 22 yrs 10 Ms 14 days.

Owing to the break in question the applicant's qualifying service amounts to only 8 yrs 4 Ms 13 days & he is entitled to a gratuity of 8 Months' pay.

In two former cases this Government have recommended to the Government of India that the break should be overlooked and as in this case the period of service forfeited amounts to more than 22 years whilst the term of disqualification was so brief, there seems ground for a representation on the applicant's behalf. if the confirmation of the Govt. of India is deemed requisite.

C.W.L.

Sub. say it might be settled here.

The Hon. the Governor in Council, however, taking into consideration the fact that the period of service forfeited in the present case amounts to more than 22 years whilst the term of disqualification was so brief is pleased to overlook the break and to grant to Tirumal Pillai a retiring pension of Rs 31-10 equal to half his average salary for the last five years with effect from the 1st Feb 71, subject, however, to the confirmation of the Govt. of India.

Case of Perumal Pillai
late Sub Magte of Chavashery
Malabar District

C. 19 April

29

Pension Department.

PROCEEDINGS of the MADRAS GOVERNMENT.

Read the following letters from the
Collector of Malabar dated 31st May 1871.
Accountant General, Madras dated 2nd February 1872, No. 559.

Order thereon, 1st May 1872. No. 303.

Perumal Pillai, late Sub Magistrate of Chavashery, Malabar District, applies for retiring pension of Rs 31-10-0, equal to half his average salary for the past 5 years.

2. His total service amounts to 36 years, 8 months, and 4 days, of which 5 years 5 months and 10 days do not reckon towards pension, making his net period of service 31 years, 2 months, and 24 days. On the 15 January 1858 he was

was appointed Stamp Darogah and served on a fixed salary, debited to stamp sales, for 2 years, 3 months and 17 days, after which there was a break in his service of 7 months and 17 days, owing to the abolition of the post.

3. Under a strict interpretation of the rules, the applicant's service as Stamp Darogah should not only be excluded from the computation, but constitutes a break entailing the forfeiture of his former service amounting to 22 years, 10 months and 14 days. Owing to the break in question the applicant's qualifying service amounts to only 8 years, 4 months, and 13 days, and he is entitled to a gratuity of 8 months' pay.

The

4. The Honorable the Governor in Council, however, taking into consideration the fact that the period of service forfeited in the present case amounts to more than 22 years, whilst the term of disqualification was so brief, is pleased to overlook the break, and to grant to Perumal Pillai a retiring pension of Rs 31-10-0 equal to half his average salary for the past five years with effect from the 1st February 1871, subject, however, to the confirmation of the Govt of India.

C.L.

To
The Collector of Malabar. 6
" Accountant General. 6 } 18 Copies

Govt. of {1872} Madra

Pension

The Collector of
Malabar

ated May 1st/4 } 1872, No. 303.
ecd. }

Nos.

Granting subject to the confirmation of the Govt. of India, a pensio of Rs 31-10 per mensem to Perumall Pillay late Sub Magistrate of Chevashery, Malabar District.