MADRAS RECORD OFFICE.

Government of Madras.

DEPARTMENT.

G.O. No.

Press
Mis.

Dated 18[illegible]

Not to be folded or roughly handled

Proceedings of the Board of Revenue
Dated 14 September 1881.
No. 8460 Miscellaneous.

Read the following Proceedings of the Madras Government, Revenue Department.

Read Proceedings, Board of Revenue dated 1st September 1881 No. 8214 Misc., recommending that Mr Digue, Tahsildar of Cuddalore be required to retire on the 24 September 1881 under the 55 years' rule.

Order thereon. 8 September 1881. No. 2375

The proposal that Mr Digue be required to retire on attaining the age of 55 is approved.

(True Extract)
(Signed) C.G. Master
Secretary to Government

To The Board of Revenue.

Communicated to the

Collector of South Arcot.

(True copy and Extract)

(Signed) E. Aitchison
Ag Secretary.

(True copy)

A Cruickshank
Collector.

[illegible]—1—1894

compd
T.T.

No. 248

From

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

To

A. Cruickshank Esquire
Collector of South Arcot.

Sir,

I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of your letter dated 30 September 1881 No 227, and to give below the information required therein so far as it can be obtained from the records now available in this office. There is nothing on the record to show the leave taken by Mr F. Digue, or any suspension during the period of his employment in the late Sudder and Foujdaree Udalut. The extract which accompanied your letter is herewith returned.

R.A.

Entertainment on 1st July 1844 as Telugu Reader on 14—
1845 to 1849 Pay abstracts are missing.
1st January 1850 to 9 May 1852 — English Writer —— 21—

10th May 1852 to 22d August 1853 – 2d Class Copyist – 24–8–

I have &c

High Court of Judicature
Madras 14 October 1881

(Signed) S Weir
Acting Registrar
Appellate Side

(True Copy)

Collector.

No. 119.

Proceedings of the Board of Revenue, dated 9th January 1868.

Read the following letter from C. W. READE, Esq., Collector of South Arcot, to the Secretary to the Board of Revenue, dated Cuddalore, 21st December 1867, No. 335:—

1. I have the honour to report to the Board that I have, this day, suspended Mr. Francis Dique, the Tahsildar of the Cuddalore talook, accused before me of bribery in connection with the License-tax.

2. Proceedings, under Chapter XIV. of the Code of Criminal Procedure, have already been taken by me against the Tahsildar, and he has been bound over, in his own recognizance and two sureties, to appear before me for trial, on the 3rd January 1868.

3. T. Sambamoorty Iyer, Sub-Magistrate of Trivady, who passed the Modified Special Test at the Examination held in February 1866, has been put in charge of the talook for the present.

The Board await the Collector's further report.

(A true Copy and Extract.)

(Signed) **R. A. DALYELL,**
Secretary.

To the Collector of South Arcot.

Exd. J. Wright.

Department.

1868

No.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE BOARD OF REVENUE,

Dated 9th January 1869.

No. 119.

Awaiting further report from Collector of South Arcot on the subject of the accusation of bribery brought against Mr F. Digue Tahsildar of Cuddalore in connection with the License Tax.

Proceedings of the Board of Revenue dated 20 November 1868 No. 8210.

Read the following letter from J.R. Arbuthnot Esq. Ag Collector of South Arcot to the Acting Secretary to the Board of Revenue dated Tindivanam 3 November 1868:

With reference to the Proceedings of the Board dated 30 September 1868 No. 6937, I have the honor to forward copies of the evidence taken before the Magistrate and the Sessions Court, respecting the charges of corruption and bribery — brought against Mr Digue, Suspended Tahsildar of Cuddalore Taluq.

Enclosures Nos 1 & 4.

Abstract.— Copies of evidence taken before the Magistrate and Sessions Court.

The Board have carefully considered the Collector's letter recommending that the Tahsildar should not be re-employed in the Public Service, notwithstanding his acquittal by the Sessions Court, on the ground that he is unworthy of the confidence formerly placed in him by the Collector.

2. The Board have also perused the evidence, in both cases, before the Magistrate and before the Court, and are not prepared to deprive Mr Digue of the full benefit of the unqualified acquittal of the Sessions Court.

3. Mr Digue will accordingly be restored to his post, with payment of the usual allowances sanctioned under the rules for officers under suspension; but the Board deem that it is expedient to transfer Mr Digue to another Taluk, the substantive salary of which is equal to that which Mr Digue held up to date of suspension.

(Signed) F Brandt
Ag Sub Secretary.

(True Copy)

Collector.

Ins V 1894

Compd
T.U.

Proceedings of the Madras Government, Revenue Department, 13th May 1869.

Read the following:—

No. 323 Proceedings of the Board of Revenue, dated 30th September 1868, No. 6937:—

× × × × ×

No. 325 Proceedings of the Board of Revenue dated 26 April 1869, No. 2756.

Read Petition No. 81 of 1869.

Read again Board's Proceedings, dated 30 September 1868, No. 6937 and of 20 Nov. 68 No. 8210.

Mr Digue, Tahsildar of Cuddalore was suspended on the 21st December 1867 on suspicion of bribery and corruption, in connection with the License Tax. He was committed for trial, but acquitted by the Sessions Court. The Collector remained convinced of his guilt, but the Board after reviewing the records of the case did not share this conviction and ordered Mr Digue's restoration to office, though in a different Taluk. He was reinstated on the

16 December 1868 after being suspended for eleven months and twenty five days.

2. The Board reinstated Mr Dique because they were of opinion that his innocence was established. They therefore see no reason why full pay for the period of suspension should not be granted to him.

3. They accordingly resolve to request Government to sanction payment of Rs 2192-6-, being salary at the rate of Rs 225 per mensem, minus the fourth which Mr Dique has already received as subsistence allowance.

No. 326. Order thereon, 13 May 1869, No 1341.

Miscellaneous

Sanctioned Rupees 2192-6-

(True Extract)

(Signed) R A Dalyell
Ag Secretary to Govt.

(True Copy)

Collector.

[illegible] 1894

Compd
20

11

Proceedings of the Madras Government, Revenue Department, 16th October 1874.

No. 198. Read the following Proceedings of the Board of Revenue, dated 23rd September 1874, No. 2,738 :—

Read the following letter from J. H. GARSTIN, Esq., Collector of South Arcot, to J. GROSE, Esq., Secretary to the Board of Revenue, dated Cuddalore, 28th August 1874, No. 435 :—

IT is my disagreeable duty to bring to the special notice of the Board the conduct of Mr. Dique, Tahsildar of Tindevanum.

2. The Acting Head Assistant Collector has reported this officer to me for impertinence to Mr. Norfor while in charge of the 2nd Range. I enclose copies of Mr. Norfor's letter to Mr. Cox, and of the latter officer's letter to me marginally noted.

Mr. Norfor's to Mr. Cox, dated 25th July 1874, No. 204 A.
Mr. Cox to Collector, 3rd August 1874, No. 284 B.

3. It seems that a peon of the Tindovanum Taluq was dismissed for imputing disgraceful conduct to Mr. Thomas, the Assistant Superintendent of Police, and was then taken by Mr. Dique into his private employ. This man while in Mr. Dique's employ presented a durkhast to the village officers of Giddangal (a village adjoining Tindevanum and forming part of it) for a piece of waste land which Mr. Norfor had previously taken possession of for a gravel quarry under the rules* bearing on the point, without reference to the revenue authorities, as he was justified in doing. Before the durkhast was disposed of, Mr. Dique's servant began to build on the land. On learning this, Mr. Norfor wrote to Mr. Dique and requested him to reserve the land as he wanted it for a quarry. Mr. Dique took no notice of this letter, though the progress of the hut stopped. Shortly after, the land was occupied as a bandystand with the permission of the Tahsildar Mr. Dique, a fact Mr. Norfor says he learnt from inquiries among the bandymen. He wrote to ask Mr. Dique if such was the case, and complains to Mr. Cox of the disrespectful tone of Mr. Dique's reply.* He says he has always had to complain of Mr. Dique's disrespectful conduct to him, and considers his whole proceedings in this matter little short of deliberate impertinence.

* *Vide* Board's Standing Order, No. 9 of 1872, 132-2.

*C. Translation enclosed.

4. Mr. Cox says that Mr. Norfor told him that the man who was building on the quarry-land distinctly informed him that he was acting under Mr. Dique's directions, and that the building he was erecting was destined to be occupied by Mr. Dique till he had built a new house. I may here mention that Mr. Dique occupied a house rent-free at Tindevanum on condition of keeping it in repairs, and that as the railway is destined to pass right through the buildings, it was necessary to eject him and pull the buildings down; and that the only instance in this district in which it has been necessary to put the Act in force in order to eject a person in possession has been in the case of Mr. Dique, of whose obstructive behavior the Railway Deputy-Collector has complained to me bitterly. I mention this to show why Mr. Dique should be under the necessity of building a new house.

Since the above was written, I have received a complaint from the Railway Deputy-Collector, complaining that after the buildings and land had been acquired by Government under Act X. of 1870, Mr. Dique, to whom no award was made, but who was distinctly declared not to be entitled to any compensation, had carried off the materials of the buildings without any permission.

5. Both Mr. Dique and the man building the hut deny before Mr. Cox that it was being built under the orders of Mr. Dique. Mr. Cox does not seem to credit this however, and is much inclined to believe that that officer gave permission to occupy the land as a bandystand in order to annoy Mr. Norfor, and, though Mr. Dique in his letter to Mr. Norfor denies having given any such permission, it seems evident that from his living close to the spot and passing it every day, he must have been aware that the land Mr. Norfor had officially requested him to reserve for a quarry for the Department of Public Works was being used as a cart-stand, and he was, therefore, most certainly both disrespectful to Mr. Norfor and neglectful of his duty in not at once putting a stop to such a proceeding, and securing the undisturbed possession of the quarry for Mr. Norfor.

6. I should not have troubled the Board with a special report about such a matter if it had stood alone, but the records of this office show such repeated acts of insubordination and impertinence on Mr. Dique's part, that any powers of punishment I possess are quite insufficient to deal appropriately with him. Moreover, there are other matters to which the Board, and probably Government, will attach much more importance, which I deem it right to bring to the Board's notice in connection with Mr. Dique.

7. On the 18th of last month, the arrears of Fasli 1283 outstanding in the Tindevanum Taluq were Rupees 2,09,343. A very severe order was sent to Mr. Dique, warning him that he would be reported to the Board if he did not do better in the discharge of his important duty of collecting the revenue, and he was ordered to submit a list of villages visited by him since the 1st June, together with a full explanation of his conduct with the collection report for the ensuing week ending the 25th July. Of this order, he has not up to this date taken the slightest notice.

8. The remission Deputy-Collector wrote to me officially on the 6th June last,* complaining of Mr. Dique's insubordination and disobedience to his orders, and of his determined neglect to assist him in any way in disposing of the punjah remissions in his taluq. I reprimanded Mr. Dique, and fined him Rupees 10.

* D.—Copy of letter, No. 87, enclosed.

9. Mr. Sullivan found it necessary to fine Mr. Dique 10 Rupees for impertinence and insubordination for commenting, in a very unbecoming tone, on his proceedings in an appeal against a sale for arrears conducted by Mr. Dique. I enclose copies of Mr. Sullivan's proceedings* disposing of the appeal, of Mr. Dique's "report†," and of Mr. Sullivan's order‡ fining him. The Board will see from another proceedings§ of Mr. Sullivan's, dated the 15th August 1872, how by Mr. Dique's most reprehensible disobedience to a distinct order of the Collector to register the transfer of a piece of land sold by an appellant to another man, the former although actually a creditor of Government, and having more than Rupees 7 due to him lying in the taluq cash-chest, had his land, worth about 50 Rupees, sold for an arrear of about Rupees 3. It is true that in the sale of the land the Tahsildar was justified in selling a whole field and not part of one; but the sale was altogether unnecessary, and was aggravated by the fact that if the order to transfer the registry of ownership had been obeyed, the land could not have been sold.

* E.—Dated 5th August 1872, No. 18.

† F.—Dated 15th August 1872.

‡ G.—Dated 30th August 1872.

§ H.

10. In their order of the 8th July 1874, No. 845, the Government declare that they will visit with severe displeasure any irregularity or illegality which enhances the severity of the law respecting coercive measures for the realization of the revenue; they will therefore, if the conduct of Mr. Dique is brought to their notice, as I trust it will be, be inclined, I think, to be severe with him for having issued summonses under Act III. of 1869 to twenty-five revenue defaulters to appear before him and explain why they did not pay their kists, and on the summonses not being obeyed, for having prosecuted all the parties and had them fined by the Taluq Sheristadar. The High Court quashed the whole of the convictions as illegal, on a reference being made to them. These proceedings were in effect a very gross abuse of his authority on the part of Mr. Dique. Copies of my letter‖ to the High Court and of the Court's Proceedings¶ are forwarded for reference.

‖ I.

¶ J.

11. No district officer with whom Mr. Dique has come in contact seems to entertain a good opinion of him. On this point, I beg to refer the Board to paragraphs 10 and 11 of Mr. Sullivan's letter of the 17th November 1873, No. 469, recorded in Board's Proceedings of the 12th December 1873, No. 2,589, where the opinions of Mr. Reade, Mr. Sullivan, Mr. Lister, Mr. Kough, Captain Young and Mr. Thomas are quoted or alluded to.

12. There is, I consider, ample evidence to show that Mr. Dique is habitually impertinent and disrespectful in his official correspondence, that he has lately shown himself disobedient to orders and indifferent to the careful discharge of his primary duty, and that he has exhibited an inclination to abuse his magisterial powers in order to save himself trouble as a Revenue Officer; and as official censure is entirely thrown away on him, while the trifling fine I am able to inflict is not in my opinion at all an adequate punishment for his conduct, I submit his case for such orders as the Board may choose to pass on it.

ENCLOSURES A. to J.—Copies of Correspondence.

IN their Proceedings of the 17th April 1874, No. 910, the Board warned Mr. Dique to be more careful in future, and informed him that the way in which he was reported on by the officers of the district, especially with regard to his insubordinate conduct and impertinence, satisfied the Board that if any further irregularities of a serious character occurred, he would have to be removed from the post of Tahsildar.

2. In their Proceedings disposed of in G. O., dated 4th September 1874, No. 1,140, the Board remarked that Mr. Dique had given Mr. Banbury and Mr. Garstin an exaggerated account of the distress in his taluq, and that his denial that he had stated what he certainly did state to Mr. Banbury and Mr. Garstin was discreditable. Government noticed with great displeasure the conduct of Mr. Dique "whose inattention to his duties and careless action led in the first instance to an exaggerated estimate of the scarcity believed to be impending."

3. In their order of the 8th July 1874, No. 845, Government observed that the conduct of Mr. Dique in a certain case of sale for arrears had been open to serious reflection, and expressed an intention of visiting with "severe displeasure any irregularity or illegality which enhances the severity of the law."

4. From the papers now submitted, it appears that Mr. Dique has laid himself open to punishment in all these respects.

5. In June and July last, he was guilty of delay, obstruction and great impertinence with reference to certain land required for quarrying by the Executive Engineer. Mr. Garstin shows that it is impossible for him to deal with the case because of the manner in which Mr. Dique has been fined and warned on previous occasions. On the 15th August 1872, the Collector (Mr. Sullivan) severely censured him for the action he had taken in a certain case where coercive processes had been used, and warned him that if another instance of neglect and disobedience of orders occurred, it would be noticed in a different manner. On the 30th idem, the Collector disposed of a *reply* which Mr. Dique had chosen to make to certain proceedings of his on an appeal, in which reply Mr. Dique had "desired to know" how his discretion in selling land for arrears was to be limited, had talked of "the pleasurable satisfaction of seeing his order cancelled," had demanded to know "in the case now under consideration, where is the wrong and where is the fault," had said with regard to a complaint which the Collector had allowed "there is no reason at all in his complaint and it has all the appearance of being vexatious and litigious," and remarked, in conclusion, that if the means employed in making collections were canvassed and censured, as the Collector had canvassed and censured them, "it becomes embarrassing to the taluq officials, and the duty of collection must necessarily be impeded." Mr. Sullivan said: "In this paper Mr. Dique has taken upon himself to comment in a very unbecoming tone on the Proceedings of the Collector * *. He has taken the unusual course of addressing the Division Oofficer in English instead of by a Vernacular Arzi, and has omitted the ordinary respectful heading prescribed by the Board of Revenue in their Standing Order No. 414. Mr. Dique has in addition penned a series of remarks which are partly unintelligible and wholly impertinent. Insubordination of this description the Collector cannot allow to pass unnoticed, Mr. Dique is fined Rupees 10, and should he again offend in a similar manner, he will be at once suspended and his conduct reported to the Board of Revenue." When these facts are considered with those reported in paragraph 10 of Mr. Sullivan's letter recorded in Board's Proceedings, dated 12th December 1873, No. 2,589, and with the opinion of Mr. Dique's discourtesy which the Board have ample evidence is held by all the superior officers of the Revenue, Police and Public Works Departments in the district, it is quite clear that the case is not one which Mr. Garstin

Compd

could dispose of himself. Mr. Dique is evidently incorrigible. It would be useless to fine or suspend him, for these forms of punishment would leave him with the position of a Tahsildar, and the position of Tahsildar is enough to inspire him with views regarding himself and others which his clerical ability enables him to embody in offensively discourteous letters, and which tempt him, with a temptation which he is unable to resist, to meet orders he does not like with cavilling and obstructiveness. The only remedy in the Board's opinion is to remove Mr. Dique from the position of Tahsildar.

6. Next, with regard to the course Mr. Dique has chosen to pursue in the matter of the revenue of his taluq as affected by the scarcity which was felt at the beginning of the calendar year. Mr. Dique represented the scarcity as far greater than it really was, and proposed far greater remissions than were really necessary, and subsequently denied having done so. For this he has been severely censured. Subsequently, Mr. Banbury's tour in South Arcot allayed the alarm which had been partly excited by Mr. Dique; the extent to which remission should be given was roughly determined, and a Special Deputy-Collector was appointed to conduct the settlement. If Mr. Dique had been governed by the motives which must actuate an honest and efficient public servant, he would have retrieved his initial error by careful attention to collections, and by zealously assisting the Deputy-Collector. Instead of that, he has left large balances outstanding, has ignored orders from the Collector regarding them and from the Deputy-Collector regarding remission statements, and has been generally most obstructive. The Board have little doubt that he has done this with his usual obstinate insubordination in order to prove that he was right in the beginning and Mr. Banbury and the rest wrong. For this cause alone the Board think it would be necessary to move Mr. Dique from Tindevanum.

7. Lastly, with regard to the manner in which Mr. Dique has worked the law for collecting revenue by means of coercive processes. The case already referred to, which was disposed of by Mr. Sullivan in his order of the 15th August 1872, is a very bad one. For an arrear of Rupees 3-7-4, Mr. Dique sold land which did not belong to the defaulter, and which he had been ordered to transfer to the real owner in May 1871, though all the while there was a sum of Rupees 7-7-0 deposited in the taluq treasury which belonged to the defaulter. Rs. 47 or Rs. 43-8-8 more than was wanted was realized by the sale. The case disposed of in Board's Proceedings, dated 17th April 1874, No. 910, is another instance of irregularities by which Mr. Dique made a severe law harsher than it need be. The case now reported by Mr. Garstin in which Mr. Dique had twenty-five revenue defaulters summoned under Act III. of 1869 (Madras), to appear before him and explain why they did not pay their kists, and then had them punished for not appearing under Section 174 of the Penal Code, falls under the same category. The Board are strongly of opinion that it is a sound and necessary policy, in the words of Government, to "visit with severe displeasure any irregularity or illegality which enhances the severity of the law" for the recovery of arrears, and they think the case of Mr. Dique, in which a perversely-minded man with a thorough knowledge of the law and considerable ability has used that knowledge and ability to "enhance the severity of the law" is one in which the policy should be exercised.

Proceedings of the Madras Government, Revenue Department,
16th October 1874.

Mr. Reade, Board's Proceedings, 30th September 1868, No. 6,937.
Mr. Sullivan, Board's Proceedings, 12th December 1873, No. 2,589.
Mr. Garstin, Board's Proceedings, 3rd June 1874, Miscellaneous No. 3,697.

8. Three successive Collectors, one of whom was the Collector who made Mr. Dique a Tahsildar, have successively urged that Mr. Dique should be dismissed from the public service. The Board have stood between him and punishment on previous occasions, believing that the faults committed were not the result of bad faith, and hoping that a man with such abilities, as Mr. Dique possesses, would take warning and reform. This hope has been disappointed, and the Board now resolve to recommend Government to reduce Mr. Dique from the post of Tahsildar to that of Deputy-Tahsildar and Sub-Magistrate.

No. 199. ORDER THEREON, 16th October 1874, No. 1,337.

Miscellaneous.

HIS EXCELLENCY the Governor in Council is pleased to direct that Mr. Dique, Tahsildar of Tindevanum, be reduced to the post of Deputy-Tahsildar and Sub-Magistrate as recommended by the Board.

(True Extract.)

(Signed) C. G. MASTER,
Acting Secretary to Government.

To the Board of Revenue.
" the Accountant-General.

Exd. W. H. French.

Compd

Govt of 1874 Madras.

REVENUE.

To

THE BOARD OF REVENUE

&c. &c. &c.

Dated October 16th.

Recd. Encl.

G.O., 16th October 1874, No. 1,367.

OCTOBER.

Nos. 188—190.

Mr. Degue, Tahsildar of Tindivanam, South Arcot District.—Directing that — be reduced to the post of Deputy-Tahsildar and Sub-Magistrate.

Lu. C. No 1894

Compiled 30

Revenue Department.

18

Proceedings of the Madras Government

Read the following

Proceedings of the Board of Revenue

Submitting with remarks letter from Collector of South Arcot reporting on petition presented by Mr Degue, late Tahsildar of Tindivanam — [A.L. 23 June 75 No 1736].

Order thereon 26 July 1875 No 1112.

On reconsideration of the case, Government resolve to limit the reduction to a period of one year from the date of the previous order having been carried out.

Mr Degue will at the expiration of the year be restored to a taluq of equal pay to that from which he was removed.

(True Extract)

(Signed) A. Macgregor

Ag Secretary to Govt

To,

The Board of Revenue

Miscellaneous No. 7018

Communicated to the Collector of South Arcot, who will give effect to the order of Government.

(By order)

Rev. Board office
Madras
4 August 1870

(Signed) C. A. Galton
Ag Sub Secretary

(True Copy)

Collector.

Ins No 1894

Compd
D. U.

No. 739.

Order from W. G. Underwood Esq. r
Ag Sub Collector of South Arcot to Mr.
J. Dique, Tahsildar of Tindivanam

Of the summonses entered in the Summons Registers of your Taluq, you first sent me some and subsequently only 71 of the remainder. Although orders have been sent to you to send up all the remaining summonses, you have not as yet done and obeyed my orders. I have therefore suspended you. you will make over charge of your office to the Taluq Sheristadar.

4 November 1880.
Camp Tiruvannamalai

(Signed) W. G. Underwood
Ag Sub Collector.

(True Translation)

Collector.

Revenue Department.

Mis. No. 12699.

Proceedings of the Board of Revenue
Dated 17th November 1880.

Read letter from the Collector of South Arcot dated 8th instant No 420.

Upon the insufficient information before them the Board are not prepared to accord their unqualified approval to the action taken by the Sub Collector in suspending the Tahsildar. Nevertheless they desire as far as possible to support District officers in maintaining discipline, and they will not, at present, disturb the order of suspension.

2. When, however Mr Dique has complied with the order of the Sub Collector by submitting the information required, he will resume charge of his Talook; and the Collector will submit a full report upon his conduct, together with any explanation which the Tahsildar

may have to offer. The Board will then be in a position to consider what further action should be taken.

3. Mr Underwood's letters now before the Board are wide and incomplete, and it is necessary that the full information be furnished hereafter.

4. Regarding the suggestion at the close of the Collector's letter that Mr Digue should be compelled to retire at once, the Board observe that the proposal is inadmissible (Vide Section 7 Civil Pension Code).

(True Extract)

(Signed) C. Gibson
Ag Sub Secretary.

(True copy)

Collector

Compd.
J.A.

No. 2336.

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

To
A. Cruickshank Esquire
Collector of South Arcot.

Sir,

Adverting to your letter No. 251 dated 3 November 1881, I have the honor to enclose a true extract from the Pay bill of the late Sadr and Faujdaree Udalut Court for August 1853, showing that Mr F. Digue drew Rupees 17-6-2 at Rupees 24-8- per mensem from 1st to 22nd of that month.

High Court of Judicature
Madras 10 November 1881

I have &c.
(Signed) J. Weir
Acting Registrar
Appellate Side

(True Copy)

Collector.

Compd.

(11)

2

Extract from the Pay Abstract of the late Sadr and Foujdaree Udalut for the Month of August 1853.

× × ×.

F. Dique, 2d Class Copyist from 1st to 22 August 1853 at Rs A.P. 24-8-0 per mensem	Rs. a. P. 17. 6. 2

× × ×

(True Extract)

Acting Registrar
Appellate Side

(True copy)

Collector.

Compd
2A

(12)

District Court of South Arcot
Cuddalore, 28 October 1853.

No. 201.

29

From

J. H. Nelson Esquire
District Judge of
South Arcot.

To

A. Cruickshank Esquire
Collector of
South Arcot.

Sir,

In reply to your letter No. 240 of the 24 Instant, I have the honor to inform you that on again examining the Pay bills it is quite clear that Mr. Digue drew pay as 2d Writer of this Court at the rate of Rupees 35 per mensem from the 6 August 1853, and that although his name appears as acting 2nd Writer in the bills for August and September of this year he was paid the full pay of the office which was Rupees 35.

2. The two enclosures received with your letter are herewith returned.

I have &c.
(Signed) J. H. Nelson
District Judge

(True copy)
A. Cruickshank
Collector

Compd
J. G.

No. A. D. K.
186

TREASURY ACCOUNT DEPARTMENT.
PENSION VERIFICATION BRANCH.

Fort Saint George,
Accountant-General's Office,
2d December 1881.

FROM
H. F. Clogstoun Esq.
Offg. ACCOUNTANT GENERAL,
MADRAS,

TO
THE Collector of
South Arcot.

SIR,

WITH reference to your application for pension ~~gratuity~~ on behalf of Mr. Francis Digna, late Tahsildar, Cuddalore Taluk,

I have the honor to inform you that the final disposal of the application is delayed for want of Nos. 2, 5, 6 and 7.

2. I particularly request that the required information may be supplied without delay, this letter being retransmitted for submission to Government along with the other papers connected with the case.

I have the honor to be,
Sir,
Your obedient Servant,
G Hall
offg Chief Clerk of ~~Assistant to~~ the *Accountant-General,*
for *Accountant-General.*

1. House or country name of the applicant and that of his father.

× 2. Insertion in the column headed "How verified," on the second page of the application herewith returned, the nature or class of records from which the applicant's services have been verified.

3. Explanation of apparent breaks and degradation opposite to No. 2 on the third page of the application herewith returned.

4. Insertion in detail in the service book herewith returned of the several kinds of leave of absence other than privilege or casual leave enjoyed by the applicant.

× 5. Insertion in the service book herewith returned of the reason of termination of service on 24th Sept. 81 and for attestation of the entries thus made by the Head of the Office. vide Rule 6 Sec. 116 of the Civil Pension Code

× 6. Insertion of the certificate opposite to No. 5 on the third page of the application that the applicant is inefficient owing to age or infirmity.

× 7. Signature of the Applicant ~~Head of the Office~~ in the 7th ~~appropriate~~ column of the 4th page of the accompanying service book.

8. Transmission of the true copy of the correspondence in connection with the applicant's suspension / dismissal in and of a Last Pay Certificate.

9. Explanation of the cause of delay of nearly months / years in the submission of the application

10. Explanation why the applicant was retained in service up to when the medical certificate declaring him to be unfit for further service was dated the

11. Explanation why the applicant was removed from the service before his incapacity for further service was duly established by a certificate.

12. Explanation why the medical certificate is post-dated to the extent of $\frac{\text{days}}{\text{months,}}$ the applicant having ceased to do duty on

13. Information as to whether the applicant applied for his $\frac{\text{pension}}{\text{gratuity}}$ during his life time; if so, when he applied and when he died.

14. Information as to the name of the applicant's heir entitled to receive the gratuity or the amount of arrears of pension due to him.

15. Revision of the affidavit and contemporary evidence. The evidence should contain information on the following points:—

(*a.*) Whether the applicant was in *permanent* employ of Government.

(*b.*) Whether there were any breaks in the continuity of his service and whether he was at any time absent on leave other than privilege; if so, the nature of such breaks and the duration of such leave of absence should, as far as possible, be specified.

16. Information as to whether the appointment of in which the applicant is stated to have been acting from to was *fully vacant*, and whether any person, save the applicant, counted service in it during that period.

17. Information as to whether any endeavours were taken to provide a suitable appointment for the applicant. The amount of saving effected to Government by the abolition of his appointment in the Revision of Establishment should be stated.

18. Insertion of the several rates of acting allowance separately from pay.

19. A few more personal marks to facilitate identification.

20. Certificate to the effect that the applicant appeared before a Medical Officer in view to his being examined as to whether he has or has not the normal prospects of life, *vide* Rule 5, Section 105 of the Civil Pension Code.

21. Specific report as to the nature of the investigation made and the conclusion arrived at by the Head of the Office, in respect of the portion of service not verifiable from office records.

22. Information as to whether the applicant's detachment on temporary duty from to was on the understanding that when the temporary duty should cease, he would revert to his substantive appointment. Copy of any departmental order on the subject should also be forwarded.

23. Information as to why the applicant's name does not appear in the $\frac{\text{Annual Return}}{\text{Audit Register}}$ for on record in this office.

No. 777

No. 398

33

SOUTH ARCOT COLLECTOR'S OFFICE,
Cuddalore 8. December 1881

FROM THE COLLECTOR OF SOUTH ARCOT.
TO THE Accountant General.

VIDE { your / ~~this~~ } ~~Proceedings~~ Office Letter ~~Memo.~~ ~~Docket~~ } No. $\frac{\text{ADK}}{186}$ dated 2. December 1881

The undersigned has the honor to resubmit the application for pension on behalf of Mr. J. Digue, late Tahsildar of Cuddalore, and his Service Register returned with the above letter with the omissions pointed out supplied therein.

2. Mr. Digue being now at Madras, his signature in the 7 column of the 4 page of the Service book cannot be obtained here. He has however been required by a letter this day addressed to him, to appear in the Accountant General's office at Madras, where it is requested that the signature required may be taken.

ACCOUNTANT GENERAL'S
10 DEC 81
MADRAS

Collector.

12 [illegible]

Revenue Department

Miscellaneous No 12,338.

Proceedings of the Board of Revenue
Dated 8th November 1880.

Read letter from the Collector of South Arcot dated 12th October 1880 No 391 reporting certain irregularities of Mr Digue Tahsildar of Tindivanam

---

The Board do not see sufficient grounds in this case for reducing Mr Digue to a third class Taluq, but looking to his past career and the frequent complaints made against him, they think that he should be required to retire from the service on attaining the age of 55, which will apparently be about a year hence. Meanwhile there is no objection to his being transferred to Cuddalore on equal pay as proposed by the Collector in his letter dated

12th October

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

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. In.	Personal marks for identification.	Date of Entry.	Signature of Officer.	Signature and designation of the head of the Office.
Francis Sique	East Indian	Sadivanam	Francis Sique	Madras	24th September 1826	50	2	24	5	9	One Mole on the nape of the neck	18th December 1876		

12 October 1880 No. 387.

(True Extract)

(Signed) C. A. Galton
Secretary

(True Copy)

Collector

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
Name of appointment.	Nature, *i.e.*, whether substantive or acting, permanent or temporary.	Substantive appointment, if the new appointment be acting only.	Pay.	Acting allowance.	Date of appointment.	Signature of Officer.	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.*	Signature & designation of immediate head of the Office.	Date of termination of appointment.	Reason of termination *e.g.*, *transfer*, *promotion*, *return of permanent incumbent.*	Signature and designation of immediate head of the Office.
Court of Sudder and Fouzdary Adalut											
Gumasta	Permanent	„	14 Rs	.	1st July 1844						
Writer	Do.	„	17½ Rs	..							
Do.	Do	„	21 Rs.								
2nd Class ~~Do~~ Copyist	Do.	„	24½ Rs.	„	5th August 1853						
Civil Court, Cuddalore.											
English Writer	Do.	„	35 Rs	.	6th Aug. 1853				[illegible]	Promoted	
Head Writer	Ag.	„	70 Rs		3rd April 1854				[illegible] 1852	Return of permanent incumbent	
English Writer	Permanent	„	35 Rs	„	2nd Aug. 1854				[illegible] 1856	Promoted	
Head Writer	Acting	Eng Writer	70 Rs		5th Sep. 1856				[illegible] 1856	Return of permanent incumbent	
English Writer	Permanent	„	35 Rs	„	22nd Sep. 1856				31st May 1858	Promoted	
Head Writer	Permanent	„	70 Rs	„	1st June 1858				16th [illegible] 1860	Promoted	
Collector's Office Cuddalore											
Head Clerk Income Tax Department	Permanent.	„	100 Rs	„	17th March 1860				[illegible] 1861	[illegible]	
Head Clerk English Dept.	Permanent	„	100 Rs	„	1st Dec. 1861				1st [illegible] 1863	Promoted	
Tasildar of [illegible]	Acting		175 Rs		5th January 1863.				[illegible] 1863	Return of permanent incumbent	
Head Clerk English Dept.	Permanent	„	100 Rs	„	5th July 1863				[illegible] 1863	Promoted	
Tasildar of Elavanasoor	Acting		200 Rs		16th Sep. 1863.				[illegible] 1864	Return of permanent incumbent	
Head Clerk English Dept.	Permanent	„	100 Rs	.	1st Dec. 1864				31st [illegible] 1865	Promoted	
Do. Do	Do.	„	150 Rs	.	1st Nov. 1865.				3rd [illegible]	Promoted	
Tasildar of Cuddalore	Do.	„	225 Rs	.	4th June 1866.				[illegible] 1868	[illegible]	
Do. of Tindivanam	Do.	„	225 Rs		16th Dec. 1868				[illegible]	[illegible]	

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.
Tasildar of Chellam charam	Temporary		250 Rs		23rd Aug 1872	
Do. of Tindivanam	Permanent	"	225 Rs	"	18 Aug 1873	
Sub Registrar & Deputy Tahsildar of [illegible]	Do		70 Rs		[illegible]	
Tahsildar of Tindivanam under suspension	Do		225		[illegible]	
Tahsildar of Cuddalore	Do	"	50		1872 27.12.80	
Tahsildar of [illegible]	Do		225		[illegible]	

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.
15 Days privilege leave from 20 Sept 1872		17 Aug 1873	Promoted	
Six months privilege leave from 20 April 1870		15.11.74	Transfer	
Do do for three months from 21st July 1873		18.11.75	~~[illegible]~~	
Privilege leave from 17th Nov 84 to 16 Nov 1885			[illegible] 20/7/78	
Privilege ~~leave~~ for 2 months from 1st July 1878		26.12.80	Transfer	
			Having attained the age of 55 years he was required to retire under G.O.R. dated 8 Sept 1880 No 2375.	

Collector

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
Name of appointment.	Nature, *i.e.*, whether substantive or acting, permanent or temporary.	Substantive appointment, if the new appointment be acting only.	Pay.	Acting allowance.	Date of appointment.	Signature of Officer.	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.*	Signature & designation of immediate head of the Office.	Date of termination of appointment.	Reason of termination *e.g., transfer, promotion, return of permanent incumbent.*	Signature and designation of immediate head of the Office.

No 384

No 742

SERVICE BOOK

OF

Name. Francis Digue

Caste or Race. East Indian

Residence. Tindivanam

FATHER'S. Name. Francis Digue

FATHER'S. Residence. Dead

Date of birth. 24th Sept 1826

In No 1894

76

APPLICATION FOR {PENSION. ~~GRATUITY~~.

1. Name of Applicant. Mr Francis Digue
2. Father's name. Mr Francis Digue
3. Sect or Caste. East Indian
4. Residence. Tindivanam
5. Present or last employment. Tahsildar Cuddalore taluq.
6. Date of beginning service. 1st July 1844.
7. Date of end of service. 24th September 1881.

	Y. M. D.
8. Length of service including breaks	37 - 2 - 24
of which superior	32 —
inferior	—
non-qualifying and breaks	5 - 2 - 24

9. Class of {pension ~~gratuity~~} applied for, and cause of application* ... Superannuation
10. [Average] emoluments or pay. Rs 225 —
11. Proposed pension. Rs 112 - 8 -
12. Proposed gratuity.
13. Date from which to commence. 25th September 1881.
14. Place of payment. South Arcot
15. Age of Applicant on this date. 55 years and one day (24 Sept 1826)
16. Height. 5 feet 9 inches
17. Marks. A mole on the nape of the neck - no other marks
18. Date. 25th November 1881.

28 NOV 81

A. Wedderburn
Collector.
SIGNATURE OF THE HEAD OF OFFICE.

Deputy Collector.

* 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.

83 / 84

HISTORY OF THE SERVICE (SHOWING BREAKS) OF Mr. Francis Dias late Tahsildar of Cuddalore Taluq South Arcot District.

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.
[illegible]	Telugu Reader	14	–	–	–	1. 7. 1844	23. 9. 48				4	2	23	Pay abstracts from 1845 to 1848 are missing in the Records of the [illegible] [illegible] at Madras	Copied from the records of the late [illegible] [illegible] [illegible]	Service from 1st July 44 to 23rd Sept 48 non qualifying being service rendered before attainment of the 22nd year of age. Services from 24th Sept 48 to 5th Aug 53, from 6th Aug 53 to 16th Nov 60 and from 17 Nov 60 to 24th September 1881 have been verified from the records of the Offices of the Regist. High Court, Appellate Side, District Judge and the Collector of South Arcot respectively, and the verification confirmed by reference partly to the Annual returns and partly to the Audit Registers in record in this office.
[illegible]		17	8	–	–	24. 9. 1848	31. 12. 1849	1	3	7	~~4~~	~~2~~	~~23~~			
	English Writer	21	–	–	–	1. 1. 1850	9. 5. 1852	2	4	9	–	–	–			
	Asst. [illegible]	24	8	–	–	10. 5. 1852	5. 8. 1853	1	1	26	–	–	–			
Collector of [illegible]	Eng. Writer	35	–	–	–	6. 8. 1853	2. 4. 1854	–	8	28	–	–	–			
	[illegible] Writer	35	–	–	17½	3. 4. 1854	2. 8. 1854	–	4	–	–	–	–			
	Eng. Writer	35	–	–	–	3. 8. 1854	4. 9. 1856	2	1	2	–	–	–			
	[illegible] Writer	35	–	–	17½	5. 9. 1856	21. 9. 1856	–	–	17	–	–	–			
	Eng. Writer	35	–	–	–	22. 9. 1856	31. 5. 1858	1	8	9	–	–	–			
	Head Writer	70	–	–	–	1. 6. 1858	16. 11. 1860	2	5	16	–	–	–			
[illegible]	[illegible]	100	–	–	–	17. 11. 1860	31. 10. 1861	–	11	14	–	–	–			
[illegible]	[illegible] Clerk	100	–	–	–	1. 11. 1861	4. 1. 1863	1	2	4	–	–	–			
Kallakurchi	Tahsildar	50	–	–	87½	5. 1. 1863	5. 7. 1863	–	6	1	–	–	–			
	[illegible] Clerk	100	–	–	–	6. 7. 1863	31. 8. 1863	–	1	26	–	–	–			
[illegible]	Tahsildar	200	–	–	–	1. 9. 1863	31. 10. 1864	1	2	–	–	–	–			
	[illegible] Clerk	100	–	–	–	1. 11. 1864	31. 10. 1865	1	–	–	–	–	–			
	Do	150	–	–	–	1. 11. 1865	3. 6. 1866	–	7	3	–	–	–			
Cuddalore	Tahsildar	225	–	–	–	4. 6. 1866	20. 12. 1867	1	6	16	–	–	–			
	Do	225	–	–	–	21. 12. 1867	15. 12. 1868	–	11	25	–	–	–			
Tindivanam	Tahsildar	225	–	–	–	16. 12. 1868	22. 8. 1872	3	8	6	–	–	–			
Chidambaram	Do Ag	250	–	–	–	23. 8. 1872	17. 8. 1873	–	11	25	–	–	–			
Tindivanam	Tahsildar	225	–	–	–	18. 8. 1873	15. 11. 1874	1	2	28	–	–	–			
[illegible]	Dy. Tahsildar on half pay	36	–	–	–	16. 11. 1874	16. 11. 1875	–	–	–	1	–	1			
Tindivanam	Tahsildar	225	–	–	–	17. 11. 1875	6. 11. 1880	4	11	19	–	–	–			
	Under Suspension	225	–	–	–	7. 11. 1880	22. 12. 1880	–	1	16	–	–	–			
Tindivanam	Tahsildar	225	–	–	–	23. 12. 1880	26. 12. 1880	–	–	4	–	–	–			
Cuddalore	Tahsildar	225	–	–	–	27. 12. 1880	24. 9. 1881	–	8	28	–	–	–			
							Total period of superior Service	32	–	–	5	2	24			

SIGNATURE.

No ADj/389

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 32 years " months " days; and that a superannuation {pension ~~gratuity~~} not exceeding Rs. 112-8 per mensem (1 year's ½ average emoluments), is admissible under Section 1061 & 109(c) (5th edition), of the Civil Pension Code. The calculations have been duly verified

From the remarks of the Collector entered opposite to No. 1 on the 3rd page of the application and the G.O. No. 2375 dated the 8th Septr. /81 Rev. Departt. it would appear that the applicants retirement, after attaining the 55th year of his age, was made compulsary, and the Collector has not furnished that Certificate of inefficiency for the Public Service, which he is required to do by rule 4 Section 106 of the Civil Pension Code. As however the enforcement of such retirement, under Orders of Government Nos. 463 & 539 dated 27th February 75 & 12th March 80 Fin. respectively, is left to the descretion of the Heads of Departments, the Government, ~~however~~ if satisfied, that the applicant is inefficient owing to age and infirmity, may grant him the Pension recommended above.

From the accompanying Copies of letters from the Registrar High Court and the District Judge South Arcot it will be seen that Mr. Sigue drew double pay for the period intervening between 5th and 23rd August 53 from the High Court at Rs. 24-8-0 and from the District Judge's Court South Arcot at Rs. 35-0-0 per mensem. The overdrawal calculated at the lower rate amounts to Rs. 13-6-11, which will have to be recovered from the arrears of any pension that may be sanctioned to him.

It is observed from the remark opposite to No. 1 in the 3rd page of the application and the several papers forwarded in connection therewith that the character and past conduct of the applicant have not been at all satisfactory. It rests therefore with Government to make such reduction in the amount of Pension that may be sanctioned to him as it may deem proper with reference to Section 65 of the Code and the note and rule under it.

The delay in the submission of this application is explained by the Collector in his remarks opposite to No. 5 on the 3rd page of the application.

Fort Saint George,
Accountt. Genl's Office,
17th December 1881.

To
The Under Secretary to Government
Pension Departt.

C. Hare
Offg. Chief Clerk of the Accountant General
for Accountt. General

17-12-81

REMARKS BY HEAD OF OFFICE.

1. As to character and past conduct of Applicant.

The Character and past Conduct of the Applicant were such as to justify his Compulsory retirement from Public Service on attaining the age of 55 years. Having been required by Government in their order No 2375 dated 8th September 87 communicated in Board's Pro: dated 14 Idem Mis: No 8460 (Copy accompanying) to retire on the 24 September 1887 the date on which he attained the age of 55 years the Collector recommends him for the grant of a Superannuation Pension of Rs 12-8-0 under Rule 1 Section 106 and Section 111 of the Civil Pension Code.

*

2. Explanation of any suspension or degradation.

3. Regarding any gratuity or pension already received by Applicant. See Chapter XX. Nil

4. Explanation under Section 47, Rule 1, so far as the Head of the Office can give it. Nil

* From 21st December 1867 to 15th December 1868 the applicant was under suspension from the post of the Tahsildar of Cuddalore accused of bribery in Connection with the License Tax but was restored to office as Tahsildar of Tindivanam on 16th December 1868 with arrears of pay up to the date of restoration - Vide Copies of Board's Pro: and orders of Government Nos 117-8210 and 1341 dated 9th January 20th November 1868 and 13th May 69 respectively. The time passed under suspension has been counted as service towards pension under Para 5 of Board's Standing order No 38½ of Mr Dalyell's Edition.

2- On 16th November 1874 the applicant was reduced from the post of Tahsildar of Tindivanam Taluq to that of Deputy Tahsildar of Tiruvadi on account of insubordination impertinence neglect and disobedience of orders - Vide order of Government dated 10th October 1874 No 1337 (Spare Copy accompanying). In their order dated 26 July 1875 No 1112 Communicated in Board's Pro: Mis No 7928 dated 4th August 1875 (Copy accompanying) the Government have limited the reduction to a period of one year from the date of previous order having been carried out and ordered his restoration at the expiration of one year to a Taluq of equal pay to that from which he was removed - The applicant did not join the appointment of the Deputy Tahsildar of Tiruvadi, but obtained leave of absence on half pay from 16th November 1874 to 16th November 1875 and assumed Charge of the post of Tahsildar of Tindivanam on the 17th Idem. Lastly, the applicant was on 7th Novem suspended by the Sub Collector on account of disobedience of orders, but was restored on 23rd Nov to the post of the Tahsildar of Tindivanam on his Complying with the order of the Sub Collector by submitting the information required - Vide accompanying Translation of the Takeed of the Sub Collector and Board's Proceedings dated 5 and 17th November 1880 No 739 and Mis: No 12699 respectively. As the applicant was under suspension pending enquiry into his Conduct which was followed by reinstatement the time passed under suspension on this occasion also is counted under section 95 of the Civil Pension Code.

5. Any other remarks. The applicant was employed as a 2nd Class Copyist on a salary of Rs 14-0-0 in the late Sudder and Foujdaree Adalut Court and subsequently was appointed as 2nd Writer in the Cuddalore District Court on Rs 35 - From the letter of the Registrar of the High Court it appeared that Mr Dique drew pay as 2nd Class Copyist up to 22nd August 1853 while it appeared from the letter of the District Judge of South Arcot that he drew pay in his Court from 8th August 1853. His payment of salary from 8th to 22nd August 1853 was made

to

to Mr Dique in both Courts cannot be ascertained at this distance of time but the date from which the higher rate of pay was drawn by Mr Dique in the District Court here has been noted in the history of service - Vide accompanying Copies of letters of the District and High Courts Nos 207 and 2336 dated 28th October last and 10th Instant respectively - The service claimed has been established and should be admitted - His service book with a last pay Certificate is herewith sent - The delay in the submission of this Case was unavoidable owing to references which had to be made to the Courts for information on the point abovementioned, and the final reply from the High Court was received only on the 10th Instant

The applicant has attained the age of 55 years - He is considered by Government unfit to continue longer in service (G.O.R.D. dated 8th September 1887 No 2375) - The reason for his retirement is that given in Board's Pro: of 8th November 1880 which No 12338 Copy of which is sent -

Collector.

Collector

1894

PENSION DEPARTMENT.

Proceedings of the Madras Government.

READ the following papers :—

From the Collector of South Arcot dated 25 Novr 1881

" Accountant-General, dated 17th December 1881 No. $\frac{AD}{389}$ -

ORDER THEREON, 24th Jany 1882 No. 68

UNDER Sections 106 and 109 (C) of the Civil Pension Code (5th Edition), the Right Honorable the Governor in Council is pleased to grant to Mr Francis Digue late Tahsildar Cuddalore Taluq South Arcot District a Superannuation pension of Rupees (105—) One Hundred and five per mensem payable at Cuddalore from 25 September 188— in consideration of his qualifying Superior service of thirty - two years. ~~months and~~ ~~days.~~

2. The sum of Rs 13-6-11 being the amount of pay overdrawn by the applicant for

To the Accountant-General, with Register.

" Collector of South Arcot

" [illegible]

[illegible] 24-1-82

Stated that Mr Digue's services [illegible]
to amt of Rs. 105. [illegible]
He is given there a [illegible] Rs. 200 by
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
to appt on 12-1-82 [illegible]

Note for Orders

Rs 112. 8. half pay is admissible, but Mr Digue's character has been very unsatisfactory. Orders solicited as to whether any, & if so what deduction should be made from his pension. It may be observed that for his misconduct, he partly suffered during his service, & that his compulsory retirement may also be taken as a further punishment, but yet there hardly seem sufficient for his frequent misbehaviours as reported in the Pension application & in the records put up with it. [illegible]

APPLICATION FOR {PENSION OR GRATUITY}

Date of Application 25th November 1881

Name of Applicant Mr F. Digue

Last Appointment. Tahsildar of Cuddalore

Class of {pension or gratuity}

Amount of pension sanctioned.

Amount of gratuity sanctioned.

Date of commencement.

Date of sanction.

Pen: 1881 No [illegible]

No 18

1884

Vide order 18 1882

for the period between 5
and 23rd August 1853
will be recovered from
the arrears of his pension

Jm
18/1/62

C.C.

6/4/28

Govt. of {1881} Madras.

PENSION.

To

The Accountant-General,

&c., &c., &c.

Dated 24 January 1882

Despd. —

Recd. ✓

G.O., 24 January 82 — No 68

Granting a Superannuation pension of Rs 105 — per mensem to Mr. F. Dique late Tahsildar Cuddalore Taluq South Arcot District

Arc. 23-1-81
Ent 28-1-82