Political (1897) Department.

ORDINARY PRINTED.

G.O., No. 1360-1

DATED 4-6-97.

RECEIVED.

[Despatch Abstract.]

Retirement from British Service of Officers & Subjects employed by Native States

Addressing the Govt of India on the subject of the —.

[Letter Abstract]

—. Forwarding, with remarks, correspondence connected with the applications of Dewan Bahadur K. Krishnaswami Rao and Dr. K. Raman Nair of the 4th Cadre of Travancore for retirement from British Service with prejudice to their continuance in the employ of the State.

BACK PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.	G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

FURTHER PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.	G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.
21/98 =	So	27-28 7-1-98	122 12-2-98				
No 280 of 98							
" 1176/98 —		205-6 19-1-98					
1258/98		So.					

Government {1897} of Madras.

POLITICAL.

Recd. } 1897. *Enclosures*

Regd. *Spare copies*

G.O., No. 360, 4th June 1897.

JUNE.

Retirement from British Service of Officers still in the employ of Native States.

Addressing the Government of India on the subject of the —.

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS.

POLITICAL DEPARTMENT.

Read—again the following papers :—

G.O., No. 19, Political, dated 10th January 1883.

Abstract.—Communicating to the Resident in Travancore and Cochin letter from the Government of India, Foreign Department, No. 1583-G., dated 21st December 1882, sanctioning the transfer, permanently, of Mr. Kunhi Raman Nair, District Munsif of Calicut, to the Travancore State as a Puisne Judge of the Travancore High Court.

G.O., No. 532, Political, dated 12th August 1884.

Abstract.—Communicating to the Resident in Travancore and Cochin letter from the Government of India, Foreign Department, No. 2846-I., dated 26th July 1884, sanctioning the permanent transfer of the services of Mr. Kanchi Krishnaswami Rao, Subordinate Judge of Cocanada, to the Travancore State for employment as Chief Judge of Travancore.

G.O., No. 162, Political, dated 26th March 1890.

Abstract.—Communicating to the Resident in Travancore and Cochin letter from the Government of India, Foreign Department, No. 314-G., dated 3rd March 1890, sanctioning the grant by the Travancore Durbar of net increases of Rs. 200 and Rs. 100 *per mensem*, respectively, to the pay of Messrs. Krishnaswami Rao, Chief Judge of the Travancore High Court, and Mr. Kunhi Raman Nair, a Puisne Judge of the High Court in that State.

G.O., Nos. 600, 601, Political, dated 29th August 1894.

Abstract.—Requesting the sanction of the Government of India to the retirement from British service of Mr. Kunhi Raman Nair, a Puisne Judge of the Travancore High Court, without prejudice to his continuance in the employment of the Durbar.

G.O., No. [illegible], Political, dated 15th May 1895.

Abstract.—Communicating to the Resident in Travancore and Cochin letter from the Government of India, Foreign Department, No. 750-G., dated 29th April 1895, intimating that Mr. Kunhi Raman Nair cannot be permitted to retire from British service without prejudice to his continuance in the employment of the Travancore State.

Read—also the following papers :—

From F. A. NICHOLSON, Esq., Acting Resident in Travancore and Cochin, to the Chief Secretary to Government, dated Cochin, 12th March 1897, Ref. on C. No. 345.

I have the honour to forward herewith, for the favourable consideration and orders of Government, copy of an application, with its enclosures, from Diwan Bahadur M.R.Ry. K. Krishnaswami Rao Avargal, Chief Justice of the High Court of Travancore, for permission to retire from the service of the British Government without

prejudice to his continuance in the service of the Travancore State. His services were lent to the Durbar under G.O., No. 532, Political, dated 12th August 1884. His pensionable service under the British Government now amounts to more than 30 years rendering him eligible for a retiring pension of Rs. 5,000 per annum.

2. When M.R.Ry. Kunhi Raman Nair Avargal, another British officer lent to the Durbar, similarly applied for permission to retire from the British service while continuing to hold his Travancore appointment, the Government of India in its letter, No. 750-G., read in G.O., No. 319, Political, dated 15th May 1895, ruled that, unless he retired from the Travancore service also, he could not be admitted to the pension to which he would become entitled. In his present application, Mr. Krishnaswami Rao contends that this ruling, which is based on article 509 of the Civil Service Regulations, is not applicable to officers transferred to Foreign service, whose cases are to be dealt with under part VII of the Civil Service Regulations. Under article 838 in this part, as it originally stood, an officer could not get his pension unless he actually retired from his foreign employment. This disability has, however, since apparently been removed by the correction to the above article in the second edition of the Civil Service Regalations now in force. For easy reference I give below the article as it originaliy stood and as corrected :—

As it originally stood.—"The *pension* and leave of an officer on Foreign service, whether acting or permanent, are regulated by the rules which apply to officers of the Government of India. And an officer may not get *pension* unless he actually retires from his employment, or leave unless he actually quits duty and proceeds on leave."

As corrected.—"The pension and leave of an officer on Foreign service, whether acting or permanent, are regulated by the rules which apply to officers of the Government of India. And an officer may not get leave unless he actually quits duty and proceeds on leave."

Mr. Krishnaswami Rao argues, therefore, that this removal of the disability is tantamount to granting permission to retire from British service without prejudice to continuance in Foreign service. It seems to me that his contention is both reasonable and correct, and I beg therefore to forward his application for the favourable consideration of Government.

Enclosure.

From M.R.Ry. K. KRISHNASWAMI RAO Avargal, Chief Justice of Travancore, to the Acting British Resident in Travancore and Cochin, dated Trivandrum, 3rd February 1897, No. A.

My services were transferred to the Travancore State for employment as Chief Justice of His Highness the Maha Raja's High Court under the order of the Government of Madras, Mis. No. 532, dated 12th August 1884.

2. I intend to retire from the service of the Government of India on the pension due to me, but to continue in the service of the Travancore State. In reply to the inquiries I made, the Accountant-General of Madras in his letter, No. I.A.E.—27-C., dated 20th February 1896, informed me that my pensionable service amounted to more than 30 years rendering me eligible for a retiring pension of Rs. 5,000 per annum; and drew my attention to the letter of the Government of India, No. 750-G., dated 29th April 1895, embodied in Madras G.O., No. 319, Political, dated 15th May 1895, declining to grant permission to Mr. Kunhi Raman Nair (a Puisne Judge of the Travancore High Court) to retire from the British service without prejudice to his continuance in the service of this State. From the copy of the said letter of the Government of India furnished to me by Mr. Thomson (the permanent Resident), I learn that, on relying on article 509 of the Civil Service Regulations, the Government of India refused to grant the permission solicited by Mr. Justice Kunhi Raman Nair. I beg to submit that this article does not appear to be applicable to officers on Foreign service who are governed by the special rules contained in part VII of the Civil Service Regulations. Article 838, as amended by the Financial Department order, No. 555, dated the 3rd February 1890 (*vide* the correction slip attached to the article), sanctions the grant of pensions to the British officers on Foreign service, without requiring them to retire *actually* from their employment under foreign Governments. In reply to my inquiry the Accountant-General of Madras has informed me that his office was not aware of any express order cancelling the correction slip above referred to. I, therefore, take article 838, as amended by the correction slip to be the authority to be consulted on the subject.

Before the amendment this article stood as follows:—"The pension and leave of an officer on Foreign service, whether acting or permanent, are regulated by the rules which apply to the officers of the Government of India. And an officer may not get *pension unless he actually retires from his employment*, or leave unless he actually quits duty and proceeds on leave." The condition that an officer on Foreign service should *actually* retire from his employment to entitle him to his pension from the British Government, which the words italicized in the above quotation had imposed, was expressly withdrawn by the said correction slip which, in conformity with the order of the Financial Department, No. 555, dated 3rd February 1890, struck out from article 838, the words "pension unless he actually retires from his employment or." This article, as it *now* stands, does not seem to debar the grant of pensions to British officers on Foreign service while continuing in foreign employment. In support of my view, I beg to refer to the case of Mr. Thumbu Chetty, C.I.E. (the Senior Member of the Mysore Council), who was graciously permitted to retire from British service on the pension due to him, without prejudice to his continuance in the service of the Mysore State to which his services had been lent by the Government of India.

3. If article 509 of the Civil Service Regulations be applied to British officers on foreign service, they will be placed in a worse position than their brother officers in British India. A British officer not on Foreign service is at liberty to retire on pension due to him, with a view to enter Foreign service. Messrs. Best and Weir of the Imperial Civil Service of India, after obtaining assurances of employment in the Mysore State, retired from the service of the Government of India on the pension due to them and joined the service of the Mysore State. They are now in the receipt of the British pension and of the Mysore pay. If British officers on Foreign service be required to actually retire from their employment, to entitle them to their pension, they will lose the double benefit which their brother officers not on Foreign service are allowed to enjoy. It is, I believe, to remove this injustice to officers on Foreign service that the Government of India were graciously pleased to amend article 838 of the Civil Service Regulations by the Financial order, No. 555, dated the 3rd February 1890, embodied in the correction slip. This article seems to have escaped the attention of the Government of India when, on the authority of article 509 (not applicable to officers on Foreign service) they declined to permit Mr. Justice Kunhi Raman Nair to retire from British service without prejudice to his continuance in the service of this State.

4. In conclusion, I beg that you will be kind enough to move the British Government to grant me permission, under article 838 of the Civil Service Regulations as it now stands, to retire from their service on the pension due to me, without insisting on my actual retirement from the office I hold in this State.

From F. A. NICHOLSON, Esq., Acting Resident in Travancore and Cochin, to the Chief Secretary to Government, dated Cochin, 12th March 1897, Ref. on C. No. 621.

With reference to G.O., No. 319, Political, dated 15th May 1895, I have the honour to forward herewith copy of an application from M.R.Ry. T. Kunhi Raman Nair Avargal for a reconsideration of the orders declining to permit him to retire from the British service without prejudice to his continuance in the service of the Travancore Durbar. The arguments adduced in this application are the same as those in a similar application recently received from Diwan Bahadur M.R.Ry. K. Krishnaswami Rao Avargal, which I am this day forwarding with a separate communication. To what I have written therein, I have only to add that from a letter written by the Diwan to Mr. Thomson in August 1895, the Travancore Durbar seems anxious to be relieved of the contribution it is now paying on behalf of Mr. Kunhi Raman Nair since he is no longer earning a pension on the service he now renders, and it is for such pension that the Durbar contributes.

Enclosure.

From M.R.Ry. T. KUNHI RAMAN NAIR Avargal, Judge of the Travancore High Court, on deputation, to the Acting British Resident in Travancore and Cochin, dated Trivandrum, 22nd February 1897.

Adverting to your predecessor's letter of the 29th May 1895, communicating to me the purport of the order of the Government of India declining to sanction my retirement from the British service without prejudice to my continuance in the employment of the Travancore State, I have the honour to request you will be so good as to move the Government of India, through the Madras Government, for a reconsideration of its order.

2. The grounds on which I respectfully solicit a review and reconsideration of the above order are—

(*a*) The provisions of chapter 36 of the Civil Service Regulations applicable to British Indian officers like myself transferred to Foreign service of the first kind, that is, service in Native States, do not enact a prohibition against the retirement of such officers from the British service on the pension admissible under the rules without prejudice to their employment in the Native States. The effect of such transfer on deputation is simply to make the officer's Foreign service equivalent to British service for the purpose of pension, but not to render his retirement from such Foreign service compulsory as a condition precedent to his right to get the British pension earned by his service. Several officers lent to Native States have in recent times been permitted to retire on pension from the British service without prejudice to their continuance in the employment of the Native States. As instances, I may mention the cases of two officers lent to the Mysore State. Messrs. Thumbu Chettiar and L. Rickets, the former of whom is still in the Mysore State as a Member of Council of that State.

(*b*) Article 838 of the Civil Service Regulations, as amended by the order in the Financial Department, No. 555, dated 3rd February 1890, shows that the condition that an officer on Foreign service should actually retire from his employment to entitle him to his pension from the British Government has been expressly withdrawn. The spirit of this Government order and the effect of the amendment thereby made in article 838 have, I humbly venture to think, been overlooked in passing orders in my case.

(*c*) The benign policy of the British Indian Government in matters affecting the interests of its servants has been not to enact any new rule, nor to lay down any new interpretation of old rules in such way as to affect injuriously the rights acquired or reasonable expectations formed under the old rule as originally interpreted and acted upon, and I humbly venture to hope that the interpretation of the rules adopted in the case of the officers of my position will be held applicable to my case as well.

(*d*) The Government of India have, since the passing of the orders in my case, cancelled the rule prohibiting the employment of British pensioners in Native States without its previous sanction, and the denial to officers on Foreign service the right of resigning the British service and of continuing in the service of Native States would place them in a worse position than the officers in the active service of the British Government who are at liberty to retire from the British service on pension and then enter the service of Native States. The cases of Messrs. Best and Weir, who recently retired from British service and entered the service of Mysore State, are instances in point.

(*e*) I do not, as supposed by the Government of India, earn by my Foreign service British pension on the full salary I now draw, but only on my original salary of Rs. 700 on which alone the pensionary contribution is levied from me by the British Indian Government, and I cannot, as a matter of right, and except as a special case, claim the maximum pension from the British Government. The increased salary which I now draw from the Travancore State was sanctioned by the Government of India on the understanding that I am not to claim from British Government any additional pension in respect of such increase.

3. In conclusion, I may add that I have by accepting Foreign service as a permanent arrangement, lost all my prospects in the British service, and it is but a bare act of justice to allow me to draw the British pension which I have already earned without prejudice to my continuance in the employment under the Travancore State.

Endt. No. 810.

Referred to the Accountant-General for favour of remarks.

(By order.)

(Signed) A. R. KNAPP,
Ag. Under Secretary.

5th April 1897.

From W. H. MICHAEL, Esq., Officiating Accountant-General, to the Chief Secretary to Government, dated Fort St. George, 1st May 1897, No. I.A.E.—30-C.

I have the honour to acknowledge the receipt of your endorsement No. 810, dated the 5th of April 1897, referring to me, for remarks, application from Diwan Bahadur M.R.Ry. K. Krishnaswami Rao Avargal, Chief Justice of the High Court of Travancore, and M.R.Ry. T. Kunhi Raman Nair, Judge of the same court, respectively,

the former for permission to retire on pension from the service of the British Government without prejudice to his continuance in the service of the Travancore State, and the latter for a reconsideration of the orders of the Government of India declining to permit him to so retire from the British service.

2. With reference to Mr. Krishnaswami Rao's application, I have to state that, although that gentleman is serving in a Native State, he is still an officer of the British Government, and as such is subject to the same conditions as regards pension as are applicable to British Government officers (*vide* article 838 of the Civil Service Regulations). He cannot, therefore, claim the retiring pension for which he is eligible until, with the previous sanction of the British Government, he has formally retired from service. In this connection attention is drawn to the views expressed by the Government of India in the Foreign Department in letter, No. 750-G., dated 29th April 1895, embodied in G.O., No. 319, Political, dated 15th May 1895, and to G.O., No. 196, Political, dated 16th March 1896.

3. The arguments put forward by Mr. Krishnaswami Rao in support of his contention that article 838 of the Civil Service Regulations, as it exists at present, allows him to claim a pension without formally retiring from the appointments in respect of which he has been contributing for pension, cannot, it seems to me, be admitted, as they imply that the provisions of that article were overlooked by the Government of India in deciding to the contrary in the case of Mr. Kunhi Raman Nair in their letter of the 29th April 1895, which clearly directs that the grant of a pension must be preceded by actual retirement. Should Government, however, consider that the decision of the Government of India would entail hardship on officers lent to foreign service, I would suggest that the point be referred again to them for orders.

4. The cases of Messrs. Best and Weir quoted in the application are not analogous to Mr. Krishnaswami Rao's case, as those officers actually retired from their appointments in Government service and afterwards obtained appointments in the Mysore State, while Mr. Thumbu Chetty's case appears to have been treated as a special one by the Government of India with reference to the request made on his behalf by the Madras Government.

5. As regards the application from Mr. T. Kunhi Raman Nair, I presume that no remarks are called for by me as it is an appeal against the orders of the Government of India, and the Government of Madras is at liberty, if it thinks fit, to refer it to the Supreme Government for their orders.

6. The endorsement under reply and its enclosures are herewith returned.

———

Order—No. 360, Political, dated 4th June 1897.

The Government of India will be addressed.

[Here enter letter No. 361, Political, dated 4th June 1897.]

(True Extract.)

Chief Secretary.

To the Resident in Travancore and Cochin.
" Accountant-General.

Exd. C. M. Thumbuswamy.

Government {1897} of Madras.

POLITICAL.

Recd. } 1897. *Enclosures*
Regd. } *Spare copies*

Letter, No. 361, 4th June 1897.

JUNE.

Retirement from British Service of Officers still in the employ of Native States.

Forwarding, with remarks, correspondence connected with the applications of Diwan Bahadur K. Krishnaswami Rao and Mr. Kunhi Raman Nair of the High Court of Travancore for retirement from British service without prejudice to their continuance in the employment of the State.

POLITICAL DEPARTMENT.

Letter—from

The Chief Secretary to the Government of
Fort St. George,

To

The Secretary to the Government of India,
Foreign Department.

Sir,

I am directed to refer to the correspondence ending with Captain Daly's letter, No. 750 G., dated 29th April 1895, in which it was intimated that Mr. Kunhi Raman Nair, formerly a District Munsif, whose services were transferred in 1882 to the Travancore State, could not be permitted to retire from British service without prejudice to his continuance in the employment of the Darbar. The reasons given for this ruling were that this officer has been, and is, earning pension by reason of service in the appointment he holds in the Travancore State, and that until he actually retires from service, within the meaning of article 509 of the Civil Service Regulations, the question of granting him a retiring pension does not arise.

2. I am to enclose copies of further correspondence * on the above subject from the Resident in Travancore and Cochin, together with the remarks of the Accountant-General † thereon. With the second of his letters the Resident submits an application from Mr. Kunhi Raman Nair for a reconsideration of the order referred to in paragraph 1 *supra*. His first communication gives cover to an application from Diwan Bahadur K. Krishnaswami Rao, Chief Judge of the High Court of Travancore, for permission to retire from the service of the British Government without prejudice to his continuance in the employment of the Darbar. Diwan Bahadur Krishnaswami Rao's services were permanently transferred to the Travancore Darbar in 1884 (*vide* correspondence ending with your letter, No. 2846 I., dated 26th July 1884), and in 1890 he was granted an increase of Rs 200 to his emoluments (*vide* Foreign Department No. 314 G., dated 3rd March 1890). He has a pensionable service of more than thirty years and is, under British rules, eligible for a retiring pension of Rs. 5,000.

* No. 345, dated 12th March 1897.
„ 621 „ 12th „ „
† No. I.A.E.—30 C., dated 1st May 1897.

3. These two cases are, it will be observed, similar and almost the same arguments are adduced in support of each. It is urged that the ruling of the Government of India referred to in paragraph 1 *supra* is based on article 509 of the Civil Service Regulations, but that this article is inapplicable to officers transferred to Foreign service whose cases should apparently be dealt with under Part VII of the Regulations; and that, although under article 838, as it originally stood, an officer in Foreign service could not receive a pension until he actually retired from such service, this disability has since been removed by the correction to the above article issued under Financial Department No. 555, dated 3rd February 1890.

4. The latter part of article 838 ran originally as follows:—

"And an officer may not get (pension unless he actually retires from his employment, or) leave unless he actually quits duty and proceeds on leave."

The words within brackets have been eliminated by the correction slip of 1890 and do not appear in the present edition of the Regulations. Both Messrs. Kunhi Raman Nair and Krishnaswami Rao contend that this removal of the disability is tantamount to granting permission to retire from British service without prejudice to continuance in Foreign service.

5. It is further represented that the application of article 509 of the Civil Service Regulations to British officers in Foreign service places them in a worse position than their brother officers in British India, since the latter are, under Government of India No. 1904, Political, dated 27th April 1895, at liberty to retire on pension with a view to enter Foreign service, as in the case of Messrs. Best and Weir, who, after obtaining assurances of employment in the Mysore State, retired from the service of the Government of India on the pension due to them and joined the service of that Darbar. The case of Mr. Thumbu Chetti, C.I.E., is also again brought forward.

6. Mr. Kunhi Raman Nair points out also that he does not earn, by his Foreign service, a British pension on the full salary now drawn by him, but only on the original salary of Rs. 700, on which alone pensionary contribution is levied; and that the increased salary drawn from the Travancore State was sanctioned by the Government of India on the understanding that it gave him no claim to any additional pension from the British Government in respect of such increase.

7. The Resident remarks, in resubmitting Mr. Kunhi Raman Nair's case, that, from a letter written by the Diwan in August 1895, the Travancore Darbar seems anxious to be relieved of the contribution it is now paying on his behalf since he is no longer earning a pension on the service he at present renders, and that it is for such pension that the Darbar contributes. This remark applies to Mr. Krishnaswami Rao's case as well.

8. The papers have been referred to the Accountant-General who points out, with reference to Mr. Krishnaswami Rao's application, that, although that officer is serving in a Native State, he is still an officer of the British Government and as such, is subject to the same conditions as regards pension as are applicable to other British officers (*vide* article 838 of the Civil Service Regulations). He cannot therefore, the Accountant-General considers, claim the retiring pension for which he is eligible until, with the previous sanction of the British Government, he has formally retired from service. The arguments adduced in support of the contention that article 838 of the Civil Service Regulations, as it now stands, allows the officers in question to claim pensions without formally retiring from the appointments in respect of which they have been contributing for pension cannot, it seems to the Accountant-General, be admitted as they imply that the provisions of that article were overlooked by the Government of India in deciding to the contrary in the case of Mr. Kunhi Raman Nair. The cases of Messrs. Best and Weir are, the Accountant-General considers, not analogous, as those officers actually retired from their appointments in Government service and afterwards obtained appointments in Mysore, while Mr. Thumbu Chetti's case appears to have been specially treated by the Government of India.

9. It seems clear to His Excellency the Governor in Council that the first sentence of article 838 of the Civil Service Regulations, which clearly states that the pension of an officer in Foreign service is regulated by the rules which apply to the officers of the Government of India, supports the ruling of the Government of India in Mr. Kunhi Raman Nair's case. I am, however, to draw attention to the anomaly which the present correspondence has brought to light, viz., that there is no objection to an officer retiring from British services receiving a pension for such service, and immediately entering the service of a Native State, the entry into the latter service having been arranged previous to the retirement from British service, whilst an officer already in the service of a Native State cannot receive his British pension without actual retirement from both British and Foreign service. The objection raised in Captain Daly's letter of the 29th April 1895 really amounts to requiring the officers whose applications are now being dealt with to resign their Travancore appointments,

then to retire from their British appointments and then to be re-appointed to their Travancore posts. Insistence on this formality would, it is hardly necessary to point out, give needless trouble to the officers themselves and to the Darbar. His Excellency the Governor in Council considers that it should be deemed a sufficient compliance with the Code that the Darbar should know and permit of officers in the position of Messrs. Kunhi Raman Nair and Krishnaswami Rao making their applications to retire from British service. The Darbar would thus show that it was aware of, and acquiesced in the change of the status of the officers in question, from British officers lent to the State to private individuals.

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

Ootacamund,
4th June 1897. *Chief Secretary.*

Extd. T. K. Narayana Aiyangar.

[Annexure,

ANNEXURE.

From F. A. NICHOLSON, Esq., Acting Resident in Travancore and Cochin, to the Chief Secretary to Government, dated Cochin, 12th March 1897, Ref. on C. No. 345.

I have the honour to forward herewith, for the favourable consideration and orders of Government, copy of an application, with its enclosures, from Diwan Bahadur M.R.Ry. K. Krishnaswami Rao Avargal, Chief Justice of the High Court of Travancore, for permission to retire from the service of the British Government without prejudice to his continuance in the service of the Travancore State. His services were lent to the Durbar under G.O., No. 532, Political, dated 12th August 1884. His pensionable service under the British Government now amounts to more than 30 years rendering him eligible for a retiring pension of Rs. 5,000 per annum.

2. When M.R.Ry. Kunhi Raman Nair Avargal, another British officer lent to the Durbar, similarly applied for permission to retire from the British service while continuing to hold his Travancore appointment, the Government of India in its letter, No. 750-G., read in G.O., No. 319, Political, dated 15th May 1895, ruled that, unless he retired from the Travancore service also, he could not be admitted to the pension to which he would become entitled. In his present application, Mr. Krishnaswami Rao contends that this ruling, which is based on article 509 of the Civil Service Regulations, is not applicable to officers transferred to Foreign service, whose cases are to be dealt with under part VII of the Civil Service Regulations. Under article 838 in this part, as it originally stood, an officer could not get his pension unless he actually retired from his foreign employment. This disability has, however, since apparently been removed by the correction to the above article in the second edition of the Civil Service Regulations now in force. For easy reference I give below the article as it originally stood and as corrected :—

As it originally stood.—"The *pension* and leave of an officer on Foreign service, whether acting or permanent, are regulated by the rules which apply to officers of the Government of India. And an officer may not get *pension* unless he actually retires from his employment, or leave unless he actually quits duty and proceeds on leave."

As corrected.—"The pension and leave of an officer on Foreign service, whether acting or permanent, are regulated by the rules which apply to officers of the Government of India. And an officer may not get leave unless he actually quits duty and proceeds on leave."

Mr. Krishnaswami Rao argues, therefore, that this removal of the disability is tantamount to granting permission to retire from British service without prejudice to continuance in Foreign service. It seems to me that his contention is both reasonable and correct, and I beg therefore to forward his application for the favourable consideration of Government.

From F. A. NICHOLSON, Esq., Acting Resident in Travancore and Cochin, to the Chief Secretary to Government, dated Cochin, 12th March 1897, Ref. on C. No. 621.

With reference to G.O., No. 319, Political, dated 15th May 1895, I have the honour to forward herewith copy of an application from M.R.Ry. T. Kunhi Raman Nair Avargal for a reconsideration of the orders declining to permit him to retire from the British service without prejudice to his continuance in the service of the Travancore Durbar. The arguments adduced in this application are the same as those in a similar application recently received from Diwan Bahadur M.R.Ry. K. Krishnaswami Rao Avargal, which I am this day forwarding with a separate communication. To what I have written therein, I have only to add that from a letter written by the Diwan to Mr. Thomson in August 1895, the Travancore Durbar seems anxious to be relieved of the contribution it is now paying on behalf of Mr. Kunhi Raman Nair since he is no longer earning a pension on the service he now renders, and it is for such pension that the Durbar contributes.

From W. H. MICHAEL, Esq., Officiating Accountant-General, to the Chief Secretary to Government, dated Fort St. George, 1st May 1897, No. I.A.E.—30-C.

I have the honour to acknowledge the receipt of your endorsement No. 810, dated the 5th of April 1897, referring to me, for remarks, application from Diwan Bahadur M.R.Ry. K. Krishnaswami Rao Avargal, Chief Justice of the High Court of Travancore, and M.R.Ry. T. Kunhi Raman Nair, Judge of the same court, respectively, the former for permission to retire on pension from the service of the British Government without prejudice to his continuance in the service of the Travancore State, and the latter for a reconsideration of the orders of the Government of India declining to permit him to so retire from the British service.

2. With reference to Mr. Krishnaswami Rao's application, I have to state that, although that gentleman is serving in a Native State, he is still an officer of the British Government, and as such is subject to the same conditions as regards pension as are applicable to British Government officers (*vide* article 838 of the Civil Service Regulations). He cannot, therefore, claim the retiring pension for which he is eligible until, with the previous sanction of the British Government, he has formally retired from service. In this connection attention is drawn to the views expressed by the Government of India in the Foreign Department in letter, No. 750-G., dated 29th April 1895, embodied in G.O., No. 319, Political, dated 15th May 1895, and to G.O., No. 196, Political, dated 16th March 1896.

3. The arguments put forward by Mr. Krishnaswami Rao in support of his contention that article 838 of the Civil Service Regulations, as it exists at present, allows him to claim a pension without formally retiring from the appointments in respect of which he has been contributing for pension, cannot, it seems to me, be admitted, as they imply that the provisions of that article were overlooked by the Government of India in deciding to the contrary in the case of Mr. Kunhi Raman Nair in their letter of the 29th April 1895, which clearly directs that the grant of a pension must be preceded by actual retirement. Should Government, however, consider that the decision of the Government of India would entail hardship on officers lent to foreign service, I would suggest that the point be referred again to them for orders.

4. The cases of Messrs. Best and Weir quoted in the application are not analogous to Mr. Krishnaswami Rao's case, as those officers actually retired from their appointments in Government service and afterwards obtained appointments in the Mysore State, while Mr. Thumbu Chetty's case appears to have been treated as a special one by the Government of India with reference to the request made on his behalf by the Madras Government.

5. As regards the application from Mr. T. Kunhi Raman Nair, I presume that no remarks are called for by me as it is an appeal against the orders of the Government of India, and the Government of Madras is at liberty, if it thinks fit, to refer it to the Supreme Government for their orders.

6. The endorsement under reply and its enclosures are herewith returned.

Political (1897) Department.

CURRENT No.

ACCOUNTANT GENERAL'S OFFICE MADRAS 7 APR 97 9 april 97

1513

CHIEF SECRETARY GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS 19 MAR. 1897

From The Resident in Travancore & Cochin

C. No. 380 1386

Endt. Order No. 810 of 5th April 1897.

Referred to the Accountant General for favour of remarks.

By Order

A. Mukerjee

Under Secretary

Ref: on C No. 345

Dated 12th March 1897

Received

Registered

Enclosures 3

Spare copies 1

Cues 5/4/97

TO BE RETURNED WITH REPLY.

SUBJECT.

Forward for favourable consideration copy of an application with its enclosures from Dewan Bahadur M.R.Ry. K. Krishnaswamy Rao avl. Travancore High Court Chief Justice for permission to retire from the British service without prejudice to his continuance in the service of the Travancore service.

BACK PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.
~~L.~~	382-83	Bell	11-6-84.
—"—	697/8	"	18-10-84
~~Dis~~	458	"	15-July/84
~~Pens~~	532	"	12-8-84

FURTHER PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

Fort St. George,

Pension Department. Accountant-General's Office,

20th February 1896.

No. 1.A.E. / 27C

From

F. C. Harrison Esquire,

Offg. Accountant-General & Ex-

Government of Madras

To

M. R. Ry

K. Krishnaswamy Rao,

Chief Justice of the High Court of

Craven Cove.

Sir,

With reference to your letter dated the 8th inst, I have the honor to inform you that your pensionable service amounts to more than 30 years, rendering you eligible for a retiring pension of Rs 5000 per annum. But you cannot claim it until with the previous sanction of the British Government, you have formally retired from service. In this connection

I would draw your attention to the views expressed by the Government of India in letter No. 750, G, dated 29th April 1895, embodied in Government Order No 319, dated 15th May 1895, Political, a Copy of which has been Communicated to the Resident in Travancore, in the case of M. R. Ry. Kunhi Raman Nair.

Article 993 of the Civil Service Regulations prescribes the procedure that should be followed by a Gazetted Officer for obtaining his pension.

I have the honor to be,
Sir,
Your most Obedt. Servant,
(Signed) F. C. Harrison
Offg. Accountant-General.

(True copy)

K. Krishnaswamy Rao
Chief Justice of Travancore.

1897 Pol. Dept. Feb. 3 No 350

Pension Department.

Fort St. George,
Accountant-General's Office
20th January 1897.

No I.A.E. 318C

Draft issued

From
F. C. Harrison Esqr
Offg Accountant-General to the
Government of Madras

To.
M. R. Ry. K. Krishnaswamy Rao Avergal
Dewan Bahadur,
Chief Justice of Travancore

Sir

With reference to your letter dated the 29th December 1896, I have the honor to state that this office is not aware of any express order cancelling the Correction slip quoted by you.

I have the honor to be,
Sir,
Your most Obedt. Servt.
(Signed) J. L. Pinto

I would draw your attention to the views
exp[illegible] the letter No. 1, March
in[illegible] 3rd. February 1897.
em[illegible]
dar[illegible]
wh[illegible]
G[illegible]
e[illegible]

G[illegible]
[illegible]
C[illegible]

K. Krishnan Nair

1897 Pol. Dept.

Political Secretary to Travancore.

/True copy/

Chief Justice of Travancore.

Enclosure No. II to the letter No. A, dated 3rd February 1897.

1897
Political Dept.
Enclosure No. 2 to
G.O. 380

Political (1897) Department.

CURRENT No. 386

CHIEF SECRETARY
19 MAR 1897
GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS

From

The Resident in Travancore & Cochin

Order

Ref: in C **No.** 621

Dated 12th March 1897

Received 19 }
Registered 20 } 3 97

Enclosures /

Spare copies

SUBJECT.

Forwards copy of an application from Mr. I. Kunhi Raman Nair for a reconsideration of the orders declining to permit him to retire from the British service without prejudice to his continuance in the Travancore service.

R.O. for papers
Rd. 27/3/97

BACK PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.
R 88: 17	3	96 ✓	461: 24-9-90 ✓
R 160: 10	6	95 ✓	327: 25-6-90 ✓
319: 15	5	95 ✓	162: 26-3-90 ✓
600-1:	29	8-94 ✓	43: 29-1-90 ✓
540:	3	8-94 ✓	691 Jud: 10-10-89 ✓
383-4:	7	6-94 ✓	697/8: 18-10-84 ✓
176 Pen	2	3-92 ✓	532: 12-8-84 ✓
1147 Jud:	10	2-91 ✓	458: 15-7-84 ✓
			382/3: 11-6-82 ✓
437 Pol:	10	7-96.	14: 10-1-83 ✓
190-7 ½:	16	3-96	1481 Jud: 16-10-82 ✓

FURTHER PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

Political

Judicial (1897) Department.

CURRENT No. 589

CHIEF SECRETARY'S
-4 MAY 1897
GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS

From The Acott General

Order

No. 182 / 30 C

Dated 1st May 1897

Received 4th } May 1897.

Registered 5th }

Enclosures Roll. C No. 380 with 3 enclosures & 386 with one returned.

Spare copies

SUBJECT.

Returning with remarks applications from Dewan Bahadur M. R. Ry K. Krishnaswami Rao Avergal Chief Justice of the High Court of Travancore and M. R. Ry T. Kunhi Raman Nair, Judge of the same Court about their retirement from British Service

BACK PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

FURTHER PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

Political Dept:

Retirement from British Service of officers still in the employ of Native States.

C.Nos.380, 386 & 589

HIS EXCELLENCY THE GOVERNOR

F G.O.Nos.600-1 Poll., d/ 29th Augut. 1894.

F O R O R D E R S

The services of Mr.Kunhi Raman Nair were, with the sanction of the Govt. of India, transferred permanently to the Travancore Darbar for employment in that state as a Puisne Judge of the High Court in 1883 (G.O.No.19, dated 10th Jany 1883) In 1890 an increase of Rs.100 to his salary in Travancore was sanctioned (G.O No.162 Poll., d/ 26th March 1890)

2. In August 1894 the Govt. of India was, at the instance of the Resident, requested to permit Mr. Kunhi Raman Nair retire from British service without prejudice to his continuance in the employment of the Darbar. It was represented that pensionary contribution on his behalf had been recovered up to the 31st March 1894 that his pensionable service then amounted to 30 years, 2 months and one day for which, under ordinary circumstances, a retiring pension not exceeding Rs.343-13-9 per mensem, equal to 30/60ths of his average emoluments, would be admissible; that he drew, inclusive of the pensionary contribution, a salary of Rs.854-11-9 per mensem, but that the contribution was levied on an assumed pay of Rs.756-7-10; and that the Darbar was willing, should he complete sufficient service to entitle him

a

a pension under its rules, to consider his claims to an additional pension not only for service rendered after his retirement from British service, if such retirement were permitted, but also on the amount representing the difference between his actual emoluments (Rs.854) and the assumed pay (Rs.756). The case of Mr. T.R.A.Thumbu Chetti, the then Offg. Chief Judge of the Chief Court of Mysore, was quoted in support of the application and it was added that the immediate effect of the proposed arrangement would be to raise Mr Kunhi Raman Nair's emoluments by the pension he would receive from the British Govt. and to relieve the Darbar of the payment of pensionary contribution on his behalf.

3. The Govt. of India declined to sanction the application, remarking that Mr. Kunhi Raman Nair had been and was earning pension by reason of service in the appointment he held in the Travancore state and that until he actually retired from service within the meaning of art: 509 of the C.S.R. the question of granting him a retiring pension did not arise.

4. With C.No.386 the Resident submits an application from Mr.Kunhi Raman Nair for a reconsideration of the above order. C.No.380 contains an application from Diwan Bahadur K.Krishnaswami Rao, Chief Justice of the High Court of Travancore for permission to retire from the

of these officers making their application to retire from British service. The Darbar would thus show that it knows and appreciates in the changes of these officers' status, from British Officers back to these, to private individuals. I need not add that this is the real view of the question. 8.24 16.5.97

G.O.No.176 Pension, d/ 2nd March '92

D

I agree. The emendation of 838 and the return of the letter.

JG
20/5/97

G.O.No.319 Pol., d/ 15th May 1895

B

* Article 509 A retiring pension is granted to an officer who voluntarily retires after completing qualifying superior service for 30 years or such less time as may for any special class of officers be prescribed

C

and he was granted an increase of Rs 200 to his emoluments at the same time as Mr. Kunhi Raman Nair's pay was increased

O.162/26.3.98

New para

the service of British Govt. without prejudice to his continuance in the employ of the Darbar. This officer's services were permanently transferred to the Darbar in 1884 under G.O.No.532 Pol., d/ 12th August 1884. Having a pensionable service of more than 30 years he is eligible for a retiring pension of Rs.5000 per annum under British rules. These two cases are similar and almost the same arguments are adduced in support of each.

5. It is urged that the ruling of the Govt. of India in Mr. Kunhi Raman Nair's case is based on art: 509 of the C.S.R., but that this article is inapplicable to officers transferred to foreign service, whose cases should apparently be dealt with under Part VII of the Regulations, and that, although under art:838 as it originally stood an officer in foreign service could not get his pension until he actually retired from such service, this disability has since been removed by the correction to the above article issued under Finl. Dept. No. 555, d/ 3rd Feb. 1890. The latter part of the article in question ran originally as follows:--

"And an officer may not get (pension unless he actually retires from his employment, or) leave unless he actually quits duty and proceeds on leave".

The words within brackets have been eliminated by the correction slip referred to and do not appear in the present edition of the Regulations. Both the officers whose applications are under consideration contend that this removal of the disability is tantamount to granting

permission to retire from British service without prejudice to continuance in Foreign service. The Resident is of opinion that this contention is both reasonable and correct and observes that the ruling of the Govt. of India in Mr. Kunhi Raman Nair's case was passed in the Foreign dept. while the amendment of the C.S.R. was effected in the Finl. dept. to which a question like the present would appear to more properly belong. This, it may be observed, does not really affect the question as the Foreign dept. would not issue such a ruling without first consulting the Finl. dept.

6. It is further represented that the application of art: 509 of the C.S.R. [redacted] to British officers in foreign service [redacted] places them in a worse position than their brother officers in British India, since in conformity with the Govt. of India ruling contained in G.O.No.334 Pol., d/ 22nd May 1895, the latter are at liberty to retire on pension with a view to enter foreign service, as in the case of Messrs. Best and Weir who, after obtaining assurances of employment in the Mysore State, retired from the service of the Govt. of India on the pension due to them and joined the service of the Darbar. The case of of Mr. Thumbu Chetti, C.I.E. is again brought forward. Mr. Kunhi Raman Nair points out also that he does not earn by his foreign service a British pension on the full salry now drawn by him but only on the original salary of Rs.700 on which alone pensionary contribution is levied and that the increased salry drawn from the Travancore State was sanctioned by the Govt. of India on the understanding that it gave him no claim to any additional pension from the British Govt. in respect of such increase.

7. The Resident remarks, in submitting Mr.Kunhi Raman Nair's case, that from a letter written by the Diwan [redacted]. [redacted] in August 1895 the Travancore Darbar seems anxious to be relieved of the contribution it is now paying on his behalf since he is no longer earning a pension on the service he now renders and that it is for such pension that the Darbar contributes. This remark applies to Mr. Krishnaswami Rao's case as well.

8. The papers have been referred to the Acct. Genl. for remarks and his reply is contained in C.No.589. As regards the application from Mr. Kunhi Raman Nair the Acct. Genl. presumes that no remarks are called for from him as this is an appeal against the orders of the Govt. of India and the Govt. of Madras is at liberty if it thinks fit to refer the application to the Supreme Govt. for [redacted] orders. With reference to Mr. Krishnaswami Rao's application the Acct. Genl. points out that although that officer is serving in a Native State, he is still an officer of the British Govt. and, as such, is subject to the same conditions as regards pension as are applicable to other British officers (vide art: 838 of the C.S.R.) He cannot therefore, claim the retiring pension for which he is eligible until, with the previous sanction of the British Govt. he has formally retired from service. The Acct. Genl.

Genl. draws attention to the ruling of the Govt. of India in Mr.Kunhi Raman Nair's case and to the correspondence as regards the employment of Hospital Asst. Arunachellam Pillai in Pudukkottai (vide G.O.Nos.196-7 Poll., d/ 16th March 1896). The arguments adduced in support of the contention that art: 838 of the C.S.R. as it now stands allows the officers in question to claim pensions without formally retiring from the appointments in respect of which they have been contributing for pension cannot, it seems to the Acct. Genl., be admitted as they imply that the provisions of that article were overlooked by the Govt. of India in deciding to the contrary in the case of Mr. Kunhi Raman Nair. The cases of Messrs. Best and Weir are, the Acct. Genl considers, not analogous, as those officers actually retired from their appointments in Govt. service and afterwards obtained appointments in Mysore, while Mr. Thumbu Chetti's case appears to have been treated specially one by the Govt. of India.

This, it may be observed, is such a very strong argument.

9. As regards the constructions placed on the amendment of art:838 of the C.S.R., attention is solicited to the first sentence of that article which clearly states that the pension of an officer in foreign service is regulated by the rules which apply to officers of the Govt. of India. This supports the contentions of the Govt. of India and of the Acct. Genl but the anomaly brought

brought to light namely that there is no objection to an officer retiring from British service, receiving a pension for such service, and immediately entering the service of a Native State, the entry into the latter service having been arranged previous to the retirement from British service, whilst an officer already in the service of a Native State cannot receive his British pension without actual retirement from British service both Foreign might be pointed out to the Govt. of India.

Genl. draws attention to the ruling of

Retirement from British service of officers still in the employ of Native States.

C

C

H

18

Political Dept:

Read again G.O.No.19 Poll., d/ 10th Jany. 1883, communicating to the Resident in Travancore and Cochin ~~the~~ sanctioning ~~it~~ the Govt of India, Foreign Dept. No.1883 G., d/ 21st Decr. 1882, ~~to~~ the transfer, permanently, of Mr. Kunhi Raman Nair, Dt. Munsif of Calicut to the Travancore State as a Puisne Judge of the Travancore High Court.

" " G.O.No.532 Poll., d/ 12th August 1884, communicating to the Resident in T. & C. letter from the Govt. of India, Foreign Dept., No.2846 I, d/ 26th July 1884, sanctioning the permanent transfer of the services of Mr. Kanchi Krishnaswami Rao, Subordinate Judge of Cocanada, to the Travancore State for employment as Chief Judge of Travancore.

" " G.O.No.162 Poll., d/ 26th March 1890, communicating to the Resident in T. & C. ~~the~~ letter from ~~sanctioning~~ the Govt. of India Foreign Dept. No. 514 G., d/3rd March 1890, ~~to~~ sanctioning the grant by the Travancore Darbar of ~~11~~ net increases of Rs.200 and Rs.100 per mensem respectively to the pay of the officers referred to in para 1 supra. His first communication gives cover to an

Mr.Kunhi Raman Nair, a Puisne Judge of the High Court in that state.

Read again G.O.No.600/Poll., d/ 29th August 1894, requesting the sanction of the Govt. of India to the retirement from British service of Mr. Kunhi Raman Nair, a Puisne Judge of the Travancore High Court, without prejudice to his continuance in the employment of the Darbar.

Read again G.O.No.318 Poll., d/ 18th May 1895 communicating to the Resident in T. & C. letter from the Govt. of India, Foreign dept. No. 750 G., d/ 29th April 1895, intimating that Mr. Kunhi Raman Nair cannot be permitted to retire from British service without prejudice to his continuance in the employment of the Travancore state.

Read also C.Nos. 380 & 386 from the Resdt. in T. & C.

" " C.No.389 from the Acct. Genl.

ORDER / P.S. No. 360 dt. 4th June '97

The Govt. of India will be addressed.

(from orders)

1/6/97.

To

The Resident in T. & C.

— Acct Genl

C/6197
R 16197

H.E. the Governor

No.345, d/ 12th March '97

No.621, d/ 12th March 1897

× No. 918/30 C 7/5/97

LETTER No. 361 dt 4th June '97

To

The Secy. to the Govt. of India,
Foreign Dept:

SIR,

I am directed to refer to the correspondence ending with Capt: Daly's letter No.750 G, d/ 29th April 1895, in which it was intimated that Mr. Kunhi Raman Nair, formerly a Dt. Munsif, whose services were transferred in 1882 to the Travancore State, could not be permitted to retire from British service without prejudice to his continuance in the employment of the Darbar. The reasons given for this ruling were that this officer has been, and is, earning pension by reason of service in the appointment he holds in the Travancore State and that until he actually retires from service, within the meaning of art: 509 of the C.S.R., the question of granting him a retiring pension does not arise.

2. I am to enclose copies of correspondence from the Resident in Travancore and Cochin on the above subject together with the remarks of the Acct. Genl. thereon. With the second of his letters the Resident submits an application from Mr. Kunhi Raman Nair for a reconsideration of the order referred to in para 1 supra. His first communication gives cover to an

application from Diwan Bahadur K. Krishnaswami Rao, Chief Judge of the High Court of Travancore, for permission to retire from the service of British Govt. without prejudice to his continuance in the employment of the Darbar. Diwan Bahadur Krishnaswami Rao's services were permanently transferred to the Travancore Darbar in 1884 (vide correspondence ending with your letter No. 2846 I, dated 26th July 1884) and in 1890 he was granted an increase of Rs. 200 to his emoluments -vide Foreign dept.No.314 G., d/ 3rd March 1890. He has a pensionable service of more than 30 years and is, under British rules, eligible for a retiring pension of Rs.5,000.

3. These two cases are, it will be observed, similar and almost the same arguments are adduced in support of each. It is urged that the ruling of the G of I referred to in para 1 supra is based on art: 509 of the C.S.R., but that this article is inapplicable to officers transferred to foreign service, whose cases should apparently be dealt with under Part VII of the Regulations; and that, although under art:838, as it originally stood, an officer in foreign service could not receive a pension until he actually retired from such service, this disability has since been removed by the correction to the above article

158

issued under Finl. dept. No.555, d/ 3rd Feb. 1890.

4. The latter part of art:838 ran originally as follows:--

"And an officer may not get "(pension unless he actually retires from "his employment, or) leave unless he "actually quits duty and proceeds on "leave".

The words within brackets have been eliminated by the correction slip of 1890 and do not appear in the present edition of the Regulations. Both Messrs Kunhi Raman Nair and Krishnaswami Rao contend that this removal of the disability is tantamount to granting permission to retire from British service without prejudice to continuance in Foreign service.

5. It is further represented that the application of art: 509 of the C.S.R. to British officers in foreign service places them in a worse position than their brother officers in British India, since they under the Govt. of India No. 1904 Poll, d/27th April 1895, the latter are at liberty to retire on pension with a view to enter foreign service, as in the case of Messrs. Best and Weir who, after obtaining assurances of employment in the Mysore State, retired from the service of the Govt. of India on the pension due to them and joined the service of that Darbar. The case of Mr. Thumbu Chetti, C.I.E. is

6. Mr. Kunhi Raman Nair points out also that he does not earn, by his foreign service, a British pension on the full salary now drawn by him, but only on the original salary of Rs. 700, on which alone pensionary contribution is levied, and that the increased salary drawn from the Travancore State was sanctioned by the the Govt. of India on the understanding that it gave him no claim to any additional pension from the British Govt. in respect of such increase.

7. The Resident remarks, in re-submitting Mr. Kunhi Raman Nair's case, that from a letter written by the Diwan in August 1895 the Travancore Darbar seems anxious to be relieved of the contribution it is now paying on his behalf since he is no longer earning a pension on the service he renders and that it is for such pension that the Darbar contributes. This remark applies to Mr. Krishnaswami Rao's case as well.

8. The papers have been referred to the Acct. Genl. who points out, with reference to Mr. Krishnaswami Rao's application, that although that officer is serving in a Native State, he is still an officer of the British Govt. and as such, is subject to the same conditions as regards pension as are applicable to other British officers (vide art:838 of the C.S.R.) He cannot therefore, the Acct. Genl. considers, claim the ability has since been removed by the correction to the above article

Received by me from the Madras Records office with the remarks noted

ut to Press.

r signature.

d in print.

No. DATED

No.

marked -

ro C. No.

GOVERNMENT

GOVERNMENT.

TO.

FILED BEING MEANT FOR DESPATCH
ORIGIN

10 Copies

A = Print in full.
B = Not to be printed.
P = Print abstract only.
Q = Print heading only.

NUMBER OF COPIES REQUIRED. { Order complete. / Letter only. / Order complete with Letter. 65

17/11/27 91/

Dept. — orders