M.R.O. 1—77,006—8-6-37.

(1) Number of pages 46

(2) Date of repair

(3) Initials of the Referencer

MADRAS RECORD OFFICE.

Government of Madras.

Pension DEPARTMENT.

G.O. No. 28 Press
Mis.

Dated 26-1-1874.

Not to be folded or roughly handled

Proceedings of the Madras Government, Pension Department,
26th January 1874.

Read the following papers :—

From the Collector of North Arcot, dated 15th September 1873.
,, Accountant-General, ,, 19th December ,, No. 460.
Petition from N. Veerasawmy Iyer, ,, 22nd November ,,

Order thereon, 26th January 1874, No. 28.

Under Section 57 of the Civil Pension Code His Excellency the Governor in Council is pleased to grant to Nandialum Veerasawmy Iyer, late 2nd Class Revenue Inspector of Chittoor Taluq, North Arcot District, a superannuation gratuity of Rupees (300) three hundred, or twelve months' pay, to which he is entitled for his qualifying superior service of twelve years, two months, and five days.

2. Petitioner will be informed by endorsement that his qualifying superior service only amounts to twelve years and two months and that the Government see no reason to interfere on his behalf in any way.

(True Extract.)

Ag. Under Secy. to Govt.

To the Collector of North Arcot.
,, Accountant-General, with Register.

Exd. A. S. Rodgers.

Deputy Collector

Curnam of [illegible]

Govt. of 1874 Madras

PENSION.

To
The Collector of North Arcot,
&c., &c., &c.

Dated January, 26th.
Recd.

G. O., 26th January 1874, No. 28.

JANUARY.

Granting a superannuation gratuity of Rupees 300 to Nandialum Veerasawmy Iyer, late 2nd Class Revenue Inspector of Chittoor Talug, North Arcot District.

Revenue Department

3

Miscellaneous No 7045

Proceedings of the Board of Revenue
Dated 17th October 1873

Read letter from the Collector of North Arcot dated 17th September 1873 No 592 reporting on Petition presented by Veerasamy Iyer late 2d Class Revenue Inspector of Chittoor Talug

The Petitioner is probably in error in stating his age to be 53. The Collector states that his appearance and infirmity indicate more advanced age. Moreover there are four entries of the Petitioners age on the Records furnished at different times by himself. his present objection is unreliable. The Board will not interfere on his behalf.

(True Extract)

(Signed) H Stokes
Ag Sub Secretary

(True copy)

Deputy Collector

Rec: with Lr 23 [illegible]

5

Extract from the North Arcot District Gazette dated 6th April 1867 Page 187.

Leave and Appointment by the Collector.

Veerasamy Iyer 1st class Revenue Inspector Palamanair Taluq, has been at his own request transferred to Chittoor Taluq as 2d class Revenue Inspector in lieu of Iyaviah who has been likewise transferred to Palamanair Taluq as 1st class Revenue Inspector. To take effect from the 1st April 1867.

(True Extract)

E Marjoribanks.
Deputy Collector

13

Curnow [illegible]

[illegible] No 3 8/74

No. 20/2

Proceedings of the Collector of North Arcot dated 10th May 1869.

Read Shoriapatti with record submitted by the Tahsildar of Chittoor Taluq on the 28th April 186

These papers relate to a case of darkast made by one Kallanna son of Gunderpalle Chengam of Yelavanchavaripalli a hamlet of Patur in the Chittoor Taluq.

It appears that 4 Kanis of Punja land in that village were taken up without darkast by the said Kallanna's father G. Chengamma and Purankonda Rangappa about two years ago and that after sinking two wells in it they cultivated the land. Last year, Kallanna tendered for the land in a formal Darkast. This darkast it does not appear how or why found its way into the hands of the Revenue Inspector Veerasawmiyer who took it with him to the village and had the application in the prescribed form drawn up under his own personal direction

Whilst this application was being prepar Veerasawmiyer would appear to have instruct the writer of it, Narnappa the brother of the Curnam gumasta Buchamma to include in it the name of one Jonnagadla Ramanna. The application thus drawn up was signed by the Moneegar and when submitted to the Tahsildar wa approved by him. The other signature to it altho it purports to be that of the curnam gumasta Buchamma is not his but was forged in it by the writer his brother Narnappa who is als Curnam of [illegible]

These three public servants viz Revenue Inspector Veerasawmiah, Monigar Venkatareddy Curnam Narasappa have thus so far as the case is before the Collector from ~~making~~ motives of partiality or other corrupt influence combined to frame a false document ~~pending~~ prejudicing the exclusive rights of the proper parties in a plot of ground upon which they had already expended capital and for the purpose of securing which they had made a formal tender–

The Revenue Inspector Veerasawmy Iyer and the Monigar Venkata Reddy have thus rendered themselves ~~lately~~ liable to be dealt with under clause 4 Section II Regulation IX of 1822 and Narasappa to prosecution on a charge of forgery.

Mr Gibson will take up the investigation of this case as soon as he reassumes charge of the Taluq Meanwhile all three persons have been suspended pending enquiry.

As Curnam Gumasta Buchamma appears utterly unfit for the post he will be removed and the Curnam who is a woman will be instructed by the Tahsildar to nominate some fit person whose name will be submitted with report for the Collector's approval.

The Collector would here observe ~~[illegible]~~ generally that as a rule Revenue Inspectors have

---

N. 71

11

Proceedings of the Collector of North Arcot dated 27 January 1870.

During the Jamabandi settlement of the past Fusli, it was reported by the then Tahsildar that Veerasami Iyer the Revenue Inspector of the Chittoor Taluk and Venkat Reddi the Monigar of Pâtur Jagaent in the same Taluk had fraudulently entered in A. Memo prepared under the Durkhast Rules, the name of Jonnagudla Ramanna as joint Durkhastadar with Gundlapalli Nallanna for field No. 259 Cawnies 4 assessed at Rs. 2-12-4 in Yelamichanaripalli in the said Jagaent whereas the said Nallanna had alone made a Durkhast and the said Jonnagudla Ramanna had not applied for the land and that they Defendants have thereby committed the offence defined in paras 4 & 5 Clause II Regulation IX of 1822 and punishable under Section V of the same Regulation.

As the Preliminary enquiry instituted by the Tahsildar showed that it was a case for judicial investigation under the Regulation above quoted, the Revenue Inspector & Monigar were suspended from office and the case was referred to the Hd Collector

Collector's Pro: d/ 28 April 1869.

Mr Gibson who was at the time in charge of the Chittoor Taluk. Mr Gibson having shortly afterwards left the District and the Dy Collector on General duties having immediately afterwards assumed charge of the Taluk, the latter Officer was requested to enquire into the matter and report the result. This the Dy Collector has done; and from the report & record of enquiry submitted by him, it is clear that the charge against the Revenue Inspector has not been proved. Nine witnesses have been examined for the Prosecution and their evidence does not sustain the charge against Veerasamiah although some slight suspicion attaches to his conduct in the matter from the fact of his having been present in the village and inspected the land on the very day the Durkhast A. Memo was prepared. Giving the 1st Defendant the benefit of the doubt, the Collector acquits him of the charge with a warning and ×restores him to his appointment.

Names of Witnesses
1. Yendoopalie Chenganna
2. Kurnam Naranappa
3. do Buchanna
4. Moniem Chengal Reddi
5. Bairannah
6. Jonnagadla Ramanna
7. Samy Venkatasawmi
8. Gurramkonda Rangiah
9. Kambala Kondappa.

× Vide docket to Tahr. of Chittoor dated 30th November 1869 & to Revenue Inspector of same dt. 87.

The 2nd Defendant the Moniyagar admits having had the names of the Durkhastadar Nallanna and of Jonnagadla Ramanna entered in the A Memo, but pleads he did so at the request of the 1st Witness the father of the said Nallanna who denies having made any such request and this is strengthened by the fact that the A Memo was prepared in his absence. These circumstances attach grave suspicion to the conduct of the 2nd Defendant in the matter. He is therefore suspended for one year, such suspension to date from 11th May 1869. 13

At the Preliminary Enquiry held in this matter by the Tahsildar, the 2nd & 3rd Witnesses (who are brothers, the latter being the Kurnam Gumasta of the village and the former the Kurnam of a neighbouring village Polakala) and the 2nd Defendant the Moniyagar stated that the signature of the 3rd witness was entered in the Memo by the 2nd Witness who wrote the A Memo with the acquiescence of the 3rd witness. That statement they withdraw before the Dy Collector declaring that the 3rd witness signed the Memo A. As it appears there are no other witnesses to prove that 2nd witness forged the signature, no proceedings can be taken to prosecute him on a charge of Forgery, and the charge is accordingly dismissed. These village servants will be dismissed from their offices as it is evident they uttered a deliberate falsehood in this matter and conspired to falsify a public Document.

From the deposition of the 1st Witness, the father of Nallanna, the Durkhastadar, it would appear that finding his son's durkhast had not been sent to the village, he made enquiries in the Taluk Cutchery when a Gumasta (Sethoo Row) gave him a form of Memo A and told him

generally, that as a Revenue Inspector
Rule
have

that his Durkhast was not forthcoming in the record, and that the 1st Witness delivered the form to 2nd Defendant. The Collector concurs with the Dy. Collector in thinking that Sethu Row's conduct in the matter is open to suspicion. He was summoned for enquiry but has evaded his examination by sending a Medical Certificate. It was his business to have filed the Durkhast of Nallanna or to account for it when required. It is now missing. Sethu Row will be warned that any further suspicion as to his official conduct will entail his dismissal from Service.

On the 2nd April 1869, Mr. E. Gibson then in charge of the Chittoor Taluk sent a Dakhil to the Tahsildar directing him to call on Veerasawmi Iyr., the Revenue Inspector, for explanation in regard to the entries in his Diaries dated 8th, 9th & 10th October 1869 of the places visited on those days, as other papers forwarded by the Revenue Inspector and bearing those dates appeared to have been written in other places. The Revenue Inspector's Explanation was duly received but was laid by pending the result of the enquiry into the other graver Charge. That explanation has now been taken into consideration and is found to be satisfactory. Another subject also has been allowed to lie over for the same reason. When suspended pending enquiry into the present case, the Revenue Inspector was

was required by the Tahsildar to make over the records of his office to the officiating incumbent. In reply, the Revenue Inspector has written to the Tahsildar in somewhat disrespectful terms of which the Tahsildar complained in his arzee No 278 of the 27th May 1869. Considering the circumstances under which this ebullition of temper was manifested, and seeing that the Tahsildar has left the District, the Collector simply resolves to warn the Revenue Inspector against a repetition of this indiscretion.

Ordered that copy of these Proceedings be forwarded to the Actg. Collector Mr. Jones for information and guidance and that the record of the case be sent to him to be filed in his Office.

(Signed) J. D. Robinson
Collector

(True Copy)

Collector

CAL

that his F

Rec: A/c No 38 of /74

No. 47-

North Arcot, ~~Magistrate~~ Collector's Office,
Chittoor 27th November 1873.

From W. S. Whiteside Esqre

Dis No 266 Dis No 577

To be returned with reply on reverse.

AUDIT DEPARTMENT.

No.

To Clr
16-10-73

21/10/73
Eam

Fort Saint George,
Accountant General's Office,
13th October 1873.

FROM THE DEPUTY ACCOUNTANT GENERAL,
TO THE GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS,

To The Collector of North Arcot

Vide your Office application for Gratuity on behalf of M. Veerasamy Iyah-

The undersigned has the honor to request explanation on the following points:—

1. Why was applts leave of absence from 7th to 21 April /64 (vide Leave Statement for April /64) omitted to be shown in the register of application?
2. What is the cause of discrepancy in the dates of Applt: & termination, and age between those exhibited in the register of application & Service book accompanying? State whether the entries in the former or in the latter are correct.
3. Was the sanction of Govt obtained (for which the B^d of Rev: appear to have been addressed). for the payt of Salary for April & May ordered to be recovered & for June and July withheld owing to the Applicants retention in service after 55 yrs of age?

Please enter the leaves the Applt had at foot of the 3rd side, & insert the signature of the Collr instead of the Thasildars in column 15 on the 1 side of the service book.

erminations shown on the

the age shown on the 1st side of the

Register of application for gratuity

re correct; those shown in the Service

D.K.

Rec: Lr No 3 8/1/74

generally that as a ~~Rule~~ Revenue Inspector have no

No. 47.

North Arcot, ~~Magistrate~~ Collector's Office,
Chittoor 27th November 1873.

From W. S. Whiteside Esqre

Dis No 266 Dis No 577

21

To be returned with reply on reverse.

AUDIT DEPARTMENT.

19

No.

C Cler. 16-10-73

21/10/73 Exam

Fort Saint George,
Accountant General's Office,
13th October 1873.

FROM THE DEPUTY ACCOUNTANT GENERAL,
TO THE GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS,

To The Collector of North Arcot

VIDE your Office application for Gratuity on behalf of M. Veerasamy Iyah.

The undersigned has the honor to request explanation on the following points:—

1. Why was applts. leave of absence from 7th to 21 April/64. (vide Leave Statement for April/64) omitted to be shewn in the register of Application?
2. What is the cause of discrepancy in the dates of Apptt: & termination, and age between those exhibited in the register of Application & Service book accompanying? State whether the entries in the former or in the latter are correct.
3. Was the sanction of Govt. obtained (for which the Bd. of Rev: appear to have been addressed) for the payt. of salary for April & May ordered to be recovered & for June and July withheld owing to the Applicants retention in service after the 55 yrs. of age?

Please enter the leaves the Applt. had at foot of the 3rd side, & insert the signature of the Collr. instead of the Thasildar's in column 15 on the 1 side of the service book.

erminations shown on the

he age shown on the 1st side of the

Register of application for gratuity

re correct; those shown in the Service

DPK

Pr: ed No 3 of 1874

Dis No 266 Inw No 577

To be returned with reply on reverse.

19

AUDIT DEPARTMENT.

No.

Fort Saint George,
Accountant General's Office,
13th October 1873.

C Colr. 16-10-73

21/10/73

FROM THE DEPUTY ACCOUNTANT GENERAL,
TO THE GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS,

TO THE Collector of North Arcot

VIDE your Office application for Gratuity on behalf of M. Veerasamy Dyafr-

The undersigned has the honor to request explanation on the following points:—

1. Why was applts leave of absence from 7th to 21 April/64. (vide Leave statement for April/64) omitted to be shewn in the register of application?
2. What is the cause of discrepancy in the dates of applt: & termination, and age between those exhibited in the register of application & Service book accompanying? State whether the entries in the former or in the latter are correct.
3. Was the sanction of Govt. obtained (for which the Bd. of Rev: appear to have been addressed). for the payt. of Salary for April & May ordered to be recovered & for June and July withheld owing to the Applicants retention in service after the 55 yrs of age?

Please enter the leaves the Applt. had at foot of the 3rd side, & insert the signature of the Collr. instead of the Thasildar's in column 15 on the 1 side of the service book.

generally that as

Book were incorrectly entered by the Applicant. Copy of the Proceedings of the Board of Revenue No 7045 dated 17th October 1873 Concerning the Age of the Applicant is herewith sent.

3. The sanction of Government has been applied for through the Board of Revenue and will be Communicated on its receipt.

2. The leave of which the applicant availed himself on different occasions is particularized at the foot of the 3rd Side of the Service Book and I have signed my name on the 1st side as required. The two Telugu documents returned with your letter under reply are retained as they have no bearing on the Register of Application for Gratuity.

I have the honor to be
Sir
Your Most obed't Servt

Collector

Accountant General's Office
Recd 3 12 1873
Ansd

2d Clk

From ~~The Magistrate~~ Collector of

North Arcot.

To The Accountant General
Fort Saint George

Dated 27-11-73

Despatched 1-12-73

Received

No. 47-

Enclosure.

Subject.

Furnishes the explain on certain points connected with the application of Gratuity for Veerasawmy Iyer-

13352

Rec: in No 3 of /74

2c/1

Collector's
Office

COURT FEE
GOVERNMENT OF INDIA
ONE ANNA

25

To
The Accountant General Esq^re
Fort St George

The humble petition of
N. Veerasawmy Iyr, late 2^nd
Class Revenue Inspector
Chittore Taluq, North
Arcot District,

Most respectfully sheweth,

The Collector Mr White-side has issued a Takeed No 316 dated the 2^nd July 1873 removing your honor's petitioner from the service as being of 55 years old and has recommended him to you for gratuity. But your petitioner begs to state that his age is 53 and not 55. When he was appointed as Taraffdar (now Revenue Inspector) in 1857, his age was entered as 37½ - Afterwards in the year 1870, in the Moyen Zabitah, Submitted by the Chittore Tahsildar to the Huzur his age was rightly entered as 50. But again in the next year, that is in 1871, in the annual Taluq Moyen Zabitah his age was, falsely entered as 53 instead of 51. Hence the difference in the entries of his age —

This is clearly manifest from the records of the Collector.

As your petitioner was at first drawing less salaries than is required for pension, his three years' service was lost. But now, if your petitioner serve for 18 months more he will be entitled to 1/3 pension.

Therefore your petitioner humbly begs that your honor will be pleased to recommend him to the Government for his restoration,

Vide reply Letter 5/12/73 No. 48

Referred to the Collector of North Arcot for his remarks

13033

---

82 No. 48 NORTH ARCOT, ~~MAGISTRATE'S~~ Collector's OFFICE,

Chittoor 5 December 1873. 27

From

W. S. Whiteside Esqr

Collector ~~Magistrate~~ of North Arcot.

To

W. Donald Esqr

Offg Dy Accountant General

Fort Saint George

Sir,

In retransmitting herewith the petition of Veeraswamiayah, late 2nd Class Revenue Inspector of Chittoor Taluq, I have the honor to draw your attention to the Board's Proceedings of 17th October 1873 Mis No 7045, and to state that I do not believe the petitioner's allegations as to his age. He was moreover considered to be unfit for service on the ground of inefficiency &c. I have no more further remarks to offer. Petitioner laid his case before the Board in the strongest possible manner, and knowing that the Board had definitely rejected his claim to continue in the service, he had no

DVE

right to make this novel reference
to the Accountant General's Office.

I have the honor to be
Sir
Your most Obedient Servant

Collector

Accountant General's Office
Recd 10
Answd 12 1873

Pd C.S.

generally that as a Rule Revenue Inspectors have ne

From Collector
THE ~~MAGISTRATE~~ OF
North Arcot.

To
The Offg. Dy. Accountant General

Dated 5th December 1873

Despatched

Received

No. 48

ENCLOSURE. nil

Subject.

Returns the Petition of Veerasami Iyer and informs that he had no right to make this novel reference to the Accountant General's Office.

13726

[illegible] No. 3 ff/4

THE ENTRIES IN THESE COLUMNS ARE TO BE REATTESTED EVERY FIVE YEARS; EACH ATTESTATION SHOULD BE CAREFULLY RULED OFF THE DATE MAY BE CLEARLY SHOWN.

Name of Officer.	Caste or Race.	Residence.	FATHER'S Name.	FATHER'S Residence.	Date of birth.	Age. Years	Age. Ms.	Age. Days.	Exact Height. Feet.	Exact Height. In.	Personal marks for identification.	Date of Entry.	Signature of Officer.	Signature and designation of the head of the Office.
Mr. Kunthalum. Veerasawmi Iyer	Brahmin Siva Sect	Mekuntkalum Chit Taluq	Subbarayer	Kunthalum	2nd Chittrayie the year of Vikrama	53	3	"	5	1	Marks of wounds on the left knee, a scar on the back of the head. Bamboo colour	21st August 1857 10th September 1873	[illegible]	C. [illegible] Tahsildar of Chittoor 16/9/73.

generally that as a rule

1 Name of appointment.	2 Nature, *i.e.*, whether substantive or acting, permanent or temporary.	3 Substantive appointment, if the new appointment be acting only.	4 Pay.	5 Acting allowance.	6 Date, of appointment.	7 Signature of Officer.	8 Character of Officer. *No entry need be made in this Column except when there is any thing either good or bad to be recorded. Suspensions should be noted here when the order of suspension is passed.*	9 Signature & designation of immediate head of the Office.	10 Date of termination of appointment.	11 Reason of termination *e.g., transfer, promotion, return of permanent incumbent.*	12 Signature and designation of immediate head of the Office.
Thurafdar of Tiruvattoor Taluq	Permanent	"	Rs 9	"	24th August 1857	[illegible]		[illegible] Collector	30th August 1857	Transfer	[illegible] Collector
Do in Vellore Taluq	Do	"	9	"	31st August 1857				15th December 1859	Do	
Do in Wandiwash Taluq	Do	"	9	"	16th Decembr 1859				30th August 1860	Promotion	
2nd Class Revenue Inspector in Do	Do	"	17	"	31st August 1860				2nd Decr 1860	Transfer	
Do in Chendraghiry Taluq	Do	"	17	"	3rd Decembr 1860				25th Febry 1861	Do	
Do in Gudiattam Taluq	Do	"	17	"	26th Febry 1861				22nd March 1861	Do	
Do in Chittoor Taluq	Do	"	17	"	23rd March 1861			G5r	31 January 23rd January 1864	Promotion	
1st Class Revenue Inspector in Palamanair Taluq	Do	"	20	"	24th January 1864	G5r			31st October 1865	Do	
Do 1st Class Revenue Inspector in Do	Do	"	30	"	1st Novr 1865			G5r	29th March 1867	Transfer at his own request	
2nd Class Do in Chittoor Taluq	Do	"	25	"	30th March 1867	G5r	This degradation was caused at his own request as he suffered from sickness in Palamnair Taluq	G5	14th September 1868	Promotion	

137/06

generally that as a rule

1 Name of appointment.	2 Nature, *i.e.*, whether substantive or acting, permanent or temporary.	3 Substantive appointment, if the new appointment be acting only.	4 Pay.	5 Acting allowance.	6 Date of appointment.	7 Signature of Officer.	8 Character of Officer. *No entry need be made in this Column except when there is any thing either good or bad to be recorded. Suspensions should be noted here when the order of suspension is passed.*	9 Signature & designation of immediate head of the Office.	10 Date of termination of appointment.	11 Reason of termination *e.g., transfer, promotion, return of permanent incumbent.*	12 Signature and designation of immediate head of the Office.
			Rs								
Acting 1st Class Revenue Inspector Chittoor Taluq	Acting	2nd Class Revenue Inspector	25	[illegible]	[illegible] Septr 1868			Tahsildar	15th October 1868	Permanent incumbent returned	Tahsildar
2nd Class Revenue Inspector	Permanent	"	25	"	15th Octr 1868				9th May 1869	"	
Suspended from Office during the enquiry for Neglect of duty from 10th May to 30th November 1869.							Order passed by J. D. Robinson Esqre Collector of North Arcot under date the 9th May 1869.				
2nd Class Revenue Inspector Chittoor Taluq	Permanent	"	25	"	1st December 1869				28th July 1873.	Thrown out of employ as he was found the 55 yrs of age	

Collector

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Name of appointment.	Nature, *i.e.*, whether substantive or acting, permanent or temporary.	Substantive appointment, if the new appointment be acting only.	Pay.	Acting allowance.	Date of appointment.	Signature of Officer.

Revenue Inspector

Concern with darkhast cases. The form to be used in this class of cases plainly shows that all action lies directly between the Tahsildar and the Village Officers and the plays of intermediate agency tends to defeat the very object in view which is to place the land at once in the proper hands and ~~would end~~ beyond factions and partial antagonism.

Ordered that copies of these proceedings be forwarded to Mr. Gibson and the Tahsildar of the Chittoor Taluq for information and guidance and that the Sharapatti and the Record which accompanied it be sent to the former Officer.

(Signed) J. D. Robinson
Collector

(True Copy)

Collector

8 Character of Officer. *No entry need be made in this Column except when there is any thing either good or bad to be recorded. Suspensions should be noted here when the order of suspension is passed.*	9 Signature & designation of immediate head of the Office.	10 Date of termination of appointment.	11 Reason of termination *e. g., transfer, promotion, return of permanent incumbent.*	12 Signature and designation of immediate head of the Office.

P. Ed: Cl. Ho 3 /1/54

16/8/73. C.R.

SERVICE BOOK

OF

Name. N. Veerasami Iyer

Caste or Race. Brahmin Iyer

Residence. Nunthialum

FATHER'S. Name. Subbarayer

FATHER'S. Residence. Nunthialum

Date of birth.

131 of 0203 DC

Recd. the 3/11/74

49

APPLICATION FOR { ~~PENSION~~ GRATUITY.

39

1. Name of Applicant. Nandialum Veerasamy Iyer
2. Father's name. Nandialum Soobba Rayer
3. Sect or Caste. Smartha Bramin
4. Residence. Chittoor
5. Present or last employment. 2nd Class Revenue Inspector of Chittoor Taluk
6. Date of beginning of service 28th August 1857.
7. Date of end of service 28th July 1873

		Y.	M.	D.	
8. Length of service including breaks	... ...	15	11	2	Ram
of which superior	... ...	12	2	17	Ram
inferior	... ...	3	"	4	
non-qualifying and breaks	... ...	"	8	4	Ram

9. Class of { ~~pension~~ gratuity } applied for, and cause of application.* Rule 1 Section 53, Clause A. Section 56.
10. [Average] emoluments or pay. " — " —
11. Proposed pension. " — " —
12. Proposed gratuity. Rs. A. P. 300 — " —
13. Date from which to commence. " — " —
14. Place of payment. Chittoor
15. Age of applicant on this date. 55 years
16. Height. Feet 5 Inches 1
17. Marks. Marks of wounds on the left knee, a scar on the back of the head, Bamboo Color.
18. Date. 15th September 1873

Collector

SIGNATURE OF THE HEAD OF OFFICE.

Recd 6 10 1873
Ansd

T.R. DK

* If the application is for a compensation pension or gratuity, the nature of the change of establishment which has given rise to the claim should be fully stated.

HISTORY OF THE SERVICE (SHOWING BREAKS) OF *Mandialum Veerasamy Iyer*

Establishment.	Appointment.	Pay. RS.	A.	P.	Acting allowance. RS.	Date of beginning.	Date of end.	Period reckoned as service. Y.	M.	D.	Period not reckoned as service. Y.	M.	D.	Remarks.	How verified.	Remarks by Accountant-General.
North Arcot Collectorate	Tursdar of Tiruvattur Taluk	9	„	„	„	28th August 1857	31st August 1857	„	„	„	„	„	4		Verified from the Huzoor & Taluk Records	Not verified. As it does not count for pension or gratuity on the Superior Scale.
	Do of Vellore Taluk	9	„	„	„	1st September 1857	15th December 59	„	„	„	2	3	15			
	Do of Wandewash	9	„	-	„	16th December 1859	31st August 1860	„	„	„	„	8	15			
	2nd Class Revenue Inspector of Do	17	„	„	„	1st September 1860	18th October 1860	„	1	18	„	„	„	Ua		Verified from the records of this Office. Applicants qualifying Service after deducting the period of Service in inferior grades Leave, and Suspension periods is co years 12-2-5.
	On Private affairs leave					19th October 1860	12th November 1860	„	„	„	„	„	24			
	Absent without leave					13th November 1860	16th November 1860	-	„	„	„	„	4			
	2nd Class Revenue Inspector of Do	17	„	„	„	17th November 1860	2nd December 1860	„	„	16	Ua	„	-			
	Do of Chendraghery	17	„	„	„	3rd December 1860	28th February 1861	„	2	28	„	„	-			
	Do of Gudiattam	17	„	„	„	1st March 1861	22nd March 1861	„	„	22	Ua	„	„			
	Do of Chittoor	17	„	„	„	23rd March 1861	31st January 1864	2	10	8	Ua	„	„			
	1st Class Do of Palamanair	20	„	„	„	1st February 1864	[illegible] 1866	~~1~~	~~5~~	Ua	„	„	-			
	Do	30	„	„	„ Ua	1st ~~July~~ 1865	28th March 1866	„	8	28	„	„		Ua		
	On Furlough leave					29th March 1866	20th April 1866	„	„	-	„	„	22			
	1st Class Rev. Inspector of Palamanair	30	„	„	„	21st April 1866	31st March 1867	„	11	20	Ua	„	„			
	2nd Do of Chittoor	25	„	„	„	1st April 1867	16th September 1868	1	5	16	„	„	-			
	Ag. 1st Class of Do	30	„	„	„	17th September 1868	12th October 1868	„	„	26	Ua	„	„			
	2nd Class Do of Do	25	„	-	„	13th October 1868	9th May 1869	„	6	27	„	„	„			
	Under suspension					10th May 1869	30th November 1869	„	„	„	„	6	21			
	2nd class Revenue Inspector of Do	25	„	„	„	1st December 1869	28th July 1873	3	7	28	„	-	-			
	On private affairs leave					7th April 1864	21st April 1864	Ua	„	-	„	-	15	Ua		
	Ua 1st Class Rev. Inspector of Palamanair Taluk	20	„	„		22nd April 1864	31st October 1865	1	6	9	Ua					
	Total period of {superior / inferior} service...						....	12	2	17	Ua 3	8	15	Ua		

REMARKS BY HEAD OF OFFICE.

1. As to character and past conduct of Applicant. Good.

2. Explanation of any suspension or degradation. The applicant was suspended from 10th May to 30th November 1869 on account of charges brought against him under clause 2 Section 5 Regulation 9 of 1822 but was subsequently restored as per accompanying Copies of the Proceedings of the late Collector dated 10th May 1869 No 20½ and 27th January 1870 No 71. The degradation from Rs.30 to 25 is in consequence of his transfer from Palamanair Taluk to Chittoor at his own request vide accompanying Extract from the District Gazette dated 6th April 1867.—

3. Regarding any gratuity or pension already received by Applicant. See Chapter XX. None.

4. Explanation under Section 47, Rule 1, so far as the Head of the Office can give it, None.

5. Any other remarks, The applicant was found to be inefficient and unfit for further active Service owing to infirmity from age. The Service Register of the Applicant is herewith sent.

C. [illegible]
Collector
SIGNATURE.

E. A. Marjoribanks.
Dy Collector

North Arcot Collectors Office
29th Sept 1873

No. 460

CERTIFICATE AND REPORT OF ACCOUNTANT-GENERAL.

CERTIFIED that (~~subject to the remarks below recorded~~) qualifying service in {~~inferior~~ / superior} grades has been duly proved for 12 —— years 2 —— months and 5 — days; and that a superannuation {~~pension~~ / gratuity} not exceeding Rs. 300 equal to 12 months pay, is admissible under Section 57 —— of the Civil Pension Code. The

Pension 1874 Depart
99/1 No 3

APPLICATION FOR {~~PENSION OR~~ / GRATUITY—

Date of application.
19 December 1873

Name of applicant.
N. Veerasawmy Iyer

Last appointment.
Revenue Inspector

Class of {~~pension or~~ / gratuity.

Amount of pension sanctioned.

Amount of gratuity sanctioned.

Date of commencement.

Date of sanction.

O No 28 of 1874

Pension Department

PROCEEDINGS of the MADRAS GOVERNMENT.

Read the following ~~letter~~ Papers

From the Collector of North Arcot (dated 15th September 1873.)
— " — Accountant General —— (— " — 19th December 1873 No 460)
Petition from N. Veerasawmy Iyer (— " — 22d Novr 1873)

Order thereon 26th January 1874 No 28

Under Section 57 of the Civil Pension Code His Excellency the Governor in Council is pleased to grant to Nandenlum Veerasawmy Iyer late 2d Class Revenue Inspector of Chittoor Taluq North Arcot District a Superannuation gratuity of Rs (300) three hundred or twelve months pay to which he is entitled for his qualifying Superior Service of 12 yrs 2 mos & 5 days.

2 *Petitioner will be informed by endorsement that his qualifying Superior Service only amounts to 12 years & 2 months and that the Government see no reason

Note. * He says his age is only 53. but the Board [illegible] that he is in error according to four entries of the [illegible] age in the records furnished at different times by himself "

Lee

Gratuity to N. Veerasawmy
Iyer late Revenue I.
N. Arcot Dist

Poonoosam

Govt. of {1874} Madras.

Pension

To The Collector of
North Arcot

Dated 7th January } 1874, No 28
Recd.

Nos.

Granting a superannuation gratuity of Rupees 300 to Naudeacum Veerasawmy Iyer late 2d Class Revenue Inspector of Chittoor Talug @ North Arcot District —

C. 24 Jany 74
R 24