MADRAS RECORD OFFICE.

Government of Madras.

DEPARTMENT.

G.O. No.	Press Mk.
Dated	18

Not to be folded or roughly handled.

No. 148. Read the following letter from the Advocate General, to the Chief Secretary to Government, Fort Saint George; dated Madras, 8th February 1866.

I have the honor to report, for the information of His Excellency the Governor in Council, the result of two cases in which I considered it my duty to appear on behalf of the Crown at the recent High Court Sessions.

2. The first was the case of one Munisawmy, a Watching Peon at the Central Museum, charged, 1st, with having broken and entered the premises, between sunrise and sunset, on the 2nd November 1865, to commit theft, under Section 457 of the Indian Penal Code, and, secondly, with having, while in the employ of the Government, stolen from the Museum a sum of Rupees 165-9-0, under Section 381 of the Code.

3. This money formed part of the Establishment's monthly pay received by the Curator, who locked it up in his drawer, before leaving the premises on the evening of the 2nd November. The Curator called the attention of the prisoner to the money, before locking his drawer. The evidence showed that the whole of the doors and windows were locked and bolted by one of the Hamals. It was the duty of the prisoner and another Watching Peon to guard the premises during the night—the prisoner taking the first watch from 6 P. M. to 12 A. M., the other Peon from 12 to 6 A. M. The watching place was just outside the principal entrance. It appeared that on the present occasion the prisoner never woke his fellow watchman, as was his custom, at 12 o'clock, but watched the whole night through. In the morning a side-door was found open, the drawer in the Curator's room open, and the money in question gone. The witness who bolted this side-door deposed that the prisoner was present when he fastened it; that it was closed with pin bolts on the inside; and that it was impossible to open it from without. This would certainly lead to the supposition that there must have been some one locked in on the premises, who committed the theft, and let himself out by this door. It is, however, possible that the prisoner, having been shewn the money by the Curator, and having made up his mind to steal it, took an opportunity of stepping back and withdrawing the bolts, but of this there was no evidence.

4. The upper part of the drawer into which the lock shoots had been cut away, and the drawer thus opened. A knife, identified as the prisoner's, was found by the Police in his mat, in the place in which the Peons ordinarily keep guard. This knife was, when found, rusty, except at the point, which had a bright appearance and scratches on it, as if recently used. Had the knife been found in the Curator's room, or even within the Museum, it would have been cogent evidence to connect the prisoner with the crime. The money was not traced; and, really, on the evidence, whatever suspicion might attach to the prisoner, the case was, as Mr. Justice Bittleston remarked, an "*impossible*" case; for the prisoner was shown to have been locked out, and the witness who fastened the side-door swore that it could not be opened from without.

5. The second case was that of George Corneille, charged with having, on the 12th October last, forged a bill on the Government of India, for 500 Rupees, purporting to be signed by one Canahiah, under the 465th Section of the Indian Penal Code; with having forged the bill described as a receipt or acquittance for money, under Section 467; with having dishonestly used the forged bill, under Section 471; and with having abetted the forgery and dishonest use, under Section 109.

6. It appeared in evidence that, on the 8th October 1858, the Government had sanctioned a grant-in-aid to the Granda Karana Saba Society, to the amount of Rupees 500 per annum; that this had been drawn up to the year 1860 or 1861; and that, on the 25th February 1865, the payment of this grant had been suspended by the Director of Public Instruction, by his letter of that date to the Civil Paymaster.

7. The prisoner was a Clerk in the Accountant General's Office. It was his duty to pass all bills, presented for payment, of grants in aid; and an entry of this letter of the Director of Public Instruction was produced, in the prisoner's handwriting, in his Departmental Note Book. He was therefore clearly aware of the fact that payment had been countermanded.

8. It appeared that, on the 1st of October, certain changes were introduced in the Office: Mr. Luxa, who had hitherto audited these grant-in-aid bills, and under whom the prisoner discharged his duties, was transferred to other duties, and Mr. Joseph, under whom one Numpermal acted, appointed Auditor in this Department. As Mr. Joseph and Numpermal were new to the duties of the Department, they were generally instructed to seek the aid of Mr. Luxa and the prisoner, on any points on which they might require information.

9. I have myself no moral doubt of the prisoner's guilt. Indeed his Counsel was apparently as much surprised as myself at the verdict of acquittal; not that I think the Jury was not justified in their verdict, under the peculiar circumstance of this case. Mr. Justice Bittleston, too, appeared to me to lean, in his summing up, rather towards an acquittal. I forward a copy of this morning's *Athenæum and Daily News*, which contains a sufficiently accurate report of the trial, *except* that it omits the evidence of one Castellas, and makes no mention of the testimony of Numpermal, one of the most important witnesses in the case.

10. As I view the probabilities of this case, it was the change in the office and the ignorance of those newly appointed that may have first suggested the fraud to the prisoner. It certainly gave facilities for effecting such an object, and of putting others forward, while keeping in the back ground himself, that could not have been looked for at any other conjuncture.

11. Anthony Pereira, a writer in the Appellate Side of the High Court, positively swore that, on the evening of the 11th October, the prisoner came to his house, and requested him to write a bill for a Native, which he accordingly did, leaving out only the amount and the name of "Canahiah," at the request of the prisoner. His daughter Adrianna, who was praying in an adjoining room, corroborated her father. She said she heard the prisoner say, "leave the amount blank." Pereira went to the prisoner's house on the evening of the 13th, as he said, to inquire about a note to one Mr. Martin, which, on the evening of the 11th, he had given the prisoner to deliver. This note was produced by the prisoner, and was dated the 12th. Pereira explained this, by saying that, though he wrote it on the evening of the 11th, he dated it the 12th, as it was not to be delivered till the following day. He swore that, on the 20th, the prisoner came to him at tiffin time, in the compound of the High Court, when he stated that the bill had been discovered at the Accountant General's Office to be in "High Court writing," and begged him, if asked, to deny the writing, promising 20 Rupees, and adding that he had himself received only 100 Rupees for his trouble. The bill, I should mention, had been cashed upon the

14th October at the Madras Bank. Pereira says he answered that the could not deny his writing, as it was perfectly well known to all about the Court. He immediately went to his Superior, Mr. Aubert, and subsequently to the Deputy Registrar, Mr. Wilkins, and reported what had occurred. He did not, however, proceed to the Accountant General's Office, to lodge his information there. A Mr. Castellas, another Clerk in the High Court, deposed to having seen Pereira and the prisoner conversing one day about tiffin time in the compound of the High Court, though he could not particularize the date. Pereira deposed to another interview between himself and the prisoner on the evening of the 21st. This took place on the High Road at Royapettah, near prisoner's house. The prisoner again inquired if the bill had been sent to the Court "for detection," and offered him 20 Rupees and drink, which Pereira refused. He said that one Corrasaloo, another writer in the High Court, was present when the prisoner joined him. This man was instantly sent for, and at once stated that he had seen the prisoner and Pereira together at Royapettah one evening, about the time in question, though he could not state exactly when.

12. Now I have no doubt Pereira was telling the truth, though not the *whole* truth. The prisoner could not of course draw up the bill in his own writing, which was too well known in his office, and I suspect that Pereira had a far more guilty share in the transaction than he chose to admit. His account of visiting the prisoner at his house on the 13th was very lame. The probability is that he went to inquire after the success of their joint operation. His subsequent disclosure of his share in the matter to his Superior was evidently to shield himself, and it is probably owing to this circumstance that he did not himself make his appearance in the dock.

13. When asked to write the bill he appears to have asked no questions, and at once to have lent himself to what must have struck him as a most suspicious transaction. The only reason he could assign for writing the document for the prisoner was that the prisoner was a compositor—as if that necessarily precluded his knowledge of the act of writing—notwithstanding the prisoner really did write a very fine hand, and the witness had known him for 24 years.

14. Of course, the Judge and Jury would be very cautious in acting upon the evidence of a witness so tainted as Pereira. It was quite possible that he alone, or he and others had been concerned in the forgery and uttering, and that now the affair was blown, he had wickedly introduced the prisoner upon the scene, in order to shift the responsibility from his own shoulders. Had there been nothing more in the case to connect the prisoner with the forgery, this might have been strongly urged. But there is so much connecting him with the uttering in the Accountant General's Office, that, to my mind at least, his guilt is transparent; although, from the impossibility of connecting him with the payment of the bill at the Bank, or the bill itself after it left the Accountant General's Office, there was just a loophole of doubt of which the prisoner has assuredly had the benefit.

15. There was also additional evidence to show that the prisoner had shortly before his interview with Pereira asked another friend, one D'Rose, to write a bill for him. I confess I do not believe one word of this part of the evidence. D'Rose, though formerly at school with the prisoner, was not intimate with him; and yet

he is supposed to have made the request at a casual meeting on the road, as if there was nothing at all unusual in the request, and to have alleged, as his reason, that his own writing would be detected! D'Rose, too, was brought on the scene by the brother of Pereira, to whom he said he had imparted the conversation.

16. On the 12th October, the bill was presented by some person unknown in the Accountant General's Office to be passed. Mr. Joseph, the new auditor, could remember little or nothing with respect to this particular bill. Numpermal, who gave his evidence in a very straight forward and satisfactory way, deposed that, being new to the work, he asked the prisoner if the bill might be passed. The prisoner said yes. Witness asked to see the Order of Government sanctioning the payment. Prisoner brought him the Order of 8th October 1858, upon which witness entered the bill in his Register. *Prisoner said nothing about the payment of this grant having been suspended;* although it will be remembered that he had made the entry of the Director of Public Instruction's letter in his own Departmental Note Book. The bill was then sent to Mr. Donald, who seeing it in order passed it. It was then given to a writer, Veerasawmy, who entered it in his Register, and delivered it to a man who gave the name of Moonesawmy, whose mark he took to the entry in his register. This bill was presented for payment at the Bank of Madras, on the 14th October, by a man, who gave his name as Veerasawmy, and paid by the Bank Shroff.

17. The letter of the Director of Public Instruction subsequently came to light, at which the prisoner expressed his surprise to the witness Numpermal.

18. It was clearly the prisoner's duty to have brought this letter to the notice of Numpermal. It is hard to believe that it had escaped the prisoner's memory. Seeing that he had made an entry of it in his own note book. Numpermal was dependent on the prisoner for his information. Had the prisoner been at the time in discharge of his ordinary duty, he would scarcely have had the audacity to ignore the existence of this letter. It was the alteration in the office which enabled him to keep back the information from the officer through whose hands the bill passed for authorization of payment.

19. On the 14th, the day on which the bill was paid, the prisoner did not come to office, but sent in a letter stating that he was sick—a representation proved to be false.

20. Canahiah, the person whose name was forged, swore that the signature was not his. He had ceased to be Secretary to the Society since 1854, the date when he left the Accountant General's Office, on his appointment to the District Moonsiffship at Nundial. He was not in Madras in October 1865. The last time the grant had been drawn by the Society was in 1861.

21. The Jury probably acquitted the prisoner, first, upon the tainted character of the evidence of the principal witness, Pereira; secondly, on the consideration that the prisoner's conduct in passing the bill through the Accountant General's Office, was rather negative than positive, and that it was possible his own entry of the Director of Public Instruction's letter might have escaped his memory; and lastly, because there was no evidence forthcoming to connect the prisoner with the bill, or the receipt of the money paid upon it after it left the Accountant General's Office, unless, indeed, it was his statement to Pereira, that he had received 100 Rupees for his trouble, to which the Jury could not have attached any belief whatsoever.

22. It appeared that the Bills for grants-in-aid in respect to this particular Institution were never sent to the Director of Public Instruction, for countersignature, after leaving the Accountant General's Office. This appears to have been the usual practice;—why it was not followed in respect to the grants to this Society, I do not understand. Had it been, the fraud could not in all probability have been successful. It is manifestly a very desirable and effective check. Again, had a reference been made in the Accountant General's Office to the date of the last payment of a grant to this Society, suspicion must have been excited; since the most recent payment was in 1860 or 1861. I am not, however, disposed to attach blame to Numpermal on this account. He called for the Order of Government sanctioning the payment, and as the prisoner bore an unexceptionable character in the office, he might well suppose that this was all the information on the subject.

23. It is clear that Mr. Pereira, on his own showing, is not a proper person to be in any way connected with the drawing up of documents bearing upon the administration of Justice.

24. I presume that the prisoner has been already discharged from Government employ. Though he has been fortunate enough to escape conviction, His Excellency the Governor in Council will probably not entertain much doubt of his actual guilt.

No. 149. ORDER THEREON, 15th February 1866, No. 228.

Communicated to the Superintendent of the Government Central Museum, to the Accountant General, and to the Registrar of the High Court.

2. It is understood that Corneille has already been dismissed by the Accountant General. The attention of the Registrar of the High Court will be drawn to the opinion expressed by the Advocate General, in the 23rd paragraph of his letter, as to the unfitness of Mr. Pereira to be in any way connected with the drawing up of documents bearing upon the administration of Justice.

(True Extract).

Chief Secretary.

To the Superintendent of the Government Central Museum.
„ Accountant General.
„ Registrar of the High Court, Appellate Side.
„ Advocate General.

Exd. J. H. Burns.

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

1 Name of appointment.	2 Nature, *i.e.*, whether substantive or acting, permanent or temporary.	3 Substantive appointment, if the new appointment be acting only.	4 Pay.	5 Acting allowance.	6 Date of appointment.	7 Signature of Officer.
English Writer	Permanent	—	17/6	"	18th March 1844	
do	do	"	21	"	5th Nov. 1844	
do	do	"	24/6	"	25th Dec. 1849	
do	do	"	28	"	1st Dec. 1850	H. Pearce
4th Class Clerk	do	"	31/6	"	9th Oct. 1853	
3d do	Officiating	4th Class clerk	35	"	8th March 1859	
3d do	Permanent	"	35	"	1st April 1860	
2d do	Acting	3d Class clerk	35	10	1st Oct. 78	
3 do	Permanent	"	35	"	1st Dec. 78	

8 Character of Officer. *No entry need be made in this Column except when there is any thing either good or bad to be recorded. Suspensions should be noted here when the order of suspension is passed.*	9 Signature & designation of immediate head of the Office.	10 Date of termination of appointment.	11 Reason of termination *e.g., transfer, promotion, return of permanent incumbent.*	12 Signature and designation of immediate head of the Office.
	Dudley Pearce	4th Nov. 1844	Promotion	Dudley Pearce
		24th Dec. 1849	Do.	
		30th Nov. 1850	Do.	
		8th Oct. 1853	Do.	
		7th March 1859	Do.	
		31st March 1860	Do.	
		30th Sept. 1878	Do.	
Good		30th Nov. 78	Return of 1st permanent incumbent	Good
Good		30th Nov. 1881	Suspension under Section	Good
H. Reg. Appt. Secy.				H. Reg. Appt. Secy.

1 Name of appointment.	2 Nature, *i. e.*, whether substantive or acting, permanent or temporary.	3 Substantive appointment, if the new appointment be acting only.	4 Pay.	5 Acting allowance.	6 Date of appointment.	7 Signature of Officer.	8 Character of Officer. *No entry need be made in this Column except when there is any thing either good or bad to be recorded. Suspensions should be noted here when the order of suspension is passed.*	9 Signature & designation of immediate head of the Office.	10 Date of termination of appointment.	11 Reason of termination *e.g., transfer, promotion, return of permanent incumbent.*	12 Signature and designation of immediate head of the Office.

1 Name of appointment.	2 Nature, *i. e.*, whether substantive or acting, permanent or temporary.	3 Substantive appointment, if the new appointment be acting only.	4 Pay.	5 Acting allowance.	6 Date of appointment.	7 Signature of Officer.	8 Character of Officer. *No entry need be made in this Column except when there is any thing either good or bad to be recorded. Suspensions should be noted here when the order of suspension is passed.*	9 Signature & designation of immediate head of the Office.	10 Date of termination of appointment.	11 Reason of termination *e. g.*, *transfer, promotion, return of permanent incumbent.*	12 Signature and designation of immediate head of the Office.

SERVICE BOOK

or

Name. Wilfred Joseph Perera

Caste or Race. Burgher

Residence. Maradana Bazaar Road

FATHER'S.	
Name.	John Perera
Residence.	Deceased

Date of birth. 10th January 1821

Mr. Pereras' character has been good.

In the beginning of the year 1866 he was examined as a witness in a case tried at the Criminal Sessions of the High Court and the then Advocate General in a letter to Government dated 8th February 1866, (embodied in G.O. dated 15th February 1866, No. 228) expressed an opinion -

"It is clear that Mr. Pereira, on his own "showing, is not a proper person to be in "any way connected with the drawing up of "documents bearing upon the administration "of justice."

In view of this expression of opinion, the then Registrar, Mr. Hutchison, asked the then Chief Justice whether Mr. Pereira was to be dismissed, and the Chief Justice decided to leave the matter entirely to the judgment and decision of the Registrar.

On

On this Mr Hutchins recorded the following memo.

"I have carefully considered the matter "and have also consulted the Counsel "who defended Cornille and whose "object at the trial, was of course to "make Pereira out to be the really guilty "party - Pereira's conduct in writing the "bill in the first instance without question "or hesitation is in the highest degree "suspicious but beyond that I see nothing "suspicious in the matter. On the "contrary his conduct throughout after that "seems to have been perfectly straightforward "and even when writing the bill he did "not attempt to disguise his hand "which was well known at the "Accountant Generals'. I think he "has been very foolish but nothing "more, and as he is not and never "has been charged with the preparation "of any documents - much less of documents of such an important "character as is suggested by the "learned Advocate General 6, I see "no reason to take any further notice "of the matter -

"I have pointed out one or two "mistakes, into which the Advocate "General has fallen, in the margin. "The interview on the 13." in particular appears "to me to have been perfectly bona fide.

"Reference to this paper should "however be placed against his name "in the Registers of Servants and I "think a copy of these remarks should "be laid before Government in the "event of his ever applying for pension."

A copy of the G.G. with Mr Hutchins' marginally noted remarks on certain paras of the Advocate Generals letter is herewith

herewith submitted for facility of reference.

Actg Registrar
Appellate Side

19 1789

No. 2658

From J. Weir Esquire.
Acting Registrar of the High Court of Judicature at Madras.

To The Honorable R. Davidson, C.S.I.,
Chief Secretary to Government.
(through the Accountant General)

Honorable Sir,

With reference to Section 106 of the Civil Pension Code, 5th Edition, I am directed by the Chief Justice to submit to Government, through the Accountant General, two Applications for pension, accompanied by their Registers of Service, on behalf of Mr. Anthony Pereira and Mylapore Soobroya Modaliar,

3rd.

3rd Class Clerks of the
High Court Establishment,
Appellate Side.

Have the honour to be,
Honourable Sir,
Your most Obedient Servant,

High Court of Judicature,
Madras, 17th December 1881.

Acting Registrar,
Appellate Side.

REGISTRAR'S OFFICE
19 DEC 81
MADRAS

Copied

Judicial {1881} Department

No. 1927

From
The Registrar of the
High Court of Judicature
at Madras.

Dated 17 December 1881
Received 24 ——

No. 2658.

Enclosure two

Submitting to Government
application for pension
on behalf of Mr Anthony
Pereira & Mylapore
Soobroya Mudaliyar
3rd Class Clerk in the
Registrars office, High Court
Appellate Side.

23

APPLICATION FOR {PENSION. / ~~GRATUITY.~~}

1. Name of Applicant. Anthony Pereira.

2. Father's name. John Pereira.

3. Sect ~~or~~ Caste & Race and Eurasian (Roman Catholic.)

4. Residence. Parcherry, North Block Lodge, Madras.

5. Present or last employment. 3rd Class Clerk in the High Court, Appellate Side.

6. Date of beginning service. 18th March 1844.

7. Date of end of service. 30th November 1881.

	Y.	M.	D.
8. Length of service including ~~breaks~~ interruptions	37	8	17
of which superior	37	8	17
inferior	"	"	"
non-qualifying and ~~breaks~~ interruptions	"	"	"

9. Class of {pension / ~~gratuity~~} applied for, and cause of application* ... Superannuation Pension under Section 106, Civil Pension Code.

10. [Average] emoluments or pay. Rupees 35 — — —

11. Proposed pension. Rupees 17, and 6 Annas 8.

12. ~~Proposed gratuity.~~

13. Date from which Pension to commence. 1st December 1881.

14. Place of payment. Accountant General's Office, Madras.

15. ~~Age of Applicant on this date.~~ Date of Applicant's birth by Christian era 10th January 1821.

16. Height. 5 Feet 8 3/4 Inches.

17. Marks. A mole on each cheek.

18. Date. 1st December 1881.

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

Actg Registrar of the High Court Appellate Side.
SIGNATURE OF THE HEAD OF OFFICE.

HISTORY OF THE SERVICE (SHOWING BREAKS) OF Mr. Anthony Pereira, 3rd Class Clerk of the High Court Appellate Side.

Establishment.	Appointment.	Pay. Rs.	A.	P	Acting allowance. Rs.	Date of beginning.	Date of end.	Period reckoned as Service. Y.	M.	D.	Period not reckoned as Service. Y.	M.	D.	Remarks.	How verified.	Remarks by Accountant-General.
Sudder and Foujdary Adalut Court	English Writer	17	8	"	"	18th March 1844	4th Nov. 1844	"	7	18	"	"	"	From the Records of the Madras and the late Sudder and Foujdary Adalut Court	Verified from the records of the High Court verification confirmed by reference party & the Record Keeper to the Supreme Court.	
D°	D°	21	"	"	"	5th Nov. 1844	24th Dec. 1849	5	1	20	"	"	"			
D°	D°	24	8	"	"	25th Dec. 1849	30th Nov. 1850	"	11	7	"	"	"			
D°	D°	28	"	"	"	1st Dec. 1850	5th Octo. 1855	4	10	8	"	"	"			
D°	4th Class Clerk	31	8	"	"	9th Oct. 1855	7th March 1859	3	5	"	"	"	"			
D°	Offg. 3rd D°	35	"	"	"	8th March 1859	31st March 1860	1	"	24	"	"	"			
D°	3rd Class Clerk	35	"	"	"	1st April 1860	30th Sept. 1878	18	6	"	"	"	"			
High Court Appellate Side	Offg. 2nd D°	35	"	"	10	1st Octo. 1878	30th Nov. 1878	"	2	"	"	"	"			
D°	3rd Class Clerk	35	"	"	"	1st Dec. 1878	30th Nov. 1881	3	—	"	—	—	—			
						Total period of {superior / ~~inferior~~} service ...	...	37	8	17	"	"	"			

REMARKS BY HEAD OF OFFICE.

1. As to character and past conduct of Applicant. Mr. Pereira's Character and conduct have been good. But see circumstances states on separate Slip.

2. Explanation of any suspension or degradation. None.

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

4. Explanation under Section 47, Rule 1, so far as the Head of the Office can give it. Not applicable to this case.

5. Any other remarks. The service of Mr. A. Pereira has been verified from the records of the late Sudder Court and the High Court. Our opinion that his Case is established and should be admitted.

Acting Registrar of the High Court Appellate Side.

SIGNATURE.

Sp A D/ 398

CERTIFICATE AND REPORT OF ACCOUNTANT GENERAL.

CERTIFIED that (~~subject to the remarks below recorded~~) qualifying service in {~~inferior~~ / superior} grades has been duly proved for 37 years 8 months and 13 days; and that a {~~gratuity~~ / pension} not exceeding Rs. 17-8 a per mensem, is admissible under Section 106 & 111 of the Civil Pension Code. The calculations have been duly verified. The Character and past Conduct of the Applicant is stated on the 3rd page of the application to have been good, but with reference to G.O. No 228 dated 15 July 66 a Copy of which is herewith forwarded and to the remarks of the Acting Registrar recorded in a Separate Sheet it rests with Govt. to decide whether any Deduction should or should not be made in the amount of any pension that may be sanctioned to him vide rule 4 Sect. 65 of the Code.

Sd/ Chief Clerk of the Accountant General. for Accountant General.

Fort Saint George, Acct Genl's Office 22nd December 1881.

To The Under Secretary to Government Pension Department

76-12-81

1927, 1928

27

PENSION DEPARTMENT.

Proceedings of the Madras Government.

READ the following papers :—

From the Registrar High Court dated 17th December 1881 No. 2658

„ Accountant-General, dated 22nd December 1881 No. 1231/398

ORDER THEREON, 9th January 82 No. 21.

UNDER Sections 106, 109 & 111 of the Civil Pension Code (5th Edition), the Right Honorable the Governor in Council is pleased to grant to Mr. Anthony Pereira late 3rd Class Clerk in the High Court Appellate Side a Superannuation Pension of Rupees (57-8-0) Fifty seven, and annas eight per mensem

payable at Madras from the 1st December 1881 in consideration of his qualifying Superior service of thirty seven years, eight months and thirteen days.

There is, it is submitted, no reason to deduct any thing from the pension admissible — as per the case in 1866. in which Mr. Pereira was concerned, to which attention has been directed in submitting his application, in a brief note annexed thereto.

JWC

To the Accountant-General, with Register.

— „ — Registrar High Court

„ JWC.

JWC 28/12/81

EWC

Dept 9-1-82

Application for {Pension or Gratuity}

Date of application. 1st December 1881.

Name of Applicant. Sir Anthony Pereira.

Last Appointment. 3rd Class Clerk in the High Court, Appellate Side.

Class of {pension or gratuity} Superannuation Pension.

Amount of pension sanctioned

Amount of gratuity sanctioned.

Date of commencement.

Date of sanction.

Date 28th 12 81

Service 1881 Eight

No 1928

Govt. of (1882) Madras.

PENSION.

To

THE ACCOUNTANT-GENERAL,

&c., &c., &c.

Dated 9th January 1882

Despd. " "

Recd.

G.O. 9 Jany 82 No 21

Granting a superannuation pension of Rs 17. 8 per mensem to Mr. A. Pereira late 3d class Clerk in the High Court Appellate Side.—

Circ 3-1-82
Rec 5-1-82