

(1) Number of pages 8(2) Date of repair 16-12-40(3) Initials of the Referencer CF

MADRAS RECORD OFFICE.

Government of Madras.

Pension DEPARTMENT.

G.O. No.	531	Press Mis.
Dated	16-12-1873.	

Not to be folded or roughly handledKV 16 12
40



To,
The Chief Secretary to the Government
of Madras.

Financial Dept. Sir,

I am directed to acknowledge the receipt of your letter N^o 367 (Pensions) dated 21st July 1873, forwarding a petition from Agasthyenthatnaraina, late a Duffadar in the Rayahmundry Talook, appealing against the order of the Government of Madras declining to admit his claim to a compassionate allowance.

2 In reply I am directed to suggest that the case may be reconsidered with reference to the following points:-

1st That the petitioner was discharged without fault and did not retire.

2^d That if he had known that there was doubt about his pension it was open to him to have applied for ^{service elsewhere} and

3^d That service was proved for a period of 28 years and that there was some evidence even of longer service.

3. The Governor General in Council would willingly consider

any

any recommendation which the Government
of Madras may be able to make in
petitioner's favour.

I have the honor to be
Sir

Your Most Obedient Servant

W Laidner

Offg Under Secy to the Govt of India

W L 3/9

Simla
The 4th Sept
1873

Under Secy

W Laidner

Despatched 28/10/73

5

Pension Department.
No. 531

To

The Secretary to the Government
of India,

Financial Department.

Sir,

I am directed to acknowledge receipt of Mr. Under Secretary Gardiner's letter of the 4th September 1873, No 2806 suggesting that this Government should reconsider their decision regarding the claim to pension preferred by Agasthy Venkat-
naraina, late a Duffadar in the Rajahmundry Taluq.

The points with reference to which reconsideration is suggested are:-

1st That the petitioner was discharged without fault and did not retire.

That.

Recd: 21 July 1873 No 2367

Pension
Recd 10/7/3 Sept
No 2806

Home
Govt of India Sept
2806

Dated 4 Sept 2 1873
Recd 12 - 1873
No 600

Intimating that the
Govt of India would wil-
lingly consider any recom-
mendation which the Govt
of Madras may ^{be able to} make
in favor of petitioner
Agasthy Venkatanaraina
late Duffadar in the
Rajahmundry taluk

No 531/73

2^d That if he had known that there was doubt about his pension, it was open to him to have applied for service elsewhere.

3^d That service was proved for a period of 28 years and that there was some evidence even of longer service.

With reference to the 1st, I am directed to submit that it received full consideration when a gratuity of \$42 was granted. Had he been discharged for a fault or retired, he would not have been entitled to anything under the rules.

With reference to the 2^d point it is submitted that the applicant must have known that there was "doubt" about his receiving a pension. — In fact he knew that it was only in December 1863 or more than two years after his

no pension could be granted, in as much as

Note

The whole question seems to turn upon whether this Govt believes that Agustya W. Mahanayana really did serve for more than thirty years. The Govt however considered the evidence adduced and rejected it "on account of the vague nature of the testimony adduced which was rendered doubly unsatisfactory

{ the very long time which the applicant seemed to have required for its production }

Unless on reconsideration the evidence is accepted in compliance with the Govt of India's suggestion seems uncalled for. JH

discharged 7
his retirement that it was decided that pensions should be granted under such circumstances.

As regards the 3^d point I am to submit that the applicant has already obtained the gratuity due for a service of 28 years 2 months & 25 days and that as this Government do not credit the testimony adduced to prove longer service they are unable to found upon it any recommendation for a more favorable consideration of petitioner's case. JH

was discharged
The Petr. retired in 1861 - and it was only in 1872 that he produced two witnesses to depose to his employment as a Sayer from 1833.

*By the Hon. Secy of the
Treasury, Rajahmundry, July*

1873 *Madras* Station

To *F. No. 750*
No. 531

The Secretary to the
Government of *Madras*
Financial Department.

Dated *16 October* 1873.

*Informing that the
Government are unable
to recommend for the
favorable consideration
of the Government of
India the case of
Sgt. Major *Subbarao*
in date 3 *September*
in the *Rajahmundry*
Station.*