

(1) Number of pages 16

(2) Date of repair \_\_\_\_\_

(3) Initials of the Referencer B

# MADRAS RECORD OFFICE.

Government of Madras.

*Revenue* DEPARTMENT.

|          |             |               |
|----------|-------------|---------------|
| G.O. No. | <u>392</u>  | Press<br>Mis. |
| Dated    | <u>9-11</u> | 18 <u>81</u>  |

Not to be folded or roughly handled

*TR*

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS.

PENSION DEPARTMENT.

9th April 1881, No. 392.

Pension.

Read again—

G.O., Pension Department, dated 22nd December 1880, No. 1238.

Read also the following papers:—

From A. C. TUPP, Esq., Officiating Accountant-General, to the Secretary to Government, Pension Department, dated Fort St. George, 5th February 1881, No. J.A.D—29.

With reference to paragraph 3 of G.O., No. 1238, dated the 22nd of December 1880, I have the honor to inquire whether the issue of a permanent pay order for payment of Mr. Ball's pension, sanctioned in the above Government Order, should be deferred till such time as the result of the inquiry regarding the recovery of Rs. 1,910-14-11 stated to be due by him is intimated to this office.

From H. W. BLISS, Esq., Commissioner of Salt Revenue, to the Under Secretary to Government, Pension Department, dated Madras, 24th March 1881, No. 2679.

With reference to paragraph 3 of G.O., No. 1238, dated 22nd December 1880, Pension Department, I have the honor to state that the works referred to appear to have been executed, though not only without sanction, but against positive orders that works were not to be carried out without the sanction by me of estimates, and that officers who disobeyed these orders would be held responsible. I cannot say that there has been positive loss to the State owing to the neglect of Mr. Ball to conform to orders, but it is most probable that some reduction in the expenditure would have been made, as has been the case in almost every other district, if proper estimates had been submitted for sanction before the works were carried out; and it is obviously useless for Government (as they have often done) or for me (as in this instance) to tell officers that they will be made responsible for unsanctioned expenditure, unless they are made responsible when they can show no reason for not obtaining sanction.

ORDER THEREON, 9th April 1881, No. 392.

As it appears that no loss has accrued to the State from Mr. Ball's inattention to orders, there is evidently nothing to be recovered, and the permanent pay order should be issued accordingly without deduction.

(True Extract.)

*Acting Under Secy. to Govt.*

To the Accountant-General.  
" Board of Revenue.  
" Commissioner of Salt Revenue.  
" Collector of South Canara.

Exd. T. O'Connor.

Pension Department 2 Fort Saint George  
No. 229. Accountants Office  
5<sup>th</sup> February 1881.

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

Sir, With reference to para. 3 of G.O.  
No. 1238 dated the 22<sup>nd</sup> of December 1880,  
I have the honor to enquire whether the issue  
of a Permanent Pay Order for payment  
of Mr. Ball's pension sanctioned in the  
above G.O. should be deferred till such  
time as the result of the enquiry regarding  
the recovery of Rs. 1910-14-11. Stated to be  
due by him is intimated to this Office.

I have the honor to be

Sir

Your obedient servant

W. H. K. S. S. S.  
Offg. Account General

Ad

Pension G. O. 22 Dec 1887  
No 1238

Pension (1881) Department  
No 211.  
From the Accountant General  
Madras

To  
The Secretary to Government  
Pension Department  
Fort St. George.

ho 1880  
29

Dated 5<sup>th</sup> } February 1887  
Received 5 }

ho;

Enquires whether the issue of  
a P. P. O. for payment of Mr  
Ball's pension should be deferred  
till receipt of intimation of recovery  
of Rs 1910-12-11 due by him

G. O. No 392 of 91

Correspondence Department.

No. 2679.

OFFICE OF THE COMM. OF SALT REVENUE,

Madras,

Dated March 24, 1881.

From

H. W. BLISS, Esq.,

Commissioner of Salt Revenue,

To

The Under Secretary to Government,  
Pension Department.

Sir,

With reference to para 3 of Govern-  
ment Order No 1238, dated December  
22, 1880, Pension Department, I have  
the honour to state that the works  
referred to appear to have been ex-  
ecuted, though not only without sanc-  
tion, but against positive orders that  
works were not to be carried out with-  
out the sanction by me of estimates,  
and that Officers who disobeyed these  
orders would be held responsible. I  
cannot say that there has been posi-  
tive loss to the State owing to the neg-  
lect of Mr Ball to conform to orders,  
but it is most probable that some  
reduction in the expenditure would  
have been made, as has been the  
case in almost every other District,  
if proper estimates had been submitted  
for

for sanction before the works were carried out; and it is obviously useless for Government (as they have often done) or for me (as in this instance) to tell Officers that they will be made responsible for unsanctioned expenditure, unless they are made responsible when they can show no reason for not obtaining sanction.

I have the honour to be

Sir  
Your most Obedt Serv't

R. V. S. W.

Commissioner of Salt & Opium

H

Correspondence Department.

188 .

From

The Commissioner of

Salt Revenue,

Madras,

To

Dated

Received

} 188 .

No.

Enclosure.

Subject.

Revenue 30 1238 722 Dec/80

From 1881 Receipt  
No. 530  
The Commissioner of  
Salt Revenue.

To The Under Secretary  
to Government,  
Pension Deptt.

Dated 24 March., 1881.  
Recd. 28

No. 2679  
Enclosures.

Subject.

Furnishing the information regarding the sum of Rs 1910-14-11, due by Mr Ball for certain works executed without previous sanction.

Ac. No. 392

[Office-paper Form.]

Pension DEPARTMENT.

Papers in hand down to date:—

X No. 211 of 1881

X No. 530 of 1881

No.

of

DRAFT ORDER.

NOTE FOR ORDERS.

Rs 1910-14-11  
shall wholly or in part  
be covered from  
Mr Ball's pension,  
the Permanent Pay order  
for which is stayed  
pending instructions.  
Euo

Submitted that the  
pension should be  
issued at once with-  
out any deduction.  
Mr Ball probably  
deserved censure  
for disobeying orders  
but that is a differ-  
ent thing from  
fining him in  
the sum of 2000  
Rs nearly because

Mr Ball's pension  
was stopped  
by order of the  
Government  
for disobedience  
of orders  
but that is a differ-  
ent thing from  
fining him in  
the sum of 2000  
Rs nearly because

he spent Govern-  
ment money  
in bona fide Govt  
work without  
any positive  
loss to the State.  
If anything was  
to be recovered  
it sh<sup>d</sup> be the dif-  
ference if any  
between Mr Ball's  
estimate and  
those wh<sup>ch</sup> the  
Commissioner  
sh<sup>d</sup> have sanction-  
ed but no at-  
tempt has been  
made to show  
that the ex-  
cess -

Y<sup>rs</sup> W

Specimen  
of the Ball's process

Madras Department.

7

PROCEEDINGS of the MADRAS GOVERNMENT.

Read again G.O. Madras No 22<sup>nd</sup> Dec<sup>r</sup> 1880 No 1238<sup>th</sup>

READ the following letter

From the Accountant General dated  
5<sup>th</sup> February 1881 No 1238<sup>th</sup>.

" " Commissioners of Salt Revenue  
dated 24<sup>th</sup> March 1881 No 2679.

Order thereon 9<sup>th</sup> April 1881 No 392

As it appears that  
no loss has accrued to  
the State from Mr.  
Ball's inattention to  
orders there is evidently  
nothing to be recovered  
and the Permanent  
pay order should be  
issued accordingly  
without deduction.  
(List from orders).

Y.M.

To the Accountant General

" " Board of Revenue

" " Commissioners of Salt Revenue

" " Collector of South Canara.

Recd 9-4-81

10-12-81

air 6 G. 81  
RA 8 4 81

G.O. No. 392 of 81

Govt. of {1881} Madras.

To *The Account Genl*

Dated *9<sup>th</sup> April*, No. *392*.  
Recd.

Nos.

*Authorizing the Account  
Genl. to issue a permanent  
payable order in the name  
of Mrs Ball it being under-  
stood that no loss has occurred  
on account of his in-  
attention to orders.*