# PENSION DEPARTMENT.

## Pensions.

No. 969.

FROM

THE SECRETARY TO THE GOVERNMENT OF FORT ST. GEORGE,

TO

THE SECRETARY TO THE GOVERNMENT OF INDIA,
DEPARTMENT OF FINANCE AND COMMERCE.

SIR,

I am directed to forward the case of T. Latsaiya Pantulu for the favorable consideration of the Government of India.

2. This man obtained permanent Government employment on the 20th June 1849 as 5th Gumasta in a Munsif's Court on Rs. 3-8-0 per mensem. On the 1st May 1856 he was promoted to a 10-rupee post, and two months later was made Head Gumasta on Rs. 12. This last appointment he held until, on the 19th June 1862, when he had five years, eleven months and nineteen days' superior service to his credit, he was dismissed.

3. His dismissal was reversed[*] in February 1864 by Government, who directed his re-employment, but in June of the same year[†] withdrew their order. On this T. Latsaiya submitted a memorial for transmission to the Secretary of State, and as it appeared that the second of the above orders of Government had been based on a misunderstanding as to the orders passed by the High Court regarding the memorialist, it was cancelled,[‡] and the original order "directing T. Latsaiya's re-employment" was declared "in force."

4. In the following year T. Latsaiya complained that the orders of Government had not been carried out, and as it appeared that he had been appointed to a post of Rs. 10 only, it was directed[§] that the earliest opportunity should be taken of giving him "such employment as will ensure him a salary equal to that drawn before his dismissal," and that "in the meanwhile, under the peculiar circumstances of the case, * * * his service subsequent to his re-employment be considered to give a claim for pension."

5. In June of last year T. Latsaiya was invalided, and it appears that he continued to draw Rs. 10 only until a few months before his removal, when he was made a clerk on Rs. 15. He has thus but three months and twenty days' service in superior grades since his re-employment, or six years, three months and nine days in all, counting that prior to his dismissal. His total service amounts to twenty-six years, ten months and nineteen days if the interruption caused by the dismissal which was cancelled is condoned.

[*] G.O., 20th February 1864, No. 221 (Judicial Department).

[†] G.O., 6th June 1864, No. 834 (Judicial Department).

[‡] G.O., 20th December 1864, No. 1834 (Judicial Department).

[§] 23rd November 1865, No. 1675 (Judicial Department).

6. The papers connected with the case are enclosed, and as the intentions of Government in directing T. Latsaiya's re-employment and early promotion to a superior grade have been frustrated, and the promises made to him been unfulfilled, I am to recommend that, as a special case, he may be granted the maximum pension, Rs. 4 per mensem, admissible to an inferior servant.

I have the honor to be,
Sir,
Your most obedient servant,

OOTACAMUND,
27*th September* 1880.

*Secretary to Government.*

## 1880.

## PENSION DEPARTMENT.

*From*
*The Secretary to the Government*
*of Fort St. George,*
*To*
*The Secy. to the Govt. of India,*
*Dept. of Finance and Commerce.*

*Dated* 27*th September* 1880.

*Issued*

*Recd.*

No. 969.

Enclosure.

---

*Pensions.*—Recommending, for reasons stated, that T. Latsaiya Pantulu, late 8th Clerk in the District Munsif's Court, Berhampore, may be granted, as a special case, the maximum pension of Rs. 4 per mensem admissible to an inferior servant.

---



RECEIVED
7 3 71
J.G.T.J^GE

G. T. THORNHILL

e.7.45

C Kaujan
Oud
Testament
11 Dec 48-
7



RECEIVED
7 3 71
J.G.T.J.

G.T.?BEHLL

Dyaujaree
Testimonial

15 Aug 51

No 8

---

III

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

RECEIVED
7 3 11
J.G.T.Jge

G. THORNHILL

E Ganjam

Orig. Testimonial

5 June 51

No 9

RECEIVED
7 3 71
J.G.T.Jge

---

IV

11

The bearer Jayyomoorthoola Sutchiah is in my opinion a young man deserving of encouragement. He has obtained good testimonials of character from his employers all along for several years past, and from my knowledge of him for a length of time I have no hesitation in saying of him that he is intelligent, active and well-behaved.-

Chicacole
9th June 1851

H. Dawson

READ
7 3 71
J.G.T. Jge

E.B. FOOT

G.THORNHILL

RECEIVED
7 3 71
J.G.T.Jge

e.4.48

130

[illegible]

RECEIVED
7 3 71
J.G.T.Jse

G. THORNHILL

e.q.45

~~VII~~ ~~M~~ 152

This is to Certify that I know the bearer T. Lestatich ever since I came to this station, he seems of deserving encouragement for his good behaviour, and Conduct. he possesses ~~xxx~~ several good testimonials [illegible] his Superiors, and appears to be active, & intelligent, in his way of living.

F.H.W.

Chicacole 28th March/53.

C. J. Thornhill
Asst. [illegible]

READ
[illegible] 17
J.G.

RECEIVED
6 12 70
J.G.T.Jge

J.G.T.

G. THORNHILL

L. 16. 45

(172)

Govt.

Testimonial

28th March 53

7

Enc No 714 of 1853

No 11

Cal No 899

Rec'd 157 of 1/79

Rec'd 24

VII

172

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

RECEIVED
7 3 71
J.G.T.

e. 8 4 5

.G.T.

[illegible] 1849

H
Canjain
Regt
Lieutenant
26th Augst 53
No 12

---

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

RECEIVED 7 3 71 J.G.T.



C.B.FOORD
RECEIVED
7 3 71
J.G.T.Jne
L.THORNHILL

I Ganjam
Orig
Testimonial

4 May 54

No 14

in No 1897

---

IX

232

مولوی محمد یحیی علیخان

I do hereby certify that I have known Tajoomoortoola Lutchiah a Goomashtah in the District Moonsiff's Court of Chicacole, since my having taken charge of the Moofty Sudr Ameen's Court; and have also heard from the late Acting and full Moonsiffs that he possesses a good character, is a poor man, and well qualified to discharge the Civil duties of an Office, with efficiency.—

Chicacole 31st March 1855.—

M. Yahya Allykhan
Moofty Sudr Ameen
Zillah Chicacole.

READ
7 71
J.G.T. Jge

RECEIVED
7 3 71
J.G.T.Jge

e.10.95

G.THORNHILL

X

252

I have known the bearer Shajamoorthy Latchiah Gunettoo for about fourteen months, & from the opportunities I have had of judging of his character & qualifications, believe him to be a very intelligent worthy good man, capable of filling a situation superior to that he now holds. —

Lea Miller

Calingapatam
26 May 1855

READ
7 3 7
J.G.T. Jge

RECEIVED
7 3 71
J.G.T. Jge

e.12.

C. THORNHILL

Original
Testimonial
21st June 55

[illegible]
Orig
[illegible]
26 May 55
No 15

---

XI

9

270

Character given to Tajomoostoola Latchia Pantodoo Gumasta of this Court

He is performing the public duties with proper behaviour since I took the Charge of the District Moonsiff in this Station The Governor's Agent have promoted him in the Revenue line

In my opinion he appears faithfull and greatfull towards the upper authorities Therefore I desire to bring him into prog

30th December 1855 }
Chicacole }

Signed / Chinta Jagannada
District Moonsiff

FHW

S. T

RECEIVED
6 12 70
J.G.T Jge

1.20.85

XII

# R

292

Character Given to Tajomoortoola Latchea

poolooloo Head Gumasta of this Court

He was appointed as an Head Gumasta on the 23rd July 1856 to this Station and his behavier is proper in delavering the public duties and also use to help for the delivery of my charge every respect. I recomended to the Governors Agent about him for the post manager of Jalumtra Not with standing his good Condect he is a sutable man to perform the Circar duties

8th March 1858
Palasa

(Signed) Napaty Balaramiah
District Moonsiff

F.H.W

RECEIVED
6 12 70
J.G.T Jge

J.G.T

1.21.78

Incls. 1516 of 70

In L No 1899

Incls. 1661 of 76

---

~~S~~

~~XIII~~

Certificate given to Tajomoorto Latchiat pantooloo Head Gumasta of this Court

When I came to this Station for taking the District Moonsiff Charge, He delivered the Charge to me very cleanly & exactly there are no any mistaks in record nor in Cash. I have informed to the Agent Court as that he is an honest man and clever in delivering the public duties and he is sutable man for promotion through a petition

F.H.W.

31st July 1861
Palasa

J G T
RECEIVED
6 12 70
J.G.T Jge

Signed/ Bundaroo Ramanujiah
District Moonsiff

7. 22.4/6

Pet No 269 of

[illegible] 1899

Pet No 1516 of 78

---

T

XN

337

Character given to Tajomoostoola Leatchiah promoted As 3rd Gumasta of this Court

He was appointed as an Ast 4 Gumasta and promoted by me as an Ast 3rd Gumasta in the mean period which he served under me he performed his duties very carefully and deligently. Owing to no vacancy in this Court he was appointed as a goomasta in the District Moonsiff Court of Berhampore I declare in my opinion he is a sutable man to promotion

F.H.W.

19th July 1865
Ichapore

Signed/ Gada Dasiah
District Moonsiff

RECEIVED
6 12 70
J.G.T.Jge

1.23.45

In No. 1899
In No. 2446

In No. 1516 of /73

№ 3

Testimonials

13

In No. 1516 of /73

[illegible]

In No. 1899

---

XV

[illegible]
[illegible] 30 [illegible]
[illegible]

Agent to the Govr

D. W. Barton
Manager

A

Ganjam

Orig order
of the Agent's Court
dismissing the
Petitioner from
his office of
head Gomesta

---

(22) 37

Translation of an order issued by G. S.
Forbes Esqr Governor's Agent of Ganjam
dated 30th June 1862 Chetterpore

To Tajomurthula Lutchiah Pantulu
Hd Gumasta of the Palase Dt Munsif's Court

As the District Moonsif of Palasa
reported that you are opposing him in the
discharge of the Circar duties by an Arzi
of the 17th Inst No 50 you are dismissed
from the post of Head Goomastah in
question from the 20th Inst

(Signed) G. S. Forbes
Agent to the Govr

XVI

A

39D

# Judicial Department

## Proceedings of the Madras Government

Read the following letter from the Agent to the Governor of Fort Saint George in Ganjam

(Here enter 17th November 1863)

Order thereon 20th February 1864 No 221

His Excellency the Governor in Council adheres to the Opinion that the dismissal of the late Head Gumastah in the District Moonsiff's Court at Palasa without any investigation having been held by the Agent, or one of the European Assistant and without calling upon the Head Gumastah for an explanation with reference to the Charges preferred against him by the Moonsiff was irregular and objectionable. The mere fact of the Gumastah when his Conduct was complained of by the District Moonsiff having preferred Counter Charge against Officer did not justify the removal of the Gumasta from his situation unless it was proved that the Charges in question were false.

2 In regard to the Charge on which O T Seutchia was tried and convicted by the Assistant Agent, the Governor in Council Considers that the evidence upon which the Conviction was based was very suspicious. It Consists entirely of the Deposition of Peons whose Salaries the Head Gumasta was Charged with having withheld many months before. It does not appear why these Charges -

[illegible]

J G T
RECEIVED
6 12 70
J G T

and the absence of explanation on the point coupled with the fact of the charge having been preferred just after the Head Gumasta's dismissal and the known bad feeling of the Palasa Moonsiff towards him. Appears to the Governor in Council to throw great suspicion on the evidence of these witnesses

3 The Governor in Council is of opinion that T. Lutchiah should be employed should a vacancy occur in some other situation in the Ganjam District. The Agent will report at the experation of six months whether he has been re-employed

(True Extract)

Signed) Chief Secretary

To The Agent to the Governor of Fort Saint George

Exd

Signed) Aconner

RECEIVED
8 12 70
J.G.T Jud

7

---

Judicial Department.

## PROCEEDINGS of the MADRAS GOVERNMENT.

Read the following letter from the Agent to the Governor in Ganjam.–

(Here enter 12th March 1864 No. 31)

Order thereon, 6th June 1864 No. 834.

As it appears from the foregoing letter that the sentence passed upon T. Lutchiah, late Head Gumastah in the Court of the District Moonsiff of Palasa, in the case referred to in the Proceedings of Government, under date the 20th February last, has been brought under the review of the High Court by whom T. Lutchiah's appeal was dismissed, the Governor in Council resolves to withdraw the order for the re-employment of T. Lutchiah

True Extract

C M Walker

Dy: Secy: to Govt.

(A)

Government Procee-
ment No 834 dated
6th June 1864
withdrawing their
orders for the employ
ment of the Memorialist
[illegible] No 2674 of 1864

---

XVIII

432

### *Proceedings of the Madras Government, Judicial Department,* *20th December* 1864.

Read the following Petition :—

No. 225. TO HIS EXCELLENCY THE GOVERNOR IN COUNCIL,

*Fort Saint George.*

The humble Petition of TAJAMOORTOOLA LUTCHIAH, late Head Goomastah in the District Moonsiff's Court of Palasa in the Zillah of Ganjam.

MY LORD,

Dissatisfied with the Proceedings of the Madras Government, No. 834, dated 6th June 1864, "resolving to withdraw their order for his re-employment," your petitioner most respectfully submits herewith, in triplicate, an Appeal Memorial against the same order to the address of the Right Honorable the Secretary of State for India, which, it is requested, may be directed to be despatched to that noble power.

Your petitioner, as in duty bound, shall ever pray.

*5th October* 1864.

---

TO THE RIGHT HONORABLE THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR INDIA.

The humble Memorial of TAJAMOORTOOLA LUTCHIAH, lately a Head Goomastah of the District Moonsiff of Palasa under the Governor's Agent of Ganjam under the Presidency of Madras.

RESPECTFULLY SHEWETH,

This is an Appeal against the Order (A.) No. 834, passed by the Government of Madras on the 6th June 1864, "resolving to withdraw their order for the re-employment of your Memorialist."

2. Before stating the grounds of this appeal, your Memorialist briefly states, for the graceful information of Her Majesty the Queen in Council, that your Memorialist had, on the 10th June 1863, submitted to the Honorable the Secretary of State for India a memorial with several accompaniments (A. to S.), which memorial is known by the office Memorandum of this Government (B.) to have been forwarded to its destination on the 14th July 1863.

3. Your Memorialist is not aware of what way the Home authorities may have disposed of that memorial; but from what His Excellency the Governor of Madras has been pleased to issue some instructions to Mr. Agent Forbes, your petitioner fully concludes that the Home authorities ought by all probabilities to have gone through the papers (A. to S.) therewith submitted, and arrived at the conclusion that the Agent was not justified in removing your Memorialist, and ought to have issued necessary orders to the Governor of Madras, requiring him to see your Memorialist re-employed.

4. Your Memorialist would respectfully bring to the notice of the Home authorities that His Excellency the Governor of Madras has, there is every reason to believe, called on the Agent (Mr. Forbes) to send in the records, with a view to carry into effect the instructions which may have come from the Home authorities, and has very justly considered the burden of the cause which gave rise to your Memorialist's total dismissal, and very strictly required the Agent (Mr. Forbes) to re-employ him in the District.

5. Your Memorialist was told that the Agent (Mr. Forbes), who, from the beginning, has given his ear to the District Moonsiff's words, and been disposed to uphold his false reports (oral or written), and of never listening to your Memorialist's reports, however they were in fact and in Justice true, as at length visible from the late memorial, and from its enclosures, has skilfully

lent his view quite reverse to what he relied on, has treated your petitioner as he may be subjected to pitiful anneyance, viz., "*as if your Memorialist had appealed to the High Court* "*against the sentence passed by him, and as if that Court had dismissed the same appeal; that* "*your Memorialist should not, therefore, be re-employed in Ganjam.*"

6. Although His Excellency the Governor of Madras, from the moment of your petitioner's appealing to him, has not satisfied himself with the manner in which his removal was effected, and willingly appeared to be right doer, yet, from the circumstance of the Agent (Mr. Forbes) having turned his reasonings anew in not re-employing your Memorialist, that noble and graceful Sovereign has, your Memorialist can confidently say, unwillingly withdrawn his own resolution recorded on the receipt of the Home orders on the former memorial, *apprehending that the Government cannot interfere with the orders of the High Court in Criminal or Civil matters disposed under Regulations and Acts.*

7. From the foregoing reasons, your Memorialist can freely submit, for the information of the Home authorities, that the arguments which this appeal memorial should contain, should be limited only to Mr. Agent Forbes' vague reasons than to any thing on the Government Endorsement A., why? because the obstacle thrown in carrying out the instructions of Her Majesty the Queen, *is chiefly occurred by the Agent's (Mr. Forbes') objections, and not in the least by His Excellency the Governor of Madras.*

8. In such a case as this, in which the interior authorities will avowedly throw obstacles in executing the local Government's directions, which may have been issued to them in obedience to the Sovereign power of England, your Memorialist has, it is true, no other alternative than soliciting the graceful interference of the same Crown, submitting good and legal grounds to have his ill-fate wiped, for Her Majesty the Queen has not any rule or Acts which can deter Her Majesty from executing unlimited discretion over the acts of the agents in the native land, viz.,

*1st.*—Because the sentence passed by the Senior Assistant and confirmed by the Agent, not being appealable to the High Court under Section 428 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, your petitioner sent a petition to that Court, but they struck it off as inadmissible (vide their Proceedings C.)

*2nd.*—Because the rejection of the said Criminal petition can by all authorities be viewed as nothing than mere non-acceptance thereof on their file. In proof of such strict meaning the pencil note by the Registrar of the said Court on a second petition (D.) (original and translation accompanying this) *will stand true example that the appeal was not dismissed by that Court upon merits, but for informality* under Section 428 of the Code of Criminal Procedure.

*3rd.*—This the Agent, who had not spoken in his several former reports to Government, *shews as a matter to make it appear as if the High Court had reviewed the case* by calling for the records, and disposed of the appeal, a circumstance adapted to mislead His Excellency the Governor, who was disposed to execute the orders of the Home authorities. Hence it is incumbent on the Home authorities to decide whether the term "rejection" of the Criminal petition, No. 72, is, as the Agent shews, a bar to the Governor to insist upon the Agent to re-employ your petitioner.

*4th.*—Because if the said point, upon which the Government withdrew their instruction, is cleared, there is nothing to add more in this Memorial than referring the Home authorities to the former memorial, and its enclosures, for all other particulars.

*5th.*—Because any other points which the Agent (Mr. Forbes) may have dwelt upon, in his reply to Government orders, as regards the amount of the embezzlement, Rupees 61, would reasonably be thought as quite after mention which cannot be taken as nothing than an avowed attempt on his part to abstract the orders of the controlling powers.

*6th.*—Because, on your Memorialist applying to the Agent (Mr. Forbes) to re-employ him, that gentleman even then has not strictly denied to employ him *than tacitly saying that your petitioner cannot be employed in Ganjam*, a circumstance which can be well meant that your Memorialist was fit for employment in the Districts other than Ganjam.

Duplicate
45

*7th.*—Because the refusing of the re-employment of a former servant in a District should be considered when he may have displeased a multitude of people and committed serious acts which would be returned to him by the people. Your petitioner is a common Goomastah, and the one that was subjected to the displeasure of a single District Moonsiff. Hence his re-employment in the same, or in any other Taluqs, will not be injurious to any one at all.

*8th.*—Because the system of the Governor's Agency in Ganjam being abolished and incorporated with the regular Civil Court of Chicacole before His Excellency the Governor sent his orders in your petitioner's favor, it would have been better for that noble authority to have communicated his resolution to the Civil Judge, instead of the Agent.

In that case your petitioner would by this time have been provided with a Goomastah situation which became vacant, and for which your Memorialist requested the Government to direct that Civil Court to favor him with that post; but, owing to your petitioner's bad luck, the Government have declined to interfere with reference to their having ere to that withdrawn their orders. By this reason any orders that should go in your petitioner's case should go to the Civil Court as the District Moonsiff's Court in which he was is amenable to that Court now.

Therefore your Memorialist prays Her Majesty the Queen in Council will have compassion on your Memorialist, and especially considering that no interior authorities in India had ever thwarted the execution of the Home Orders as in the case in this memorial, take into its deliberate consideration the point under appeal, and decide that your Memorialist might be re-employed in any other District Moonsiff's Court, or in the Civil Court of the Zillah.

Your petitioner, as in duty bound, shall ever pray.

*5th October* 1864.

---

No. 226. ORDER THEREON, 20th December 1864, No. 1834.

In their Order, No. 834 of the 6th June 1864, the Government withdrew the Order which they had previously given, (G. O., No. 221 of the 20th February 1864,) directing the re-employment of T. Lutchiah, late Head Goomastah of the District Moonsiff's Court at Palasa in the Ganjam District. The cause which influenced the Govenment in passing their second order was the statement in the Agent's letter, that the conviction of T. Lutchiah "was right in equity as well as good in law *(for the prisoner's appeal to the High Court was rejected).*"

2. From the papers which accompany the present petition, it appears that the petitioner's appeal to the High Court was not dismissed on the merits, but rejected on a point of law, as not being admissible under Section 428 of the Criminal Procedure Code, and that hence it was never, properly speaking, "under the review of the High Court" at all.

3. This being the case, the Governor in Council resolves to cancel the Order, No. 834, and to declare the former Order, directing T. Lutchiah's re-employment, in force. The Agent will, therefore, take the earliest opportunity of re-employing the petitioner, and report his having done so for the information of Government.

(True Extract).

*Chief Secretary.*

To the Agent to the Governor of Fort Saint George in Ganjam.
To T. Lutchiah, late Head Goomastah in the District Moonsiff's Court of Palasa,
(with enclosures A. to F. returned.)

Exd. J. Wright.

F.H.W.

Recd 29th Nov 65

~~XIX~~ ~~XVII~~

## *Proceedings of the Madras Government, Judicial Department,* *23rd November* 1865.

Read the following papers :—

No. 191. Abstract of a Petition from T. LUTCHIAH, Goomastah in the District Moonsiff's Court of Berhampore in Ganjam ; dated 16th October 1865.

States that the order passed by Government in his favor has not been as yet carried out, in consequence of the District Moonsiff having made all possible delay about it, and that he has mentioned in his petition to Government of 20th September last the circumstances under which he has been deprived of his just promotion in the office, though his service extends over a period of 19 years.

2. Prays for orders to grant him redress.

No. 192. From the Acting Agent to the Governor in Ganjam, to the Under Secretary to Government, Fort Saint George ; dated Chetterpoor, 3rd November 1865, No. 182.

With reference to your Memorandum, No. 2197, of the 19th ultimo, I have the honor to state, for the information of the Government, that T. Lutchiah, the petitioner therein mentioned, has been re-employed as a Goomastah in the Moonsiff's Court of Berhampoor, on a pay of 10 Rupees per mensem. The pay of the petitioner before his dismissal was 12 Rupees a month, as Head Goomastah of the late Palasa Moonsiff's Court, from which post he was dismissed.

2. The Report called for in the Order of Government, No. 1834, of the 20th December 1864, regarding the re-employment of the petitioner, was forwarded on the 14th ultimo.

3. The enclosures are herewith returned.

No. 193. ORDER THEREON, 23rd November 1865, No. 1675.

The Governor in Council directs that the Agent in Ganjam will take the earliest opportunity of giving T. Lutchiah such employment as will ensure him a salary equal to that drawn by him before his dismissal. In the meanwhile, and under the peculiar circumstances of the case, the Government resolve to direct that Lutchiah's service subsequent to his re-employment be considered to give a claim for pension.

2. The Agent will report on the 1st of June next whether these orders have been carried into effect.

(True Extract).

*Chief Secretary.*

To the Agent to the Governor in Ganjam.
" Accountant General.
Copy to T. Lutchiah.

XIX

F.H.W.

Exd. J. H. Burns.

XX

No. 908.

Proceedings of the District Court of Ganjam
Dated 7th April 1876.

Read petition dated 25th February 1876 by I. Lachayya, 5th Gumastah in the District Munsiff's Court of Berhampore praying for promotion to 2d Gumasta's post in said Court.

Read Arzi dated 1st April 1876 No. 17, with enclosures from the District Munsiff of Berhampore reporting on above petition.

Read other papers connected with I. Lachayya's Case.

The Ag Judge does not find himself i a position to promote appointment of I. Lachayya a 2nd Gumasta.

2. With reference to the Munsiff's unfav remarks about Lachayya in the Arzi above rec and heretofore the Ag Judge would point out th the law confers on the Munsiff power of punish also and that in the present instance the Ag is not prepared to deal with Lachayya's misconduct untill the Munsiff may think fi exercise his punitive function. Lachayy however, do well to take better [illegible] to as it is difficult to suppose that ther

be so much and such strong complaint against him were there not at least some ground for it.

(Signed) F. H. Woodroffe
Ag District Judge.

(True Extract)

(S) F. H. Woodroffe
Acting District Judge

(True Copy)

F H Woodroffe
Ag District Judge

la Lachayya, 5th [illegible]
District Munsiff's Court
Berhampore
4 Enclosures of his petition

---

1 M D

XX c

53 D

COURT FEE
GOVERNMENT OF INDIA
EIGHT ANNAS

[illegible]

19/4/76 [illegible]

[illegible]

1- [illegible]

2- [illegible]

1871 [illegible] 10 [illegible]

3- [illegible]

4- [illegible] 1869 [illegible] 22 [illegible]

5 [illegible] 1870 [illegible] 29 [illegible] 6 [illegible]

[illegible] 17 [illegible]

6- [illegible] 1871 [illegible] 21 [illegible]

[illegible] 17 [illegible]

(1 [illegible])

[illegible]

55D

7-1871 [illegible] 45 [illegible]

8-1871 [illegible] 7 [illegible] | [illegible] 17 [illegible]

9-1876 [illegible] 17 [illegible] 27 [illegible] | [illegible]

10-1876 [illegible] 25 [illegible] 12 [illegible]

[illegible]

1-1871 [illegible] 45 [illegible]

[illegible]

2 [illegible] $\frac{390}{75}$ [illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible] 33 [illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible] 55—1—8 [illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible] 6 [illegible]
[illegible]

[illegible] 1 [illegible] 17 [illegible]
[illegible]

3- 1875 [illegible] 235 [illegible]
1876 [illegible] 77 [illegible]
[illegible]

4- 1870 [illegible] 7 [illegible]
[illegible]

5- [illegible] 2 [illegible]
[illegible] 1 [illegible]
[illegible]

[illegible] 1871 [illegible] 10 [illegible] 1 [illegible] 17 [illegible]

(2 3 [illegible])

[illegible]

[illegible] 10 [illegible]

[illegible]

19/4/76 [illegible]

[illegible] 1876 [illegible] 10 [illegible]

[illegible] 7 [illegible]

[illegible]

DISTRICT MUNSIF OF BERHAMPORE

Proceedings of the District Court of Ganjam - dd. 28th April 1876

Read arzi dated 21st Instant No 25 from the District Munsif of Berhampore reporting degradation by proceedings also submitted of Tezomootila Latchiah 5th Gumasta to 8th Gumastas post and promotion of 6th Gumasta N. Srinivasa row 7th Gumasta G. Subbarow & 8th Gumasta L. Subbarow to the posts of 5th, 6th & 7th Gumastas posts respectively on the Establishment of his Court.

The orders of degradation and appointment made by the Dt Munsif to the effect above recorded are approved & confirmed by the Ag. Judge

T. Latchayya will be warned that should fresh misconduct by him of similar

Character be brought to the A. Judge's notice his dismissal from the Public Service will probably follow as a matter of necessity -

(Sd/) J. H. Woodroffe

A. J.

/True Copy

( [illegible]

[illegible]

---

Encl to 1720/5.7.80

JW 5.7.80

To

His Grace the Duke of Buckingham
and Chandos.
the Governor in Council
Fort Saint George

The Humble petition of Tejoemurtila Lalchappa, Clerk in the District Munsiff's Court Berhampore in the District of Ganjam who has applied for pension.

Most respectfully Sheweth,

That your Grace's petitioner's application for pension was forwarded to the Accountant General by the District Judge, with his immediate superior's recommendation, but the Accountant General wishes to know why your Grace's petitioner's Services as Head Gumastah in the District Munsiff's Court of Palasa previous to his dismissal should be included in the pensionable Services, though from the tenor of the Government Order No. 1675 dated the 23rd November 1865, a copy of which is herewith Submitted it is clear that it should be so included.

That your Grace's petitioner was unjustly dismissed on the 3rd June 1862 by the Agent of Ganjam from the Post of Head Gumasta in the District Munsiff's

Court of Palasa the salary of which was
Rupees 12 per mensem; On his appealing
to Government, they have in their Order
No. 221 dated the 20th February 1864, directed
the reemployment of your Grace's petitioner.
But on the representation of the Agent
they thought it proper to withdraw their
first Order, by their Order No. 834 dated
6th June 1864. And on your petitioner's
again appealing to the Home Authorities,
the Government have iſsued a third
Order No. 1834 dated 20th December 1864
Cancelling their 2nd Order and bringing
the 1st Order into force. Whereupon the
Agent bestowed on your petitioner
a post of only Rs 10 per mensem instead
of 12. On your Grace's petitioner having
brought it to their notice the Government
have lastely iſsued an Order No. 1675
dated 23rd November 1865 that your
petitioner's Services in his reduced post
should be treated as countable towards
pension
his petition, until he is provided with
a post the salary of which maybe
equal to that (Rs 12) drawn by him
previous to his dismissal.

"Your petitioner is an old Servant
is services previous to his dismiſsal
mount to 15 years and 2 months including
ears 1 month and 19 days during which
period

period he held the post of Head Gumastah
on Rs 12 pay per mensem; his services
after his reemployment come to 14 years
and 4 months. His total Service is
therefore 29 years and 6 months. His
age is 55 years.

Your Grace's petitioner therefore
most respectfully prays that the
Accountant General maybe
authorized to count his pensionable
Service previous to his removal i.e.,
6 years 1 month and 19 days towards
pension in reference to the tenor of
the Government Order dated the 23rd
November 1865 No. 1765, so that your
Grace's poor petitioner may get a pension
of Rs 4 a month which is 1/3 of his average
Salary. His Services since his reemployment
amount to 14 years and 4 months. Had
he been permitted to continue in his
post for 8 months more there would
have been no neceſsity for troubling
your Grace with this prayer: For
which act of justice your Grace's
petitioner shall ever pray.

(True Copy).

Berhampore
26th June 1880

Clerk District Munsif's
Court Berhampore

To The Accountant General
Fort Saint Geo

To

His Grace the Duke of Buckingham
and Chandos.
the Governor in Council
Fort Saint George

The Humble petition of Tepemurtula
Lutchayya Clerk in the District
Munsiffs Court Berhampore in
the District of Ganjam who has
applied for pension.

Most respectfully sheweth,

That your Grace's petitioner's application for pension was forwarded to the Accountant General by the District Judge, with his immediate superiors recommendation but the Accountant General wishes to know why your Grace's petitioner's services as Head Gumasta in the District Munsiffs Court of Palasa previous to his dismissal should be included in the pensionable services, though from the tenor of the Government Order No 1675 dated the 23rd November 1865, a copy of which is herewith submitted it is clear that it should be so included.

That your Grace's petitioner was unjustly dismissed on the 3rd June 1862 by the Agent of Ganjam from the Post of Head Gumasta in the District Munsiffs Court of Palasa the salary of which was Rupees 12 per mensem. On his appealing to Government they have in their Order No. 221 dated the 20th February 1864, directed the reemployment of your Grace's petitioner. But on the representation of the Agent they thought it proper to withdraw their first Order, by their order No. 834 dated 6th June 1864. And on your petitioner's again appealing to the Home Authorities the Government have iſsued a third Order No. 1834 dated 20th December 1864, Cancelling their 2nd Order and bringing the 1st Order into force. Whereupon the Agent bestowed on your petitioner a post of only Rs 10 per mensem instead of 12. On your Grace's petitioner having brought it to their notice the Government have lastly iſsued an Order No. 1675 dated 23rd November 1865 that your petitioners Services in his reduced post should be treated as Countable towards his pension, until he is provided with a post the salary of which may be equal to that (Rs 12) drawn by him previous to his dismissal.

Your petitioner is an old Servant his services previous to his dismiſsal amount to 15 years and 2 months including 6 years 1 month and 19 days during which period he held the Post of Head Gumasta on Rs 12 pay per mensem; his services

after

712

25/6/80

Jm
5.7.80.

Emolts
1729
5-7-80

Certified that I, James Hargreaves Surgeon Chetrapur, have carefully examined T. Latchayya Pantulu son of T. Survasum Garu, a Gumasta in the Ganjam District Munsiff's Court Berhampore. His age is by his own Statement 55 years, and by appearance about 60 years - I consider T. Lachayya to be completely and permanently incapacitated for further Service of any kind in the Department to which he belongs, in consequence of General debility and impaired vision - His incapacity does not appear to me to have been caused by irregular or intemperate habits -

Chetrapur
23rd June 1880

J. Hargreave
Surgeon
Chetrapur

Incl.
Medical Certificate

Inc No 1899

---

after his reemployment come to 14 years and 4 months. His total Service is therefore 29 years and 6 months. His age is 55 years.

732

Your Graces petitioner therefore most respectfully prays that the Accountant General may be authorized to count his pensionable Service previous to his removal ie, 6 years 1 month and 19 days, towards pension in reference to the tenor of the Government order dated the 23rd November 1865 No. 1765, so that your Grace's petitioner may get a pension of Rs 4 a month which is 1/3 of his average salary. His Services since his reemployment amount to 14 years and 4 months. Had he been permitted to continue in his post for 8 months more there would have been no necessity for troubling your Grace with this prayer. For which act of justice your Grace's petitioner shall ever pray.

Berhampore }
26th June 1880 }

Clerk District Munsiff Court
Berhampore

Proceedings of the Madras Government Judicial Department 23rd November 1865.

75

Read the following papers.

No. 191. 1720 5-7-80 Ju 5-17-80. Abstract of a petition from T. Lutchiah Gumastah in the District Munsiffs Court of Berhampore in Ganjam dated 16th October 1865.

States that the order passed by the Government in his favor has not been as yet carried out in consequence of the District Munsiffs having made all possible delay about it, and that he has mentioned in his petition to Government of 20th September last the circumstances under which he has been deprived of his just promotion in the Office though his service extends over a period of 19 years.

2. Prays for orders to grant him redress.

---

192 From the Ag. Agent to the Governor in Ganjam to the Under Secretary to Government Fort Saint George dated Chetterpore 3rd November 1865 No. 182.

With reference to your memorandum No. 2192 of the 19th ultimo, I have the honor to state for the information of the Government that T. Lutchiah, the petitioner therein mentioned has been employed as a Gumasta in the Munsiff's Court of Berhampore on a pay of 10 Rupees per mensem. The pay of the petitioner before his dismissal was 12 Rupees a month as Head Gumasta of the late Palasa Munsiffs Court from which post he was dismissed.

2 The Report called for in the Order of Government No. 1834 of the 20th December 1864 regarding the reemployment of the Petitioner was forwarded on the 14th ultimo.

3 The enclosures are herewith returned.

No. 193. Order thereon 23rd November 1865
No. 1675.

The Governor in Council directs that the Agent in Ganjam will take the earliest opportunity of giving T Lutchiah such employment as will ensure him a salary equal to that drawn by before his dismissal. In the meanwhile, and under the peculiar circumstances of the case the Government resolve to direct that Lutchiahs service subsequent to his reemployment be considered to give a claim for pension.

2 The Agent will report on the 1st June next whether these orders have been carried into effect.

True copy of the true extract.

(Signed) A. J. Arbuthnot.
Chief Secretary

(True copy)

Enc No 1899

---

H26

No 1074

D

D

Ganjam District Court
20th July 1880

No. 901.

From, John Wallace Esquire
Acting District Judge, Ganjam

To, The Accountant General
Madras.

Sir,

With reference to your letter dated 1st March 1880 No. $\frac{A.D.K}{124}$, returning the Pension Application of Tegomushtla Latchayya, I have the honor to send herewith a revised application for Gratuity, a Second Medical Certificate, and a copy of the District Munsifs letter explaining the delay and the necessity for invaliding the Applicant as also a representation in duplicate addressed by the Applicant to Government.

Your letter under reference and the first medical Certificate enclosed with it, are herewith returned.

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

ACCOUNTANT GENERAL'S OFFICE
29 JUL 80
MADRAS

Jn Wallace

Acting District Judge.

b[illegible] his dismissal was 12 Rupees a month

290

No. 54.

A

Certified that I have carefully examined Tejamoorbula Latsayya Pantulu son of Tejamoorbula Surnasam Sastry. 8th Clerk in the District Munsiff's Court Berhampore. His age is by his own statement 55 years and by appearance about 60 years. I consider Tejamoorbula Latsayya Pantulu to be completely and permanently incapacitated for further service of any kind in the department to which he belongs in consequence of old age and general debility.

His incapacity does not appear to me to have been caused by irregular and intemperate habits

Berhampore }
21st July 1879 }

Alfred C. Dalzarius, Surgeon
Actg. Zillah Surgeon
Berhampore

No 6962
21-7-79

A

426

A. D. K.
No. 124

812

To be returned with reply on reverse. C

{ Treasury Account Department.
Pension Verification Branch.

Fort Saint George,
Accountant-General's Office,
1 March 1880.

Recd 10-3-80 No. 173
JM
10.3.80.

From the ACCOUNTANT-GENERAL, MADRAS,

To the Acting District Judge of
Ganjam

Vide ~~your~~ Application for Pension/~~Gratuity~~ on behalf of Tejomurtula Latsayya, 8th clerk District Munsif's Court Berhampore.

The undersigned has the honor to state that as the G. O. No. 1834 dated 20th December 1864, reversing the order dismissing the Applicant, contains no declaration rendering his previous service qualifying, that service should be treated as non-qualifying, and to request.

1. That the delay in the submission of this Application should be accounted for.

2. That the Application should be countersigned by the District Judge, and a few more marks for purposes of identification noted against No. 17 on the first page.

3. That a second medical opinion as to the applicant's alleged incapacity for further service should be obtained and forwarded together with the explanation of Head of Office as to the grounds on which it is proposed to Invalid the applicant while still under the age of 55 years.

The District Judge is requested to be so good as to state the circumstances under which the grant of a Pension of Rs. 4 " " per mensem

was

as proposed while the Applicant apparently would not seem to be entitled thereto not having completed 30 years qualifying Service as required by section 76(b) of the Civil Pension Code.

Offg. Asst. to the Acctt. Genl.
for Acctt. Genl.

---

| 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. Ins. | Personal marks for identification. | Date of Entry. | Signature of Officer. | Signature and designation of the head of the Office. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | | THE ENTRIES IN THESE COLUMNS ARE TO BE REATTESTED EVERY FIVE YEARS ; EACH ATTESTATION SHOULD BE CAREFULLY RULED OFF THAT THE DATE MAY BE CLEARLY SHOWN. | | | | | | | | |
| Pājnoortula Latchappa Pantulu | Brahmin | Berhampore | Pājnoortula Sarveesam Jaru | Guzarati peta of Vizagapatam District. | May 1825. | 51 | 7 | · | 5 | 7 | There is a cut mark on the top of left Ear- Tall man. Cheeks are low | 15-12-76 | | (sd) M. Jagiah<br>Dl. Supt.<br>C. Jangayya<br>Dl. Supt. |

| 1<br>Name of appointment. | 2<br>Nature, *i.e.*, whether substantive or acting, permanent or temporary. | 3<br>Substantive appointment, if the new appointment be acting only. | 4<br>Pay. | 5<br>Acting allowance. | 6<br>Date of appointment. | 7<br>Signat of Offic |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Ganjam District | | | | | | |
| 3rd Gumastah Chicacole District Munsif's Court | Acting | . | 8 0 0 | . | 13th Apr 1847 | |
| 4th Gum: Do. Do. | Do | " | 5 0 0 | . | 24th Jany 1849 | |
| 5 Gum: Do. Do. | Permanent | . | 3 8 0 | . | 20th June 1849 | |
| Gumastah in the Ghumsoor Tahsildar's Office | D. | | 10 0 0 | | 1st May 1856 | |
| Head Gumasta in the District Munsif's Court of Palasa | Do | | 12 0 0 | | 1st July 1856 | |
| Ag 4th Gumasta in the Dt Mf's Court Itchapore | Acting | | 10 0 0 | | 1st April 1865 | |
| 4th & 3d Gumastas Do | Do | | | | | |
| 3d Gum: Do Do | Do | | 10 8 0 | | 6-4-65 | |
| 2d Do Do Do | Do | | 11 0 0 | | 6-5-65 | |
| 3d Do Do Do | Do | | 14 0 0 | | 12-6-65 | |
| 9th Gum: in the Dt Munsif's Ct Berhampore | Permanent | | 11 0 0 | | 1-7-65 | |
| | | | 10 0 0 | | 1-9-65 | |
| 8th Gum: Do Do | Do | | | | | |
| 2d Do Do Do | Acting | | 10 0 0 | | 1-12-65 | |
| 8th Do Do Do | Permanent | 8th Gumasta | 11 0 0 | | 1-2-66 | |
| 7. Do Do Do | Acting | " | 10 0 0 | | 1-4-66 | |
| 8 Do Do Do | Permt | 8 Gum: | 10 0 0 | | 1-2-67 | |
| 7 Do Do Do | Acting | . | 10 0 0 | | 1-3-67 | |
| 6 Do Do Do | Do | 8 Gum | 10 0 0 | | 1-4-67 | |
| | | Do | 10 0 0 | | 1-7-67 | |

Leave on loss of Half Pay from [illegible]

Leave on loss of Full pay from 6th [illegible]

| 1<br>Name of appointment. | 2<br>Nature, *i.e.*, whether substantive or acting, permanent or temporary. | 3<br>Substantive appointment, if the new appointment be acting only. | 4<br>Pay. | 5<br>Acting allowance. | 6<br>Date of appointment. | 7<br>Signature of Officer. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 7th Gum: Dt Mf's Ct Berhampore | Permanent | . | 10 0 0 | . | 1-11-67 | |
| 6th Do Do | Acting | 7th Gumasta | 10 0 0 | | 16-4-68 | |
| 7 Do Do | Permt | - | 10 0 0 | | 1-6-68 | |
| 5 Do Do | Permt | | 10 0 0 | | 1-10-68 | |
| | Leave on loss of Full Pay from 13th April to 12th May 72 | | | | | |
| 4 Do Do | Ag | 5th Gumasta | 10 0 0 | | 11-6-73 | |
| 5 Do Do | Permt | | 10 0 0 | | 1-11-73 | |
| 4 Do Do | Ag | | 10 0 0 | | 1-12-74 | |
| 5 Do Do | Permt | | 10 0 0 | | 5-3-75 | |
| 4 Do Do | Ag | | 10 0 0 | | 1-7-75 | |
| 5 Do Do | Permt | | 10 0 0 | | 1-2-75 | |
| 8 Do Do | Do | | 10 0 0 | | 19-4-76 | |
| 7 Do Do | Do | | 10 0 0 | | 26-5-77 | |
| 6 Do Do | Ag | | 10 0 0 | | 1-6-78 | |
| 7 Do Do | Permt | | 10 0 0 | | 1-9-78 | |
| | Leave on loss of Full Pay from 1st Decr 78 to 20th June 187 | | | | | |
| 8 Clerk Do | Do | | 15 0 0 | | 1-4-79 | |

Leave on loss of Full Pay [illegible] to [illegible]
30th June 1872
Leave on loss of Full Pay [illegible]
21st August 1872 [illegible]
Leave on loss of Half Pay from
21st Jany 187[illegible]

| 8<br>Character of Officer.<br>*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<br>Signature and designation of immediate head of the Office. | 10<br>Date of termination of appointment. | 11<br>Reason of termination, *e.g., transfer, promotion, return of permanent incumbent.* | 12<br>Signature and designation of immediate head of the Office. |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | 23^d Jany 1849 | Promotion | |
| | | 23^d March 1849 | Return of Perm^t incumbent | |
| | | 30^th April 1856 | Promotion | |
| | | 30^th June 1856 | Promotion | |
| Applicant was dismissed for misconduct on 20^th June 1862 but it was over ruled by Government & reinstatement ordered vide G.O. d^d 20^th December 1864 No. 1834. | | 19^th June 1862 | Dismissal for neglect of duty & disobedience of orders | |
| | | 5^th April 1865 | Promotion | |
| | | 3-5-65 | D^o | |
| | | 11 6 65 | D^o | |
| | | 30 6-65 | Return of Perm^t incumbent | |
| | | 31 8 65 | Appointed as permanent G^o [illegible] | |
| | | 30 11 65 | Promotion | |
| | | 31 1 66 | D^o | |
| | | 31 3 66 | Return of Perm^t incumbent | |
| | | 31 1 67 | Promotion | |
| | | 28 2 67 | Return of Perm^t incumbent | |
| | | 31 3 67 | Promotion | |
| | | 30 6 67 | D^o | |
| | | 31 10 67 | Return of Permanent incumbent | |

---

| 8<br>Character of Officer.<br>*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<br>Signature and designation of immediate head of the Office. | 10<br>Date of termination of appointment. | 11<br>Reason of termination, *e.g., transfer, promotion, return of permanent incumbent.* | 12<br>Signature and designation of immediate head of the Office. |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | 15-4-68 | Promotion | |
| | | 31-5-68 | Return of Perm^t incumbent | |
| | | 30 9 68 | Promotion | |
| | | 10 6-73 | D^o | |
| | | 31 10 73 | Return of Perm^t incumbent | |
| | | 30 11 74 | Promotion | |
| | | 4 3 75 | Return of Perm^t incumbent | |
| | | 30 6 75 | Promotion | |
| | | 31 8 75 | Return of Perm^t incumbent | |
| Applicant was degraded on 19^th April 1876 for disobedience but without loss of pay. | | 18 4 76 | Reduced for disobedience. | (sd) M. Jogiah D. Eng |
| | | 25 5 77 | Promotion | (sd) M. Jogiah D. Eng |
| | (sd) C. S. Asst. Dn | 31 5 78 | D^o | (sd) C. S. D. Eng 3/7/78 |
| | | 31-8 78 | Return of Perm^t incumbent | |
| | | 31 3 79 | Promotion under new scale. | |
| Gave me satisfaction<br>(sd) C. S.<br>22/7/78 | | 20-7 79 | Incapacitated for further service | |

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

| 8<br>Character of Officer.<br>*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<br>Signature and designation of immediate head of the Office. | 10<br>Date of termination of appointment. | 11<br>Reason of termination, *e.g.*, *transfer, promotion, return of permanent incumbent.* | 12<br>Signature and designation of immediate head of the Office. |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | |

SERVICE BOOK
OF

Name. Tiyyorstula Latchayya Pantulu
Caste or Race. Brahmin
Residence. Berhampore
FATHER'S Name. Tiyyorstula Sarveasu Pantulu
FATHER'S Residence. Jugarathpula of Vizagapatam Dis
Date of birth. May 1825.

In No 1899

---

99D

Berhampore District
Munsif's Court
3rd July 1880. 87

No: 57

From The District Munsif
of Berhampore.

Rd T.W.
5, 7, 80.

To,
T. Wallace Esquire
District Judge of Ganjam
Berhampore.

Honored Sir,

1. With reference to your honorable Court's Proceedings dated 15th March 1880 No: 410 directing me to report on the points referred to in the Accountant General's letter therewith sent, I beg to report as follows:—

2. The delay occasioned in the submission of the application of T. Latchayya for pension arose from the following circumstances.

(1) He applied for pension while

returning from Benares where he had gone on leave.

(2) After his arrival here on the 18th July 1879 he was sent to the Zillah Surgeon for Examination as to his physical capacity for further Government service. I received the Zillah Surgeon's Certificate on the 21st July.

(3) As the applicant had served in various offices prior to his employment in this Court reference for verification of his services was made to the Collector and District Judge of Ganjam and the District Munsif of Chicacole and the verified statements reached my office not later than 23rd September 1879.

(4) The applicant had been dismissed and was again employed in Government offices. On his being called upon by me to produce the papers connected

with his dismissal he went to Chicacole and returned with them on the 16th October. His application was therefore submitted on the 21st October.

3. As required in the Accountant General's letter I noted a few more remarks of identification in the application.

4. I have sent the applicant to the Surgeon at Chatrapore who also gave him a certificate declaring him unfit for further service. The certificate is herewith sent. The applicant himself applied for pension being aware of his incapacity. I found him to be inefficient in the discharge of his duties owing to his old age and debility.

5. As directed in your Proceeding

take into favoura

years 8 months and 10 days before he will be entitled to a pension of Rs:4. I do not think that a further period of 8 months, if allowed to the applicant to remain in public service would be sufficient to entitle him to the pension as he seems to have supposed. The applicant however relies on the wording of Government order directing his service subsequent to his re-employment should be considered to give a claim for pension and requests that his past services may be taken to account towards pension. A copy of G.O. dated 23rd November 1865 No: 1675 accompanies the applicant's petition to the Government. I therefore request that your honor will be pleased to take into favourable consideration

7. The delay in submitting the reply has arisen from my being unable to get a second medical opinion in consequence of the applicant's absence at Vizagapatam and other places as reported by me to your honor in my letter dated 13rd April 1880. The applicant after his return presented himself before the Surgeon at Chatrapore for examination & obtained a certificate from him & produced it before me on the 25th June 1880.

8. I beg to return herewith the papers received with the proceedings under reply.

I beg to remain
Hond Sir,
our most Obt Servant
signed C. Rangayya
Dist Munsif

True Copy)

John Watson
Ag District Judge

H Mortimer
Hd Clerk

W C Mortimer
H C

Copy of the District
Munsif's letter
explaining delay

No 891
D/D

Ganjam District Court
28th October 1879.

No. 1594

From, W J Graham Esquire ~~1090~~ 111
Acting District Judge, Ganjam

To, The Accountant General
Madras.

Sir,

I have the honor to forward herewith, for your disposal, an application for an Invalid Pension received from the District Munsif of Berhampore on behalf of Tezomurtula Latsayya, late 8th Clerk of his Court, together with the Applicant's Service Book, Medical Certificate, and 23 Certificates &c marked I to XX a to d, regarding his Character and past conduct.

I have the honor to be
Sir
Your most obedient Servant

W J Graham
Acting District Judge

ACCOUNTANT GENERAL'S OFFICE
3 NOV 79
MADRAS

[illegible]
A.C.

1132

# APPLICATION FOR {~~PENSION.~~ GRATUITY.

1. Name of Applicant. Tejomoortula Latsayya

2. Father's name. Tejomoortula Sarvesam garu

3. Race and Sect ~~or~~ Caste. Brahmin, Hindu. Smarthava Sect.

4. Residence. showing llage & Purgunnah } Berhampore, Ganjam District.

5. Present or last employment. ncluding name of stablishment } 8th Clerk of the District Munsif's Court of Berhampore –

6. Date of beginning service. – – – – – – – – 13th April 1847

7. Date of end of service. – – – – – – 20th July 1879.

| | Y. M. D. |
|---|---|
| 8. Length of service including ~~breaks~~ interruptions ... | 32—3—7 |
| of which superior ... ... ... ... | 6—1—19 |
| inferior ... ... ... ... | 13—10—20 |
| non-qualifying and ~~breaks~~ interruptions | 18—4—17 |

9. Class of {~~pension~~ gratuity} applied for, and cause of application* Invalid gratuity being totally incapacitated for further service –

10. [Average] emoluments or pay. – – – – – – – Rs 10—0—0

11. Proposed pension. – – – – – – – – – 0 — 0 — 0

12. Proposed gratuity. Rs. 40—0—0

13. Date from which Pension to commence. 0 — 0 — 0

14. Place of payment. – – – – – – Chetterpore

15. Age of Applicant on this date. – – – – – – years — months 54 — 5 — 0 (May 1825)

16. Height. – – – – – – – – – feet — inches 5 — 7

17. Marks. There is a cut mark on the top of left ear. A small mole about 1½ inch above the left shoulder blade: three slight scars from bruises on the back.

18. Date. 3rd July 1880

C. Rangayya
District Munsif
Signature of the Head of Office.

John Wallace
Ag. District Judge

---

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

115

**HISTORY OF THE (SERVICE SHOWING BREAKS) OF** Tejomoortula Latsayya Pantulu late 8th Clerk of the District Munsif's Court of Berhampore -

| Establishment. | Appointment. | Pay. RS. | A. | P. | Acting allowance. RS. | Date o 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. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Ganjam District<br>Chicacole District<br>Munsif's Court | Ag. 3d Gumasta | 8 | . | . | . | 13th April 1847 | 23d Jany 1849 | . | . | . | 1 | 9 | 11 | | By Diaries | Nonqualifying being acting Service. |
| D° | A/4th D° | 5 | . | . | . | 24th Jany 1849 | 23d March 49 | . | . | . | . | 2 | . | | | |
| | Without Employ | — | — | — | — | 24th Mar 1849 | 19th June 49 | . | . | . | . | 2 | 25 | | | |
| D° | 5th Gum: Rt. | 3 | 8 | . | . | 20th June 49 | 30th April 1856 | 5 | | 10 | 6 | 10 | 10 | | By Pay bills. | Nonqualifying being Service preceding dismissal |
| Ghumsoor<br>Tahsildar's Office | Gumasta | 10 | . | . | | 1st May 1856 | 30th June 1856 | . | 2 | . | . | 2 | . | | D° | |
| Palasa District<br>Munsif's Court | 4th Gumasta | 12 | . | . | | 1st July 1856 | 19th June 1862 | 5 | | [illegible] | 5 | 11 | 19 | | By pay bills and order of Dismissal | D° being Acting Service |
| | Without Employ | | | | | 20th June 62 | 31st Mar 65 | . | . | . | 2 | 9 | 12 | | | |
| Ichhapore District<br>Munsif's Court | A/4th Gum: | 10 | . | . | | 1st April 65 | 5th April 65 | . | . | . | . | . | 5 | | | |
| D° | A/4th + 3d Gum: | . | . | . | 10-8 | 6-4-65 | 5-5-65 | . | . | . | . | 1 | . | | | |
| D° | A/3d D° | 11 | . | . | . | 6-5-65 | 11-6-65 | . | . | . | . | 1 | 6 | | | |
| D° | A/2d D° | 14 | . | . | | 12-6-65 | 30-6-65 | . | . | . | . | . | 19 | | | |
| D° | A/3d D° | 11 | . | . | | 1-7-65 | 31-8-65 | . | . | . | . | 2 | . | | | |
| Berhampore District<br>Munsif's Court | 9th Gumasta | 10 | . | . | | 1-9-65 | 30-11-65 | . | 3 | . | . | . | . | | | |
| D° | 8 D° | 10 | . | . | | 1-12-65 | 31-1-[illegible] | . | 2 | . | . | . | . | | | |
| D° | A/2 D° | 14 | . | . | | 1-2-66 | 31-3-[illegible] | . | 2 | . | . | . | . | | | |
| D° | 8 D° | 10 | . | . | | 1-4-66 | 31-1-67 | . | 10 | . | . | . | . | | | |
| D° | A/7 D° | 10 | . | . | | 1-2-67 | 28-2-67 | . | 1 | . | . | . | . | | | |
| D° | 8 D° | 10 | . | . | | 1-3-67 | 31-3-67 | . | 1 | . | . | . | . | | | |
| D° | A/7 D° | 10 | . | . | | 1-4-67 | 30-6-67 | . | 3 | . | . | . | . | | | |
| D° | A/6 D° | 10 | . | . | | 1-7-67 | 31-10-67 | . | 4 | . | . | . | . | | | |
| D° | 7 D° | 10 | . | . | | 1-11-67 | 15-4-68 | . | 5 | 15 | . | . | . | | By Salary bills | |
| D° | A/6 D° | 10 | . | . | | 16-4-68 | 31-5-68 | . | 1 | 15 | . | . | . | | | |
| D° | 7 D° | 10 | . | . | | 1-6-68 | 30-9-68 | . | 4 | . | . | . | . | | | |
| D° | 5 D° | 10 | . | . | | 1-10-68 | 10-6-73 | 4 | 8 | 10 | . | . | . | | | Verified from the records of the District Munsif Court at Berhampore and the verification confirmed partly by the Audit Registers and partly by the Annual Returns on record in this office |
| D° | A/4 D° | 10 | . | . | | 11-6-73 | 31-10-73 | . | 4 | 19 | . | . | . | | | |
| D° | 5 D° | 10 | . | . | | 1-11-73 | 30-11-74 | 1 | 1 | . | . | . | . | | | |
| D° | A/4 D° | 10 | . | . | | 1-12-74 | 4-3-75 | . | 3 | 4 | . | . | . | | | |
| D° | 5 D° | 10 | . | . | | 5-3-75 | 30-6-75 | . | 3 | 26 | . | . | . | | | |
| D° | A/4 D° | 10 | . | . | | 1-7-75 | 31-8-75 | . | 2 | . | . | . | . | | | |
| D° | 5 D° | 10 | . | . | | 1-9-75 | 18-4-76 | . | 7 | 18 | . | . | . | | | |
| D° | 8th D° | 10 | . | . | | 19-4-76 | 25-5-77 | 1 | 1 | 7 | . | . | . | | | |
| D° | 7 D° | 10 | . | . | | 26-5-77 | 31-5-78 | 1 | . | 6 | . | . | . | | | |
| D° | A/6 D° | 10 | . | . | | 1-6-78 | 31-8-78 | . | 3 | . | . | . | . | | | |
| D° | 7 D° | 10 | . | . | | 1-9-78 | 31-3-79 | . | 7 | . | . | . | . | | | |
| D° | 8 Clerk | 15 | . | . | | 1-4-79 | 20-7-79 | . | 3 | 20 | . | . | . | | | |
| | Total period of Superior<br>Inferior | | | | Service — | | | ~~26~~<br>13 | ~~10~~<br>10 | ~~19~~<br>20 | ~~5~~<br>18 | ~~4~~<br>4 | ~~18~~<br>17 | | 13-10-20<br>12-11-29<br>26-10-19 | |

C. Rangayya
District Munsif

## REMARKS BY HEAD OF OFFICE.

1. As to character and past conduct of Applicant. Of the Officers under whom the applicant served Seven Certified that his Character and Conduct were good vide Copies of testimonials I to XIV and one found him to be disobedient. His Character & conduct were good during the time he was my subordinate.

2. Explanation of any suspension or degradation. Applicant was dismissed on 20 June 62 for disobedience & misconduct vide order of the Governor's Agent d. 30 June 62 and reemployed on the 1st April 65. See Inclosures XV to XIX. Applicant was degraded from 5th 6 8th Jumastar's post for misconduct vide District Court's proceedings d. 28 April 1876 & (XXa to XXd)

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

4. Explanation under Section ~~47~~ 59, Rule 1, so far as the Head of the Office can give it. None

5. Any other remarks. – I found the applicant to be entirely inefficient in the discharge of his duties owing to his old age and debility. The applicant himself applied for pension being aware of his incapacity. He was certified by two Medical Officers to be completely and permanently incapacitated for further Service.

6 Specific opinion of Head of Office whether the Service claimed is Established and should be admitted or not. See Rule 6 under Sec. 84 (5). } The Service is Established and should be admitted.

Wm Wallace
Ag District Judge

C. Rangayya
District Munsif
SIGNATURE.

## CERTIFICATE AND REPORT OF ACCOUNTANT GENERAL.

No $\frac{ADV}{1045}$ Certified that Qualifying Service in Inferior Grades has been duly proved for 13 years 10 months and 20 days: and that an Invalid Gratuity not exceeding Rs 60 — equal to 4 months pay (Vizt Rs 15, and not Rs 10 per mensem as shown in the 1st page of the application), is admissible under Sections 61, 76 (a) & 77 of the Civil Pension Code 4th Edition.

The delay of nearly one year in the submission of this application is explained by the District Munsif in his letter No 57 of the 3rd July/80 herewith submitted.

It will be seen from the remarks opposite to Nos 1 & 2 in the 3rd Page of the application that the character and past conduct of the applicant has not been quite satisfactory. It rests therefore with the Government to make such reduction in the amount of any Gratuity that may be sanctioned to him as they may deem proper with reference to section 22 of the Code.

Fort Saint George,
Acctt. Genl's Office,
16th August 1880.
17–8–80

To
The Under Secretary to Government
Pension Department.

C. Hall
Offg. Asst. to the Accountt. General
for Accountt. General

M.

and 20 days; and that an invalid {~~pension~~ gratuity} not exceeding Rs. 60 a m equal to ^, is admissible under Section of the Civil Pension Code. The
4 months pay (Viz. Rs. 15, and not Rs. 10 per mensem as to shewn in the 1st page of the application)
calculations have been duly verifi

Accountant General.

Pension 1880 Recept

No. 1899

Application for {Pension or Gratuity—

Date of application. 16th August 1880

Name of Applicant. S. Latchayya Pantulu

Last Appointment. Clerk District Munsif Court Berhampore

Class of {pension or gratuity —

Amount of pension sanctioned

Amount of gratuity sanctioned.

Date of commencement.

Date of sanction.

With order 969 & 12.33 [illegible] - 345

---

## Proceedings of the Madras Government.

Read the following papers:—

From the Ag District Judge, Ganjam dated 28th October 1879 No. 1596

Petitions from S. Lachayya dated 23rd Jany 22nd May & 31st July 1880

" Asstt Accountant-General, dated 16th August 1880 No. A.D.I / 1045

Order thereon,

Under Sections 61, 76 (a) and 77 of the Civil Pension Code (4th Edition), His Grace the Governor in Council is pleased to grant to Tejomoortula Latsayya late 8th Clerk of the District Munsif's Court Berhampore an invalid gratuity of Rupees (60-0-0) Sixty or four months' pay

payable at Chetterpore Ganjam District

in consideration of his qualifying inferior Service of Thirteen years, ten months, and twenty days.

18

No. 969.

To Govt of India

Dep F. C.

Sir I am directed to forward the case of T. Latsayya Pantulu for the favourable consideration of the

To the Accountant-General, with Register.

" District Judge Ganjam

" Collector of Ganjam

[illegible]

Govt of India.

2. This man obtained permanent Govt: employment on the 20th June 49 as ~~Munsiff~~ 5th Gomasta in a Munsiff's court on Rs 3-8 per mensem. On the 1st May 56 he was promoted to a ten rupee post & two months later was made Hd. Gomasta on Rs 12. This last appointment he held until on the 19th June 62 — when he had 5-11-19 yrs mm ds of superior service to his credit — he was dismissed.

3. His dismissal was reversed by ~~the~~ Govt. in Feby 64 by Govt who directed his reemployment but in June of the same year withdrew ~~cancelled~~ their order. On this T Latsaiya submitted a memorial for

T G.O. 20 Feby 64 No 221 (Judicial Depr)

TT — 8th June — No. 834 do —

T G.O. 20 Dec 64 No: 1834 (Judl Depr)

TT 23 Nov 65 No: 1675 (Judl Depr)

transmission to the Sec: of State and as it appeared that the second of the above orders of Govt. had been based on a misunderstanding as to the orders passed by the High Court regarding the memorialist, it was cancelled & the original order "directing T Latsaiya's reemployment" was declared "in force"

4. In the following year T. Latsaiya complained that the orders of Govt. had not been carried out and as it appeared that he had been appointed to a post of Rs ten only it was directed that the earliest opportunity should be taken of giving him "such employment as will ensure him a salary equal to that drawn before his dismissal" & that "in the meanwhile

under the peculiar circumstances of the case xxx his service subsequent to his reemployment be considered to give a claim for pension."

Gratuity to T. Latchayya late Clerk Dt. Court Berhampore

Govt. of {1880} Madras.

PENSION.

To
The Accountant-General,
&c., &c., &c.

Dated
Despd.

G.O.,

Granting the monthly gratuity of Rs 6 to T. Latchayya late 2nd clerk District Court Berhampore.

5. In June of last year T. Latsaiya was invalided and it appears that he continued to draw Rs ten ~~some~~ until a few months before his removal when he was made a clerk on Rs 15. He has thus

but 3 months & 20 days service in superior grades since his reemployment or ~~1-3-9 in all~~ counting that prior to his dismissal.

His total service amounts to 26-10-19 if the interruption caused by the dismissal which was cancelled is condoned.

6 The papers connected with the case are enclosed and as ~~considering~~ the intentions of Govt. in directing T. Latsaiya's reemployment & early promotion to a superior grade have been frustrated & the promises made to him been unfulfilled I am recommend that as a special case

1230 3P

Pension Dep

To Govt of Madras

Case of T. Latsaiya.

he may be granted the maximum pension - Rs 4 + per mensem - admissible to an inferior servant.

Lal

Rs 4 is just the 1/3 pension he would have been granted if he had been employed in a 12 Rs post.

Lal

Ootacamund
27 Septr 1880

c17/9

1b copies

Copd 12-10-80

The

**Govt. of (1880) Madras.**

**PENSION.**

2090

To The Secy to the Govt of India
D. of F. & C.

Dated 7th Sept } 1880.
Received 9 Oct }

Encl.

G.O., 27 Septr 1880. No. 969.

Pension Recommending grant, states that S. Sattayya Pantulu late Clerk in the District Munsif's Court, Berhampur may be granted as a special [illegible] the maximum pension [illegible] admissible [illegible] servant.