

(1) Number of pages _____

(2) Date of repair _____

(3) Initials of the Referencer _____ *GH*

MADRAS RECORD OFFICE.

Government of Madras.

Division DEPARTMENT.

G.O. No.	604	Press Mis.
Dated	19-9-1879.	

Not to be folded or roughly handled

Treas. Account DEPARTMENT.

①

10
OK

No. 124

Cotacamund

Fort Saint George,

Accountant General's Office,

11th August 1879.

FROM THE ACCOUNTANT GENERAL

TO THE GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS,

TO THE

Secretary to Government
Pension Department

SIR,

With reference to the Proceedings of Government in the Pension Department N: 420 dated the 24th July 1879, stating that Government see no reason to reconsider their order N: 223 dated the 9th May last which sanctioned the grant of a Pension of Rs. 3-0-0 per mensem to one G. Aiyalar Nayadu, or to forward the order to the Government of India, I have the honor respectfully to point out, that the Government of India Financial letter N: 3873 dated 21st October 1873, which empowered the Local Government to treat brief periods of non-employment caused by dismissal, as periods spent under suspension followed by reappointment, and under which Government were pleased to treat the period of break in Aiyalar Nayadu's case as time spent under suspension, ceased to have force after the promulgation of the

Order

order of the Government of India No. 3912 dated the 18th October 1877, reproduced in Section 1 of the Civil Pension Code 4th Edition.

2 According to that section no standing order, not contained in the Code or its supplements, should be quoted or trusted in deciding or submitting for orders any question affecting Pensions &c.

3 I would further respectfully draw the attention of His Grace in Council to section 57 of the Code under which a Local Government can only condone interruptions in service, not exceeding 3 months in all, and provided such interruptions are not caused by Resignation or Removal for misconduct &c.

4 In the case under consideration the period of non-employment extends over nearly 11 months, and the interruption was also caused by removal for misconduct.

5 Under these circumstances, and as I have not hitherto specially brought these rules to the notice of Government, I beg respectfully to do so in case His Grace the Governor in Council should be pleased to modify the order in Aiyalu & Vayadu's case, or to submit the question for the orders of the Supreme Government.

6 I would also mention that the
Proceedings

Proceedings of Government No. 360 dated the 26th June last, Pension Department, sanctioning the grant of an Invalid Pension of Rs. 300 per mensem to Subudaru Singh, whose case is similar to that of Aiyalu & Vayadu, (except that the period of interruption extends over rather less than 4 months) would be governed by any decision which His Grace in Council may come to in this case of Aiyalu & Vayadu.

I have the honor to be,
Sir,
Your most Obedt. Servt.

J. H. B. B. B.
Off. Accounts General.

Encl. 5. 0. 24. 45 July 1879
Encl. 5. 0. 26. June 1879
No. 360

Encl. 1879

DEPARTMENT.

ACCT. GENL'S OFFICE, MADRAS.

FROM

THE ACCOUNTANT GENERAL, MADRAS.

TO

The Accountant Genl.
Revision Regd.

Dated 1879

Recd. 22 No. of answer.

Subject.

Regarding order to make
the order of Govt in the
Revision Regd. No. 420
to 24 July '79 in regard
to the question for the
order of the supreme
court.

Encl. 1879

Encl. 1879

Encl. 1879

Encl. 1879

Note. The West India Company's
order in 1873, by the then
Govt of India (order of 1873, No. 587.) The
question is not one of the interpretation of the
order but of the power of Govt to say that an order
is a revision from the service followed by
a statement is issued to the service. The
order with it is a statement of service. The
order's order. The order is a statement of service.
The order is a statement of service.

The order is a statement of service.