

(1) Number of pages 44  
(2) Date of repair 19-1-62  
(3) Initials of the Referencer EX

# MADRAS RECORD OFFICE.

Government of Madras.

*Pension* DEPARTMENT.

|          |                   |             |
|----------|-------------------|-------------|
| G.O. No. | <u>14</u>         | Press       |
|          |                   | <u>Mis.</u> |
| Dated    | <u>15-1-1881.</u> |             |

Not to be folded or roughly handled

*15/1/81*

15TH JANUARY 1881, No. 14, PENSION.

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS.

PENSION DEPARTMENT.

READ—again G.O., dated 8th June 1880, No. 518, Pension.

READ—also the following papers:—

From the Accountant-General, to the Under Secretary to Government, Pension department, dated Fort St. George, 20th October 1880, No. J.A.E.-357.

Pension department.

With reference to the proceedings of Government, No. 518, dated the 8th June 1880, Pension department, sanctioning the grant of a pension of Rs. 37-8-0 and Rs. 60 per mensem to Y. Lakshmana Row and Mr. F. B. Pedroza, of the Revenue Settlement department, and to the copies of marginally-noted correspondence on the subject which passed between this office and the officer in charge of the Revenue Settlement department, Madras, I have the honor to state, that, when reporting on the applications for pension on behalf of the above-named persons, this office, in calculating average emoluments, excluded from consideration the additional allowances which they drew while holding the appointments substantive *pro tempore*, since their status at the time was that of an acting officer merely, and since they were shown in their service books to have retained lien on, and counted service for pension in, their respective substantive appointments instead of in their officiating appointments. The officer in charge of the Settlement department recommends that the acting allowances should be included in the calculation on the ground that the appointments in which Lakshmana Row and Mr. Pedroza acted were fully vacant, and that they alone counted for pension the service rendered in those acting appointments. Mr. Puckle further explains that the original entries in those books were made through ignorance as to the actual requirements in such cases, and he has accordingly made the necessary corrections in them. Should Government be pleased to accept the Acting Superintendent's explanation, Lakshmana Row and Mr. Pedroza would be entitled to a pension of Rs. 45-1-4 and Rs. 67-13-4, respectively, instead of Rs. 37-8-0 and Rs. 60 per mensem, as sanctioned in the G.O. under reference.

2. A memorandum showing how the above figures have been arrived at is appended for the information of Government.

3. The enclosures of your memorandum, No. 68, dated the 3rd September 1880, are herewith returned.

## ENCLOSURES.

## Memorandum.

## Lakshmana Row—

|                                                 | RS.   | A. | P. |
|-------------------------------------------------|-------|----|----|
| 1st January 1875 to 1st February 1878, at 75... | 2,777 | 10 | 10 |
| 2nd February 1878 to 8th September 1878, at 90  | 650   | 12 | 6  |
| 9th September 1878 to 13th October 1878, at 75  | 86    | 7  | 3  |
| 14th October 1878 to 28th February 1879, at 250 | 1,145 | 2  | 7  |
| 1st March 1879 to 31st December 1879, at 75     | 750   | 0  | 0  |

10) 5,410 1 2

6) 541 0 1

2) 90 2 8

45 1 4

## Mr. Pedroza—

|                                                  | RS.   | A. | P. |
|--------------------------------------------------|-------|----|----|
| 1st January 1875 to 1st February 1878, at 120    | 4,444 | 4  | 7  |
| 2nd February 1878 to 8th September 1878, at 250  | 1,807 | 11 | 10 |
| 9th September 1878 to 31st December 1879, at 120 | 1,888 | 0  | 0  |

10) 8,140 0 5

6) 814 0 0

2) 135 10 8

67 13 4

From R. K. PUCKLE, Esq., Acting First Member, Board of Revenue, in charge, Revenue Settlement department, to the Accountant-General, dated Madras, 16th June 1880, No. 1506-388.

In G.O., No. 518, dated 8th current, a pension of Rs. 37-8-0 and Rs. 60 was sanctioned to Y. Lakshmana Row and Mr. F. B. Pedroza, respectively, being less than that recommended by this office, and I have the honor to request to be informed whether reduction was intentional, and, if so, on what ground.

From the Accountant-General, to the officer in charge of the Revenue Settlement department, dated Fort St. George, 23rd June 1880, No. J.A.E.-127.

In reply to your letter, No. 1506-388, dated the 16th June 1880, I have the honor to state that the average salaries of the two persons referred to therein are not Rs. 106-6-10 and Rs. 135-10-8 a-month, as shown in their respective applications for pension, but Rs. 75 and 120 only as exhibited in G.O., No. 518, dated the 8th instant, Pension department. The two last mentioned amounts do not include the several acting allowances drawn by Lakshmana Row and Mr. F. B. Pedroza during the last five years of their services which are inadmissible under the provisions of section 80 (c) of the Civil Pension Code.

From R. K. PUCKLE Esq., Acting First Member, Board of Revenue, in charge, Revenue Settlement department, to the Accountant-General, dated Madras, 2nd July 1880, No. 1645-429.

In reply to your letter, No. J.A.E.-127, dated 23rd ultimo, I have the honor to point out that section 80 (c) prohibits, in the calculation of pension, the inclusion of allowances, unless the *pro tempore* service for which these allowances were granted counts under section 13 or section 27, rule 2. Lakshmana Row was officiating sub. *pro tem.* for the Nellore Uncovenanted Assistant for settlement, Balaji Row, who was acting for the Huzur Sheristadar, Venkata Kristna Row, who was officiating as Dewan in the Venkatagiri Zemindari and paid pension contribution towards pension; if the Huzur Sheristadar counts the higher allowances of his Zemindari service again Lakshmana Row and Mr. Pedroza officiated sub. *pro tem.* on various occasions as Uncovenanted Assistant for Settlement in the room of the same Balaji Row who was then permanent

tahsildar of Tanjore; in this case also no two officers counted service simultaneously in the same office (section 13), and moreover as both Lakshmana Row and Mr. Pedroza held substantive appointments, section 27, rule 2, does not seem to be prejudicial to their claim to calculate for pension the superior allowances that they received.

The application made by this office was based on the foregoing calculation.

From the Accountant-General, Madras, to the Officer in charge of the Revenue Settlement department, dated Fort St. George, 14th July 1880.

With reference to your letter, No. 1645-429, dated the 2nd July 1880, explaining the circumstances under which you considered yourself justified in including acting allowances in the calculation of "average emoluments" for pension in the cases of Lakshmana Row and Mr. Pedroza, I have the honor to observe that the provisions of rule 2, section 27, of the Civil Pension Code cannot be viewed as applicable to the cases under reference, as they are intended to govern only the case of an officer who officiates in an office which is vacant, without holding any substantive appointment under Government.

2. Further, it is evident from the explanation afforded in the letter under reply that Lakshmana Row and Mr. Pedroza were officiating in the arrangement made in consequence of the deputation of Venkata Krishna Row on foreign service to officiate as Dewan (Minister) in the Venkatagiri zemindari. This latter officer paid his contribution for pension to retain lien upon, and to count service for pension in, his substantive appointment under the British Government, viz., "Huzur Serishtadar" (head-quarter's manager)—vide rule 17, section 46, of the Civil Pension Code. The officers officiating in the arrangement above referred to although allowed to draw the full pay of their respective acting appointments, their status was that of acting officers, since they were appointed sub. *pro tem.*; they cannot consequently be allowed to count for pension services rendered in those acting appointments.

From R. K. PUCKLE, Esq., Acting First Member, Board of Revenue, in charge Revenue Settlement department, to the Accountant-General, dated Madras, 20th July 1880, No. 1795-488.

In reply to your letter, No. I.A.E.-164, dated the 14th instant, I acknowledge that you are right in your interpretation of the circumstances attending Lakshmana Row's acting in the arrangement of the Nellore Huzur serishtadar deputed on foreign service; but when Lakshmana Row and Mr. Pedroza acted successively as sub. *pro tem.* in the post vacated by Balaji Row, uncovenanted assistant of North Arcot (then confirmed as tahsildar of Tanjore), I conceive that they were entitled to count service towards pension, as no two officers did count service in that post at one and the same time; if this is allowed it will add about Rs. 8 to either pension. I have the honor to request that you will be good enough to reconsider\* the matter.

\*Vide a revised list of average emoluments drawn by Lakshmana Row attached.

From M.B.Ry. M. TILLANAYAGAM PILLAI, Deputy Collector in charge of the Treasury, Tanjore, to the Accountant-General, dated Tanjore, 11th August 1880, No. 1659.

With reference to your letter, No. I.A.E.-211, dated 30th ultimo, I have the honor to state that the post of tahsildar of Tanjore was vacant only from 7th January to 5th February

1878, and that Sami Row, the permanent second-class tahsildar of Mayavaram, acted for the tahsildar of Tanjore from 6th February to the end of April 1878. Balaji Row's name is entered in the pay abstract from 1st May to the end of July 1878 as permanent tahsildar of Tanjore, and Sami Row continued in the acting appointment till he was confirmed in it on 1st August 1878. Thus Balaji Row was treated as tahsildar of Tanjore only for three months from 1st April 1878. Sami Row had, of course, drawn, for the period during which he acted as tahsildar of Tanjore, the salary of his permanent appointment as well as acting allowance, both of which amounted to the full pay of the office.

From R. K. PUCKLE, Esq., Acting First Member, Board of Revenue, in charge Settlement department, to the Accountant-General, dated Madras, 9th August 1880, No. 1985-549.

With reference to your letter, No. I.A.E.-211, dated 30th ultimo, to the Collector of Tanjore, communicated to me with No. I.A.E.-212, dated as above, I have the honor to forward a copy of G.O., No. 1087, dated 2nd May 1878, from which it will be seen that K. Balaji Row was appointed tahsildar of Tanjore from 2nd February 1878, from which date the post of uncovenanted assistant, North Arcot, has fallen vacant. But K. Balaji Row did not join his

appointment in Tanjore, as he was Acting deputy collector, Nellore, and was afterwards made a permanent deputy collector in the Godavari district (*vide Fort St. George Gazette*, dated 27th August 1878, page 496).

From the Accountant-General, to the Collector of Tanjore, dated Fort St. George, 20th August 1880, No. I.A.E.-241.

With reference to your letter, No. 1659, dated the 11th August 1880, informing this office that Balaji Row was recognized as permanent tahsildar (native collector) of Tanjore only for three months from 1st April 1878, I have the honor to invite your attention to the order of Government embodied in the Proceedings of the Board of Revenue, Mis. No. 4584, dated the 7th May 1878, from which you will observe that Balaji Row was appointed tahsildar of Tanjore from the 2nd February 1878. The fact of his not having actually assumed charge of his appointment in Tanjore, being prevented from doing so in consequence of his employment on other duty, does not seem to establish a ground for disallowing him to count the benefit of service for pension in that appointment from the last-mentioned date. Under these circumstances, I request that I may be informed whether there is any objection to Balaji Row counting service for pension in the above appointment from the 2nd February to 11th July 1878, the date from which his appointment as deputy collector took effect.

From M.R.Ry. A. KRISHNAMAHA, Deputy Collector in charge of the Treasury, Tanjore, to the Accountant-General, dated Tanjore, 25th August 1880, No. 1801.

Referring to the concluding part of your No. I.A.E.-241, dated 20th instant, I have the honor to state that I see no objection to Balaji Row counting service for pension as tahsildar of Tanjore from 2nd February to 11th July 1878, the date on which his appointment as deputy collector took effect.

From the Accountant-General, to the Acting First Member, Board of Revenue, in charge of Revenue Settlement department, dated Fort St. George, 16th September 1880, No. I.A.E.-279.

With reference to your letter, No. 1795-488, dated the 20th July 1880, and in continuation of this office letter, No. I.A.E.-242, dated the 20th August 1880, I have the honor to state that as the Collector of Tanjore sees no objection to Balaji Row counting service for pension as tahsildar of Tanjore from 2nd February to 11th July 1878, the date on which his appointment as deputy collector took effect, Mr. Pedroza and Lakshmana Row, who are stated to have acted successively *sub. pro tem.* in the appointment in the Revenue Settlement department of uncovenanted assistant and examiner, may be allowed to count service for pension in their respective acting appointments.

2. As the entries in their respective service books show that Mr. Pedroza and Lakshmana Row, while acting in the above arrangement, counted service for pension in their respective *substantive* appointments instead of in their acting appointments, although the vacancy which gave rise to the arrangement was a permanent one, it is not apparent how they can be allowed to include in the calculation of average emoluments for pension the additional allowances which they drew while acting in higher appointments. The fact of their reversion on the 9th September 1878 to their former substantive appointments further makes it clear that they could not count towards pension their services in the acting appointments.

3. If you are still of opinion that they are entitled to reckon towards pension the additional allowance they drew while acting in higher appointments, I beg to state that corrections will have to be made in the entries in the service books which were duly attested by the officers under whom Mr. Pedroza and Lakshmana Row served in September 1878. On hearing that you will take the responsibility of making the necessary corrections, their service books, which have been recalled from Government office, will be sent to you.

From R. K. PUCKLE, Esq., Acting First Member, Board of Revenue, in charge Settlement department, to the Accountant-General, dated Madras, 7th October 1880, No. 2521-434.

As in paragraph 1 of your letter, No. I.A.E.-279, dated 16th September 1880, you sanction the service *sub. pro tem.* of Mr. Pedroza and Lakshmana Row to be allowed to count for pension, I herewith return their service books with (as I conceive) the needful corrections made in column 3. The original entries objected to were made through ignorance as to actual requirements in such cases.

No. 86.

OFFICIAL MEMORANDUM.

From the Accountant-General's letter of the 20th ultimo, No. I.A.E.-357, and accompanying papers, it is understood that it is proposed to allow Mr. Pedroza and Lakshmana Row to count towards average emoluments the amount (over and above the pay of their permanent appointments) drawn by them while holding the office of Second Uncovenanted Assistant on the Mr. Pedroza, 2nd February 1878 to 8th September 1878. occasions noted in the margin on the ground that that office was then fully vacant. Lakshmana Row, 14th October 1878 to 28th February 1879.

If this be so it is requested that the grounds on which this opinion is held may be fully stated. Neither officer was, it would appear, confirmed in the appointment, nor, though appointed (as now stated) *sub. pro tem.*, was this apparently in the place of any officer. It should be stated why it is considered that an officer can be appointed *sub. pro tem.* to an office that is *fully* vacant. Explanation should also be afforded as to the reasons for admitting Lakshmana Row's allowances while holding the post of examiner from 2nd February 1878 to 8th September 1878 with particulars as to the arrangement under which he held that post, which was not apparently Mr. Pedroza's substantive appointment.

(Signed) L. A. CAMPBELL,  
Under Secy. to Govt.

8th November 1880.

From W. DONALD, Esq., Officiating Accountant-General, to the Secretary to Government, Pension department, dated Fort St. George, 14th December 1880, No. I.A.E.-460.

With reference to Mr. Under Secretary Campbell's memorandum, No. 86, dated the 8th November 1880, requiring further information in respect of the claim for a higher rate of pension, recommended by the officer in charge of the Revenue Settlement department, on behalf of Mr. Pedroza and Lakshmana Row, I have the honor to forward, herewith, copy of a letter received from that officer containing the further information called for by Government, and to state that as the appointment of Uncovenanted Assistant of the Deputy Director's office at North Arcot appears to have been vacant from 2nd February 1878, the date on which the permanent incumbent of that post was transferred to Tanjore for employment as tahsildar (native Collector), and as Mr. Pedroza and Lakshmana Row were acting in an arrangement made temporarily to fill the vacancy, the additional allowances which they drew during the period of their employment in that arrangement may, under the provisions of section 80 (c) of the Civil Pension Code, be included in the calculation of their average emoluments, provided that Government are pleased to accept the corrections in their respective service books now made by the officer in charge of the Settlement department. These corrections would seem to indicate that Mr. Pedroza and Lakshmana Row during the above period counted service for pension in their respective officiating appointments instead of in their substantive appointments—*vide* this office letter to the officer in charge of the Settlement department, No. I.A.E.-279, dated the 16th September 1880, and his reply, No. 2521-434, of 7th October 1880, copies of which have already been furnished to Government with my letter, No. I.A.E.-357, dated the 20th October 1880.

ENCLOSURE.

From R. K. PUCKLE, Esq., Second Member, Board of Revenue, in charge Settlement department, to the Accountant-General, Madras, dated Coonoor, 4th December 1880, No. 2924-568.

With reference to your letter of the 24th ultimo, No. I.A.E.-431, I have the honor to furnish the further information required by Government on the following points:—

- (1) Why it is considered that an officer can be appointed *sub. pro tem.* to an office that is fully vacant.

(II) Why Lakshmana Row's allowances, while holding the post of examiner from 2nd February to 8th September 1878, were admitted into the calculation of average emoluments.

2. As regards the first point I beg to state that, in the absence of the Deputy Director on furlough, and the Assistant Director on famine duty, of the North Arcot party, in 1878, Mr. Pedroza was appointed sub. *pro tem.* to the Uncovenanted Assistant's post then vacant to take charge of a party and conduct the Settlement work until the return of the Deputy Director from furlough. He returned to his substantive appointment as soon as he was relieved by the above officer.

3. Mr. Rundall on resuming charge of the party required the services of an Uncovenanted Assistant to help him in office work, and having in view a person whose services could not just then be spared appointed Lakshmana Row to the vacant post sub. *pro tem.* as a fit person to perform the duties during the interim.

4. The next point is a matter of departmental arrangement. When Mr. Pedroza was appointed sub. *pro tem.* Uncovenanted Assistant of the North Arcot party, the examiner of the office was promoted to the assistant manager's post, and Lakshmana Row to the latter's appointment precisely on the same terms as Mr. Pedroza to the post of Uncovenanted Assistant.

5. As none but the sub. *pro tem.* officers counted service in those appointments during the periods specified in the margin, and as these arrangements were made purely in the interests of Government, they are respectively entitled to the higher allowances drawn by them being taken into account in calculating the average emoluments for pension under section 13 of the Civil Pension Code.

6. All other information in connection with these two individuals has already been furnished in the correspondence that has transpired regarding their pensions.

ORDER—15th January 1881, No. 14, Pension.

In supersession of their order, dated 8th June 1880, No. 518, the Government resolve to grant to Y. Lakshmana Row and Mr. F. B. Pedroza an increased pension of Rs. 45-1-4 and Rs. 67-13-4 per mensem, respectively.

2. Y. Lakshmana Row and Mr. F. B. Pedroza are entitled to the difference between the rate of pension now sanctioned and that granted in G.O., 8th June 1880 No. 518. The amount of arrears due to them will accordingly be disbursed.

(True Extract.)

L. A. CAMPBELL,  
Under Secy. to Govt.

To the Accountant-General.  
" First Member, Board of Revenue, in charge Revenue Settlement.

Exd. C. Howarth.

Govt. of (1881) Madras.

PENSION.

Issued

Recd.

Encl.

G.O., 15th January 1881, No. 14.

JANUARY.

Pension.

Granting increased pensions to Y. Lakshmana Row and Mr. F. B. Pedroza, of the Revenue Settlement department.

Pension DEPARTMENT.

No.

357

Fort Saint George,  
Accountant General's Office,  
20<sup>th</sup> October 1880.

FROM THE ACCOUNTANT GENERAL  
TO THE GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS,

To THE

Under Secretary  
to Government  
Pension Department,  
Fort Saint George.

SIR,

With reference to the Proceedings of Government No. 518 dated the 8<sup>th</sup> June 1880, Pension Department, sanctioning the grant of a Pension of Rs. 37-8-0 and Rs. 60-0-0 per mensem to Y. Lakshmana Rao and Mr. F. B. Pedroza of the Revenue Settlement Department and to the Copies of marginally noted correspondence on the subject which passed between this Office and the Officer in charge of the Revenue Settlement Department, Madras, I have the honor to state, that when reporting on the applications for Pension on behalf of the abovenamed persons, this Office in calculating average emoluments excluded from consideration the additional allowances which they drew while holding the appointments substantive protempore, since their status at the time was that of an Acting Officer merely and since they were shown in

18<sup>th</sup> September 1880.  
16<sup>th</sup> July 1880  
17<sup>th</sup> July 1880  
18<sup>th</sup> July 1880  
19<sup>th</sup> July 1880  
20<sup>th</sup> July 1880  
21<sup>st</sup> July 1880  
22<sup>nd</sup> July 1880  
23<sup>rd</sup> July 1880  
24<sup>th</sup> July 1880  
25<sup>th</sup> July 1880  
26<sup>th</sup> July 1880  
27<sup>th</sup> July 1880  
28<sup>th</sup> July 1880  
29<sup>th</sup> July 1880  
30<sup>th</sup> July 1880  
31<sup>st</sup> July 1880  
1<sup>st</sup> August 1880  
2<sup>nd</sup> August 1880  
3<sup>rd</sup> August 1880  
4<sup>th</sup> August 1880  
5<sup>th</sup> August 1880  
6<sup>th</sup> August 1880  
7<sup>th</sup> August 1880  
8<sup>th</sup> August 1880  
9<sup>th</sup> August 1880  
10<sup>th</sup> August 1880  
11<sup>th</sup> August 1880  
12<sup>th</sup> August 1880  
13<sup>th</sup> August 1880  
14<sup>th</sup> August 1880  
15<sup>th</sup> August 1880  
16<sup>th</sup> August 1880  
17<sup>th</sup> August 1880  
18<sup>th</sup> August 1880  
19<sup>th</sup> August 1880  
20<sup>th</sup> August 1880  
21<sup>st</sup> August 1880  
22<sup>nd</sup> August 1880  
23<sup>rd</sup> August 1880  
24<sup>th</sup> August 1880  
25<sup>th</sup> August 1880  
26<sup>th</sup> August 1880  
27<sup>th</sup> August 1880  
28<sup>th</sup> August 1880  
29<sup>th</sup> August 1880  
30<sup>th</sup> August 1880  
31<sup>st</sup> August 1880  
1<sup>st</sup> September 1880  
2<sup>nd</sup> September 1880  
3<sup>rd</sup> September 1880  
4<sup>th</sup> September 1880  
5<sup>th</sup> September 1880  
6<sup>th</sup> September 1880  
7<sup>th</sup> September 1880  
8<sup>th</sup> September 1880  
9<sup>th</sup> September 1880  
10<sup>th</sup> September 1880  
11<sup>th</sup> September 1880  
12<sup>th</sup> September 1880  
13<sup>th</sup> September 1880  
14<sup>th</sup> September 1880  
15<sup>th</sup> September 1880  
16<sup>th</sup> September 1880  
17<sup>th</sup> September 1880  
18<sup>th</sup> September 1880  
19<sup>th</sup> September 1880  
20<sup>th</sup> September 1880  
21<sup>st</sup> September 1880  
22<sup>nd</sup> September 1880  
23<sup>rd</sup> September 1880  
24<sup>th</sup> September 1880  
25<sup>th</sup> September 1880  
26<sup>th</sup> September 1880  
27<sup>th</sup> September 1880  
28<sup>th</sup> September 1880  
29<sup>th</sup> September 1880  
30<sup>th</sup> September 1880  
1<sup>st</sup> October 1880  
2<sup>nd</sup> October 1880  
3<sup>rd</sup> October 1880  
4<sup>th</sup> October 1880  
5<sup>th</sup> October 1880  
6<sup>th</sup> October 1880  
7<sup>th</sup> October 1880  
8<sup>th</sup> October 1880  
9<sup>th</sup> October 1880  
10<sup>th</sup> October 1880  
11<sup>th</sup> October 1880  
12<sup>th</sup> October 1880  
13<sup>th</sup> October 1880  
14<sup>th</sup> October 1880  
15<sup>th</sup> October 1880  
16<sup>th</sup> October 1880  
17<sup>th</sup> October 1880  
18<sup>th</sup> October 1880  
19<sup>th</sup> October 1880  
20<sup>th</sup> October 1880  
21<sup>st</sup> October 1880  
22<sup>nd</sup> October 1880  
23<sup>rd</sup> October 1880  
24<sup>th</sup> October 1880  
25<sup>th</sup> October 1880  
26<sup>th</sup> October 1880  
27<sup>th</sup> October 1880  
28<sup>th</sup> October 1880  
29<sup>th</sup> October 1880  
30<sup>th</sup> October 1880  
31<sup>st</sup> October 1880  
1<sup>st</sup> November 1880  
2<sup>nd</sup> November 1880  
3<sup>rd</sup> November 1880  
4<sup>th</sup> November 1880  
5<sup>th</sup> November 1880  
6<sup>th</sup> November 1880  
7<sup>th</sup> November 1880  
8<sup>th</sup> November 1880  
9<sup>th</sup> November 1880  
10<sup>th</sup> November 1880  
11<sup>th</sup> November 1880  
12<sup>th</sup> November 1880  
13<sup>th</sup> November 1880  
14<sup>th</sup> November 1880  
15<sup>th</sup> November 1880  
16<sup>th</sup> November 1880  
17<sup>th</sup> November 1880  
18<sup>th</sup> November 1880  
19<sup>th</sup> November 1880  
20<sup>th</sup> November 1880  
21<sup>st</sup> November 1880  
22<sup>nd</sup> November 1880  
23<sup>rd</sup> November 1880  
24<sup>th</sup> November 1880  
25<sup>th</sup> November 1880  
26<sup>th</sup> November 1880  
27<sup>th</sup> November 1880  
28<sup>th</sup> November 1880  
29<sup>th</sup> November 1880  
30<sup>th</sup> November 1880  
1<sup>st</sup> December 1880  
2<sup>nd</sup> December 1880  
3<sup>rd</sup> December 1880  
4<sup>th</sup> December 1880  
5<sup>th</sup> December 1880  
6<sup>th</sup> December 1880  
7<sup>th</sup> December 1880  
8<sup>th</sup> December 1880  
9<sup>th</sup> December 1880  
10<sup>th</sup> December 1880  
11<sup>th</sup> December 1880  
12<sup>th</sup> December 1880  
13<sup>th</sup> December 1880  
14<sup>th</sup> December 1880  
15<sup>th</sup> December 1880  
16<sup>th</sup> December 1880  
17<sup>th</sup> December 1880  
18<sup>th</sup> December 1880  
19<sup>th</sup> December 1880  
20<sup>th</sup> December 1880  
21<sup>st</sup> December 1880  
22<sup>nd</sup> December 1880  
23<sup>rd</sup> December 1880  
24<sup>th</sup> December 1880  
25<sup>th</sup> December 1880  
26<sup>th</sup> December 1880  
27<sup>th</sup> December 1880  
28<sup>th</sup> December 1880  
29<sup>th</sup> December 1880  
30<sup>th</sup> December 1880  
31<sup>st</sup> December 1880

their Service Books to have retained lien on, and counted Service for Pension in, their respective substantive appointments instead of in their officiating appointments. - The Officer in charge of the Settlement Department recommends that the Acting Allowances should be included in the calculation, on the ground that the appointments in which Lakshmana Rao and Mr. Pedroza acted were fully vacant, and that they alone counted for Pension the Service rendered in those acting appointments. Mr. Puckle further explains that the original entries in those Books were made through ignorance as to the actual requirements in such cases, and he has accordingly made the necessary corrections in them. Should the Government be pleased to accept the Acting Superintendent's explanation, Lakshmana Rao and Mr. Pedroza would be entitled to a Pension of Rupees 45-1-4 and Rs. 67-13-4 respectively instead of Rs. 37-8-0 and Rs. 60-0-0 per mensem as sanctioned in G.O. under reference. -

2 A. Memorandum showing how the above figures have been arrived at is appended for the information of Government. -

3 The enclosures of your Memorandum No. 68 dated the 3-September-1880 are herewith returned.

I have the honor to be,

Sir,  
Your most obedt. servant,

W. C. S.

## Memorandum.

### Lakshmana Rao

1<sup>st</sup> January 1875 to 1<sup>st</sup> February 1878 @ 75 = 2777-10-10  
 2<sup>nd</sup> February 1878 to 8<sup>th</sup> September 1878 @ 90 = 650-12-6  
 9<sup>th</sup> September 1878 to 13<sup>th</sup> October 1878 @ 75 = 86-7-3  
 14<sup>th</sup> October 1878 to 28<sup>th</sup> February 1879 @ 250 = 1145-2-7  
 1<sup>st</sup> March 1879 to 31<sup>st</sup> December 1879 @ 75 = 750-0-0

10 | 5410-1-2  
 6 | 541-0-1  
 2 | 90-2-8  
 45-1-4

### Mr. Pedroza

1<sup>st</sup> January 1875 to 1<sup>st</sup> February 1878 @ 120 = 4444-4-7  
 2<sup>nd</sup> February 1878 to 8<sup>th</sup> September 1878 @ 250 = 1807-11-10  
 9<sup>th</sup> September 1878 to 31<sup>st</sup> December 1879 @ 120 = 1888-0-0

10 | 8740-0-5  
 6 | 814-0-0  
 2 | 135-10-8  
 67-13-4

Copy

N<sup>o</sup> 1506  
388

Revenue Settlement Office  
Madras 16 June 1880.

From

The Ag. 1<sup>st</sup> Member,  
Board of Revenue, in charge  
To The Accountant General,  
Madras.

Sir,

In G. O. N<sup>o</sup> 518 dated 8<sup>th</sup> Current a  
pension of Rupees 37. 8. and 60. was  
sanctioned to G. Lutchumana Rao and  
Mr. F. B. Peddigea respectively, being less  
than that recommended by this Office, and I  
have the honor to request to be informed whe-  
ther reduction was intentional and, if so,  
on what ground.

I have &c

(Signed) R. H. Puckle  
Ag. 1<sup>st</sup> Member, Board of  
Revenue, in charge.

Treasury Account Dept.  
Revenue Verification Branch

N<sup>o</sup> 127  
127

Fort St. George  
Account General's Office  
23<sup>rd</sup> June 1880.

From

The Accountant General, Madras,  
To The Officer in Charge of the  
Revenue Settlement Dept. Madras.

Sir,

In reply to your letter N<sup>o</sup> 1506 dated

the

10/6/518d/8/10/10

Revenue 1880, Madras  
N<sup>o</sup> 357  
357

ACCT. GENL'S OFFICE, MADRAS.

FROM

THE ACCOUNTANT GENERAL, MADRAS,

To The Under Secretary  
to Govt Revenue Dept.

Dated 20<sup>th</sup>  
Recd. 21 - } No. of answer.  
Ans.

Subject.

Reporting that, under the  
circumstances explained,  
Lutchumana Rao and Mr.  
Peddigea of the Revenue  
Settlement Dept. would  
be entitled to a pension of  
Rs 45-1-4, & Rs 67-13-4<sup>10</sup>  
respectively instead of Rs  
37-8-0 & Rs 60-0-0 per annum  
sanctioned in G. O. N<sup>o</sup> 518 d.  
8 June 1880. Yours, Accts

the 16<sup>th</sup> June 1880, I have the honor to state that the average salaries of the two persons referred to therein are not Rs 106. 6. 10 and 135. 10. 8 a month, as shown in their respective applications for Pension, but Rs 75. — and 120. — only as exhibited in G. O. N<sup>o</sup> 518 dated the 8<sup>th</sup> Instant, Pension Department. The two last-mentioned amounts do not include the several acting allowances drawn by Lakshmana Rao and Mr. F. B. Pedroza during the last 5 years of their services which are inadmissible under the provisions of Section 80 (C) of the Civil Pension Code. —

I have &c.  
(Signed) R. C. Chapman

Asst. to Asst. Genl.  
for Asst. General.

N<sup>o</sup> 1145  
429.

Revenue Settlement Officer,  
Madras, 2<sup>nd</sup> July 1880.

From

The Agt. Member, Board of Revenue,  
In Charge of Revenue Settlement.

To. The Accountant General,  
Fort-Saint-Georges.

Sir,

In reply to your letter N<sup>o</sup> S. A. E. dated  
23<sup>rd</sup> ultimo, I have the honor to point out that  
Section 80 C prohibits, in the calculation

of

of pension, the inclusion of allowances, unless the pro tempore service for which these allowances were granted counts under Section 13 or Section 27, rule 2. Lakshmana Rao was officiating Sub-protem for the Nellore Uncovenanted Assistant for Settlement; Balajee Rao, who was acting for the Major Sheristadar Venkata Krishna Rao who was officiating as Diwan in the Venkataghini Zemindari and paid pension contribution to Government. If the Major Sheristadar counts the higher allowances of his Zemindari service towards pension, no two Officers were counting service simultaneously in the same Office (Section 13) again Lakshmana Rao and Mr. Pedroza officiated Sub-protem on various occasions as Uncovenanted Assistant for Settlement in the room of the same Balajee Rao who was then permanent Subildar of Tanjore; in this case also no two officers counted service simultaneously in the same Office (Section 13) and moreover as both Lakshmana Rao and Mr. Pedroza held substantive appointments, Sec. 27, rule 2, does

not

not seem to be prejudicial to their claim  
to calculate for pension the superior  
allowances that they received.

The application made by this  
Office was based on the foregoing calculation.

Shave &  
(Signed) R. K. Puckle  
Asst. Member Board of  
Revenue in Charge.

Treasury Account Dept.  
Revenue Verification Branch.

Fort St. George  
Accountant Genl's Office  
14<sup>th</sup> July 1880

From  
The Accountant General, Madras.

To  
The Officer in Charge of the  
Revenue Settlement Department.

Sir,

With reference to your letter No.  
1645<sup>429</sup> dated the 2<sup>d</sup> July 1880, explaining  
the circumstances under which you consider-  
ed yourself justified in including acting  
allowances in the calculation of "average  
emoluments" for Pension in the Cases  
of Lakshmana Rao and Mr. Pedrosa,  
I have the honor to observe that the  
provisions of rule 2 Section 27  
of the Civil Pension Code, cannot  
be

17 58  
be viewed as applicable to the Cases  
under reference, as they are intended to  
govern only the case of an Officer, who  
officials in an Office which is vacant,  
without holding any substantive appointment  
under Government.

2. Further, it is evident from the  
explanation afforded in the letter under reply  
that Lakshmana Rao and Mr. Pedrosa  
were officiating in the arrangement  
made in consequence of the deputation  
of Venkata Krishna Rao, in Foreign  
Service to officiate as Dewan (Minister)  
in the Venkataswami Temple. This  
latter Officer paid his contribution for  
Pension to retain lien upon, and to  
claim service for pension in, his sub-  
stantive appointment under the British  
Government vizt. "Muzur Sheristadar"  
(Head Quarters Manager) Order  
rule 17 Section 46 of the Civil Pension  
Code. The Officers officiating in the  
arrangement above referred to, although  
allowed to draw the full pay of their  
respective acting appointments, their  
status was that of acting Officers, and  
they were appointed Sub. Pension;  
they

they cannot consequently be allowed  
to count for Pension Services rendered  
in Acting Appointments. -

I have &c

(Signed) R. C. Chapman

Asst. to Asst. Genl.  
for Asst. Genl.

N<sup>o</sup> 1795  
488.

Revenue Settlement Office  
Madras, 20 July 1880.

From

The Agt. 1<sup>st</sup> Member, Board of Revenue,  
In charge of Rev. Sett. Deptt.

To

The Accountant General,  
Fort Saint George.

Sir,

In reply to your letter N<sup>o</sup> S. A. E.  
164  
dated the 14<sup>th</sup> instant, I acknowledge that  
you are right in your interpretation  
of the circumstances attending Laksh-  
mana Row's acting in the arrangement  
of the Vellore Muzir Sheristadar de-  
puted in Foreign Service; but when  
Lakshmana Row and Mr Pedurza  
acted successively as sub problem in  
the post vacated by Balaji Row,  
Unconventioned Assistant of North Arcot,  
(then confirmed as Tahsildar of Tanjore)  
I conceive that they were entitled to

Count

19 68/2  
Count Service towards pension as no  
two Officers did count Service in that  
post at one and the same time -  
if this is allowed it will add about  
Rs 8 to either pension. I have the  
honour to request that you will be  
good enough to reconsider the

vide -  
\* a revised list of  
averages submitted  
drawn by Sub. Ch.  
and Row attached matter, -

I have &c  
(Signed) R. H. Puckle  
Ag. 1<sup>st</sup> Member Bd  
of Revenue in charge

Treasury Dy. Collector's Office  
Tanjore 11 August 1880.

N<sup>o</sup> 1659

From

The Deputy Collector,  
In Charge of the Treasury,  
Tanjore.

To

The Accountant General,  
Fort St. George,  
Madras.

Sir,

\* Enclosure herewith  
returned -

With reference to your letter N<sup>o</sup> S. A. E.  
211  
dated 30<sup>th</sup> ultimo, I have the honour to state  
that the post of Tahsildar of Tanjore  
was vacant only from 7<sup>th</sup> January to 5<sup>th</sup>  
February 1878, and that Sami Row  
the permanent 2<sup>d</sup> Class Tahsildar  
of Mayavaram acted for the  
Tahsildar

Tahsildar of Tanjore from 6<sup>th</sup> February  
to the end of April 1878. Balaji  
Row's name is entered in the pay  
abstract from 1<sup>st</sup> May to the end  
of July 1878 as permanent Tahsildar  
of Tanjore, and Sami Row continued  
in the Acting Appointment till he was  
confirmed in it on 1<sup>st</sup> August 1878.  
Thus Balaji Row was treated  
as Tahsildar of Tanjore only for 3  
months from 1<sup>st</sup> April 1878. Sami Row  
had of course drawn for the period  
during which he acted as Tahsildar  
of Tanjore the salary of his permanent  
appointment, as well as Acting al-  
lowance both of which amounted  
to the full pay of the Office.

Shaw & Co

(Signed) M. Tillanayagam Pillai

Dy. Collector

N<sup>o</sup> 1985  
549

Revenue Sett. Office

Madras,

9<sup>th</sup> August 1880.

From

The Ag. 1<sup>st</sup> Member, Board  
of Rev. in Charge, Sett. Dy. O.

To The Assistant General, Fort St. George.

Sir,

With reference to your letter N<sup>o</sup> 1211

dated

dated 30<sup>th</sup> ultimo, to the Collector of Tanjore  
communicated to me with N<sup>o</sup> 1212 dated  
as above, I have the honor to forward a  
copy of G. O. N<sup>o</sup> 1187 dated 2<sup>d</sup> May 1878  
from which it will be seen that H. Balaji  
Row was appointed Tahsildar of Tanjore  
from 2<sup>d</sup> February 1878 from which date  
the post of Uncovenanted Assistant, North  
Arcot, has fallen vacant. But H.  
Balaji Row did not join his Ap-  
pointment in Tanjore, as he was Acting  
Deputy Collector, Nellore, and was after-  
wards made a permanent Deputy Collector  
in the Godavari District - (Vide Fort  
St. George Gazette dated 27<sup>th</sup> August 1878  
page 496).

Shaw & Co

(Signed) R. H. Purkiss

Ag. 1<sup>st</sup> Member Bd. of Rev.  
in Charge.

N<sup>o</sup> 1211

Treasury Account Dept.  
Revenue Verification Branch.

Fort. Saint. George  
Act. General's Office  
20<sup>th</sup> August 1880.

From The Assistant General, Madras

To The Collector of Tanjore.

Sir,

With reference to your letter N<sup>o</sup> 1659 dated  
the 11<sup>th</sup> August 1880 informing this Office that  
Balaji Row was recognized as permanent

Tahsildar

Tahsildar (Native Collector) of Tanjore only for 3 months from 1<sup>st</sup> April 1878, I have the honor to invite your attention to the order of Government embodied in the Proceedings of the Board of Revenue, Miscellaneous, N<sup>o</sup> 4584, dated the 7<sup>th</sup> May 1878, from which you will observe that Balaji Rao was appointed Tahsildar of Tanjore from the 2<sup>d</sup> February 1878. The fact of his not having actually assumed charge of his Appointment in Tanjore being prevented from doing so in consequence of his employment on other duty, does not seem to establish a ground for disallowing him to count the benefit of service for Pension in that Appointment from the last-mentioned date. Under these circumstances, I request that I may be informed whether there is any objection to Balaji Rao counting service for pension in the above Appointment from the 2<sup>d</sup> February to 11<sup>th</sup> July 1878, the date from which his Appointment as Dy. Collector took effect.

I have &c.  
(Signed) C. Hall.

Off. Asst. to Asst. Genl.  
for Asst. General.

N<sup>o</sup> 1801.

Treasury Dy. Collector's Office  
Tanjore 25<sup>th</sup> August 1880.

From

The Dy. Collector  
in Charge of the Treasury,  
Tanjore.

To

The Accountant-General,  
Fort. Saint. George,  
Madras.

Sir,

Referring to the concluding part of your N<sup>o</sup> S. A. E. <sup>241</sup> dated 20<sup>th</sup> Instant, I have the honor to state, that I see no objection to Balaji Rao counting service for pension, as Tahsildar of Tanjore from 2<sup>d</sup> February to 11<sup>th</sup> July 1878, the date on which his appointment as Deputy Collector took effect.

I have &c.

(Signed) A. Krishnamiah,  
Deputy Collector.

Treasury Acct. Dy. Coll.  
Revenue Verification Branch.

N<sup>o</sup> S. A. E. <sup>279</sup>

Fort. St. George  
Acct. Genl's Office  
16<sup>th</sup> Sept. 1880.

From

The Accountant-General, Madras.

To

The Asst. Member B. of Revenue,  
in ch. of Rev. Sett. Dept.

Sir,

With reference to your letter N<sup>o</sup> 1795 <sup>488</sup> dated the 20<sup>th</sup> July 1880, and in continuation of this Office letter N<sup>o</sup> S. A. E. <sup>242</sup> dated the 20<sup>th</sup> August 1880, I have the honor to state that as the Collector of Tanjore sees no objection

objection to Balaji Rao counting service for Pension as Tahsildar of Tanjore from 2<sup>d</sup> February to 11<sup>th</sup> July 1878, the date on which his appointment as Dy. Collector took effect; Mr. Pedroza and Lakshman Rao who are stated to have acted successively sub problem in the appointments in the Revenue Settlement Department of Unreserved As-  
-sistant and Examiner may be allowed to count service for Pension in their respective Acting appointments.

As the entries in their Res-  
-pective Service Books show that Mr. Pedroza and Lakshman Rao while acting in the above arrangement, counted service for Pension in their respective sub-  
-stantive appointments instead of in their Acting appointments, although the vacancy which gave rise to the arrangement was a permanent one, it is not apparent how they can be allowed to include in the calculation of average emoluments for Pension the additional allowances which they drew while acting in higher appointments. The fact of their reversion on the 9<sup>th</sup> September 1878 to their former substantive appointments further makes it clear that they could not count towards Pension their services in the Acting appointments.

125  
98  
If, you are still of opinion that they are entitled to reckon towards Pension the additional allowance they drew while acting in higher appointments, I beg to state that corrections will have to be made in the entries in the Service Books which were duly attested by the Officers under whom Mr. Pedroza and Lakshman Rao served in September 1878. On warning that you will take the responsibility of making the necessary corrections, their Service Books which have been recalled from Government Office will be sent to you.

Made &c.  
(Signed) C. Hall

Off. Asst. Secy. Genl.  
for Account. General.

N<sup>o</sup> 2521/  
434

Revenue Settlement Office,  
Madras  
7<sup>th</sup> October 1880.

From

The Acting 1<sup>st</sup> Member, Board  
of Revenue, in Charge  
Settlement Department.

To

The Assistant General,  
Fort St. George.

Sir,

As in para 1 of your letter of J.S.E. 279 dated 16<sup>th</sup> September 1880, you sanction the

the service sub problem of Mr. Nedroza  
and Lutchumana Row is allowed to  
count for pension, I herewith return  
their service books with (as I conceive)  
the needful corrections made in Column 3.

The original entries objected  
to were made through ignorance as  
to actual requirements in such cases.

I have &c

(Signed) R. H. Mickle

Adj. 1<sup>st</sup> Member, Bd.  
of Rev. in Charge.

True Copies.

*R. H. Mickle*

Maj. Gen. A. C. G. —

W. S. D. L. 125

W. S. D. L. 125

Pension 1880 receipt  
No 752  
From The Com. of the Secy.

Wrote  
Recd 21: } 4 Dec/80

Transferring a petition  
from J. Lutchman  
Am praying for early  
disposal of his gratuity  
Case.

Oct 14  
1881?

Mr. Pedroza  
27th St. 8th St.  
Luchman's Place  
14th St. 28th St.  
D.C.

108  
Mr. Lutchman  
In the absence  
of the 27th St. 8th St.  
accompanying papers  
it is understood that  
it is proposed to allow  
Mr. Pedroza & Luchman  
to count towards  
the average emoluments the  
amount of very blood the  
pay of the permanent  
officers (in the) drawn  
by them while holding  
the office of 2nd uncollected  
officer on the occasion  
noted in the margin  
on the ground that that  
office was then fully  
vacant  
If this be so it is requested

Pension 1880 receipt  
No 52  
From The Com. of the Secy.

Wrote  
Recd 21: } 4 Dec/80

Transferring a petition  
from J. Lutchman  
Am praying for early  
disposal of his gratuity  
Case.

Oct 14  
1881?

Mr. Pedroza  
27th St. 8th St.  
Luchman's Place  
14th St. 28th St.  
D.C.

108  
Mr. Lutchman  
In the absence  
of the 27th St. 8th St.  
accompanying papers  
it is understood that  
it is proposed to allow  
Mr. Pedroza & Luchman  
to count towards  
the average emoluments the  
amount of very blood the  
pay of the permanent  
officers (in the) drawn  
by them while holding  
the office of 2nd uncollected  
officer on the occasion  
noted in the margin  
on the ground that that  
office was then fully  
vacant  
If this be so it is requested

N<sup>o</sup> 86

glw

Pension Department

221

N<sup>o</sup> 186  
460

Fort Saint George  
Actg General's Office  
14<sup>th</sup> December 1880.

From The Accountant General,  
Madras,  
To The Secretary to Government,  
Pension Department,  
Fort Saint George.

Sir,  
With reference to Mr. Under  
Secretary Forbes' Memo. N<sup>o</sup> 86 dated the 8<sup>th</sup>  
November 1880 requiring further information  
in respect of the claim for a higher rate of Pension  
recommended by the Officer in charge of the  
Revenue Settlement Department on behalf of  
Mr. Pedroza and Lakshmana Rao I have  
the honor to forward herewith copy of a letter  
received from that Officer containing the further  
information called for by Government and to  
state that, as the appointment of Uncovenanted  
Assistant of the Deputy Director's Office at  
North Arcot appears to have been vacant  
from 2<sup>d</sup> February 1878, the date on which the  
permanent incumbent of that post was trans-  
ferred to Tanjore for employment as Tahsildar  
(Native Collector), and as Mr. Pedroza and  
Lakshmana Rao were acting in an arrange-  
ment made temporarily to fill the vacancy,  
the additional allowances which they drew  
during the period of their employment in that  
arrangement

arrangement may, under the provisions of Section  
80(c) of the Civil Pension Code, be included in the  
calculation of their average emoluments, provided that  
Government are pleased to accept the corrections in  
their respective Service Books now made by the officer  
in charge of the Settlement Department. These correc-  
tions would seem to indicate that Mr. Pedroza and  
Lakshman Rao during the above period counted  
service for Pension in their respective officiating  
appointments instead of in their Substantive  
appointments. Vide this <sup>the</sup> letter to the Officer in  
charge of the Settlement Department No. 122  
dated the 16 September 1880 and his reply  
No. 2521 of 7<sup>th</sup> October 1880. Copies of which  
<sub>434</sub> have already been furnished to Government with  
letter No. 122 dated the 20 October 1880.

I have the honor to be

Sir

Your obedient servant

H. Donald  
Offg. Account General.

37 Enclo <sup>138</sup>  
 Revenue Settlement Office  
 on circuit, Coonoor.  
 No. 2924  
1568  
 4 December 1880.

From The 2<sup>d</sup> Member, Board of Revenue  
 in charge, Seth Department.

To The Accountant General,  
 Madras.

Sir, With reference to your letter of the  
 24<sup>th</sup> ultimo, No. La S.  
431, I have the honor to  
 furnish the further information required  
 by Government on the following points.

(1) why it is considered that an Officer  
 can be appointed sub. pro. tempore  
 to an office that is fully vacant.

(11) why Lakshmana Rao's allowances,  
 while holding the post of Examiner  
 from 2<sup>d</sup> February to 8 September  
 1878 were admitted into the calcula-  
 tion of average emoluments.

2. As regards the first point, I beg to  
 state that, in the absence of the Deputy Director  
 on furlough, and the Assistant Director on  
 furlough duty, of the North Arcot Part in 1878,  
 Mr. Pedroza was appointed sub. pro. tempore  
 to the Uncovenanted Assistant's post then  
 vacant to take charge of a party and conduct  
 the settlement work, until the return of the  
 Deputy

Revenue Dept. 1880  
 No. 2924  
1568  
 The Accountant General  
 Madras

The Secretary to Govt.  
 Revenue Dept.

Date 16 Dec 1880  
 No. 2924  
1568

Subject in 1

I forward a copy of the letter from the  
 Officer in charge of the Settlement Dept.  
 regarding the further information called  
 for in the letter of the 24<sup>th</sup> ultimo.  
 I enclose a copy of the letter from the  
 Officer in charge of the Settlement Dept.  
 regarding the further information called  
 for in the letter of the 24<sup>th</sup> ultimo.  
 I enclose a copy of the letter from the  
 Officer in charge of the Settlement Dept.  
 regarding the further information called  
 for in the letter of the 24<sup>th</sup> ultimo.  
 I enclose a copy of the letter from the  
 Officer in charge of the Settlement Dept.  
 regarding the further information called  
 for in the letter of the 24<sup>th</sup> ultimo.

Deputy Director from furlough. He returned to his substantive appointment as soon as he was relieved by the above officers.

3. Mr. Randall on resuming charge of the party required the services of an Uncovenanted Assistant to help him in office work, and having in view persons whose demand could not be justly spared, appointed Lakshmana Row to the vacant post Sub. pro. tempore as a fit person to perform the duties during the interim.

4. The next point is a matter of departmental arrangement. When Mr. Pedroza was appointed Sub. pro. tem., Uncovenanted Assistant of the North Arcot party, the Examiner of the Office was promoted to the Assistant Manager's post, and Lakshmana Row to the latter's appointment precisely on the same terms as Mr. Pedroza to the post of Uncovenanted Assistant.

5. As none but the Sub. pro. tem. officers counted service in those appointments during the periods specified in the margin, and as these arrangements were made purely in the interests of Government, they are respectively entitled to the higher allowances drawn by them being taken into account in calculating the average emoluments for pension under Section VIII of the Civil Pension Code.

Mr. Pedroza  
25 Feb 1878 to  
18 Sept 1878

Lakshmana Row  
14 October 1878  
to 28 Feb 1879

All

6. All other information in connection with these two individuals has already been furnished in the correspondence that has transpired regarding their pensions.

I have &c  
/ Sig of R. K. Fuckle  
2<sup>d</sup> Member Board of Revenue  
in charge.

(True Copy)  
W. Donald  
Mg. Secy. General.

Ad

## PROCEEDINGS of the MADRAS GOVERNMENT.

Read again Res of Govt. No. 518, dated 8<sup>th</sup> June 1880.

Read also the following Papers.

From the Accountant General, Madras, dated 20<sup>th</sup> October 1880. No. 186.

Memo to the Accountant General, dated 3<sup>rd</sup> November 1880. No. 187.

From Accountant General, dated 8<sup>th</sup> December 1880. No. 188.

Order thereon, dated 15<sup>th</sup> January 1881. No. 189.

In Supersession  
of their order dated 8<sup>th</sup>  
June 1880 No. 518, the  
Govt. resolve to grant  
to Y. Lakshmana Row  
and Mr. F. B. Pedroza  
an increased pension  
of Rs. 15-1-11 and Rs. 7-13-11  
per mensem respectively.  
2 Y. Lakshmana Row  
and Mr. F. B. Pedroza  
will be entitled to the  
difference between the  
rate of pension now  
sanctioned and that  
granted in G.O. 8<sup>th</sup>  
June 1880 No. 518. The  
amount of arrears  
due

No. 2702

due to them will accordingly  
be disbursed. -

*[Signature]*

Recd 20/1/81

To the Accountant General

Member Board of Rev. in charge Rev. Settlement

Aug

1900

Govt. of 1881

Sum

The Account Book

Dated 15 January 1881, No. 14

Nos.

Sum

Received for sum

To Mr. J. J. Johnson

& Mr. J. J. Johnson

of the County of

Wash.

161