

(1) Number of pages. 38
(2) Date of repair 18.9.42
(3) Initials of the Referencer S.

MADRAS RECORD OFFICE.

Government of Madras.

PUBLIC DEPARTMENT.

G.O. No.	154	~~Press~~ Mis.
Dated	9th March	1892.

Not to be folded or roughly handled

27/10/12
10/3

171

ORDINARY, MS.

Public DEPARTMENT.
G.O., DATED 9-3-92
No. 154

12-12-100
5-10-12
9-6-14
8-7-16

15-3-11
14-1-25
18-3-25 II ✓

50-7-27 IV

2-5-12 8th
12-1-15
31-1-15 ✓

When given for copying

[Despatch Abstract.]

Considering that
rules for the
conduct of departmental
inquiries
within the scope of
Act XXXVII of 1850
inadvisable—



My dear Sir,

I have, with

reference to the above, drawn
up a draft of rules for
regulating departmental
insurances - Please
have them printed
with margin & a copy
sent me for correction
before circulating them.

Yours faithfully,
J. H. Gault

15/1/92



OFFICE OF THE GOVERNMENT

July 21st 2

My dear Garton

As requested in favour
of the B.T. Co. I send here with a
half margin copy of the Draft. which
for inquiries into the conduct of public
servants

Yours sincerely
Hedrickhice



My dear friend
I have a
few things struck off &
sent to you before it is
arranged to be
of for - in the
the printed in one kind
of type I think - long is
that is in material.

Henry
H. Faul-

307142



CHIEF SECRETARY
3 FEB 92
GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS

Mr. Mr. Mr.
get no man
proof of the Dept.
copy of the + I have
one letter in my
file
3/2/92 3/2

4.11.19
St. Paul

1812
Rules for the conduct of
Departmental inquiries
not coming within the scope
of Art. XXXVII of 1860.

1. When the head of an office
suspects, or is informed that
one of his subordinates has
been guilty of mis conduct
which, if proved, would
warrant his removal from the
public service, he may,
as a preliminary measure,
make such inquiry as
he deems necessary to
verify his suspicion or
the information he may
have received.

2. If, as a result of such
preliminary inquiry, the head of the
office considers that the
information or information
is sufficiently well founded
to call for formal investiga-
tion, such further inquiry
should be made either of his
own motion or under the
order of the head of the
Dept. to which he belongs
as the circumstances of
the case may require.

3. The inquiry should be
held in the presence of
the accused person, who
should be allowed

inferred from the nature
of the charge or charges.
he is required to answer.

A copy of the charge
should, at the same time,
be given to him in writing
and he should be called
on to state whether he admits
or denies the truth of any
or all of them, his
answers being duly
recorded by the officers
conducting the inquiry.

Of the accused ~~from the~~
the truth of the accusation
the evidence in support
thereof should be heard and
recorded in his presence
and he should be permitted
to put any questions
to the witnesses relevant
to the inquiry, which the
officers holding it may
think fit to allow.

Additional charges
may be framed at any
stage of the inquiry.
Before the accused is
finally called on for
his defence - provided
that a copy of every
new charge should be
given in writing to the
accused as soon as
it has been framed
and his plea thereto should
be at once recorded.

Where and when evidence
considered necessary
to support the charge
or charges ~~in~~ or which

may be available, has been
taken the accused person
should be called on to
make a statement or to
shew any statement or to
give any explanation he
desires, and may call any
further evidence he may
wish to bring in his defence.

6. Each oral statement of the
accused should be carefully
recorded by the officer holding
the inquiry and the king
and on the accused it
should be signed by him in
presence of the coroner -
The fact that it was signed
on behalf of the accused it was
signed by him should be
certified by the officer holding
the inquiry. The statement
should include the replies
of the accused to the questions
relevant to the inquiry, put
to him by the officer holding
the inquiry, it being clearly
understood that a public
account by him is not the
basis of an accusation made
against him. The officer holding
the inquiry should himself
subject to be fully examined
as his accuser, if any, or
any witnesses examined
in the case.

7. When the investigation
is completed the officer holding
the inquiry should report his opinion
thereon to the coroner of the case
himself or upon it to the
coroner of the case.

according to the order given
them may direct the
amount of the
sum to require.

2. In cases in which the
decision of the court
is made as the result of
the inquiry ~~by the officer~~
~~by the officer~~ who held it
a copy of his decision
should be given to the
accused - The decision
shall be set out clearly
the charges preferred & an
abstract of the evidence
in support of them
as taken by the defense
& the evidence in support
of it. When the order
of dismissal is made
by a higher authority on
report of the officer
holding the inquiry
a copy of the order as
well as of the report & the
proceedings -

3. If the accused person
desires he may be
furnished for payment
of the usual copying fees
with copies of the evidence
a document containing
the names of the witnesses
who he has a party &
on which the decision
is based - Should
a copy of any document
submitted to the officer who
held the inquiry be
also briefly his reasons
for such report.

10. A person accused of departmental misconduct is not entitled, as of right, to disclosure of confidential communications or of the source of the information which led to the inquiry affecting him, nor can he claim to be represented at the inquiry by counsel or other legal agency.
11. Wherever it is decided, in cases which may involve the disclosure of a public servant from public service, that an inquiry shall be held, the accused person should, as a rule, be excused from duty pending the result of such inquiry.
12. When the conduct of a public servant is under inquiry, he is prohibited from addressing any petition or statement, bearing on his case to the officer holding the inquiry, or to any of the authorities who may ultimately have to review the proceedings, or any such statement or statement of opinion or to be put in before the person forwarding it.
13. In the event of the death of an officer concerning the conduct of whose subordinate any one of the rules of discipline shall be discussed for the purpose of his removal from duty or for any other purpose...

inefficiency he had. Note
clear the facts, conditions,
by the report, ^{proving the} ~~or~~ ^{expressing}
talking a copy in writing
to the said note concerned
the record any explanation
having been to offer and
examine any bill never
a man into the way
production in his behalf
reading an abstract of
such evidence & the
grounds for his decision
before determining such
abstracts as remaining
in for his app't.
A copy of such decision
shall be provided to the
Attorney General, or
applicant, with out delay

CHIEF SECRETARY
16 JAN 62
GOVERNMENT

Surf 4/2 R
2

This heading has been
transposed & printed
the head of the number
themselves. - 14/2

Rules for the conduct of Departmental Inquiries not coming within the scope of Act XXXVII of 1850.

Dr. 11-1-0.

His Excellency the Governor in Council has had under his consideration the question of issuing more clear and precise instructions to regulate the holding of departmental inquiries into charges of misconduct or incapacity on the part of public officers whose dismissal is vested in the heads of departments or of offices. His Excellency in Council has found that the present procedure, based chiefly on the resolution of the Bombay Government of 16th October 1883, No. 7170, is not sufficiently definite and tends to defeat the ends of justice by delaying inquiry unnecessarily, whereas what is wanted is that these inquiries should be as short and summary as possible consistently with giving the accused fair play. The most objectionable feature in such inquiries, at present, is the liberty and length of time usually given to an accused person to put in a written statement of what he has to say on his behalf, whereas the experience of those most competent to judge in the matter is that such statements are not at all necessary, and that where an accused person is really innocent, his innocence can be established more easily and thoroughly by an oral examination than by a written statement put in by him but written most probably by a petition-writer or vakil. The same remark also applies to the guilt of a person who is guilty, and as the procedure of the Courts of Law in criminal trials makes no provision for any such written statements being put in, but is based on the wholesome principle of bringing accused and accuser face to face and having all the witnesses on either side examined in the presence of both parties, His Excellency in Council sees no reason for not adopting the same principle in the conduct of departmental inquiries, or for permitting the continuance of the present practice any longer. Nor does His Excellency in Council consider that at any such inquiry an accused person

should be permitted to be represented by counsel. The inquiry is purely departmental, that is, it is a private and confidential call by the Government, as the employer, on the accused, as an employé, for a prompt and straightforward explanation of misconduct specifically charged. If the inquiry results in the proof of misconduct so grave as to be criminal, the inquiry may have to be transferred to the Criminal Courts, and then it, of course, becomes public and must be conducted according to law, but until it is so, the matter is one between the Government and its employé, who is bound, as such, to do all in his power to facilitate the inquiry by answering the questions put to him, and who, by any refusal to do so, at once lays himself open to have his guilt suspected if he refuses to plead or to explain his behaviour. Such inquiries are not judicial proceedings and the accused is as much a witness for the purpose of eliciting the truth, as any one else who may be examined. The main object of every such departmental inquiry is to determine whether the public interests will suffer by continuing to be any longer entrusted to the person accused of conduct or malpractices which tend to destroy all confidence in his efficiency or rectitude. In the determination of this point, responsible public officers should not be subjected to artificial restraints not imposed on other employers of labour. His Excellency in Council is therefore pleased to lay down the following rules for the conduct of departmental inquiries in future, in supersession of all existing rules on the subject.

1. When the head of an office suspects, or is informed, that one of his subordinates has been guilty of misconduct which, if proved, would merit dismissal from the public service, he may, as a preliminary measure, make such inquiry as he deems necessary to verify his suspicion or the information he may have received. Such inquiry should be considered confidential.

2. If, as a result of such preliminary inquiry, the head of the office considers that the suspicion or information is sufficiently well-grounded to call for formal investigation, such further inquiry should be made, either of his own motion or under the orders of the head of the department to which he belongs, as the circumstances of the case may require.

*How much of this is to be
kept confidential?*

3. The inquiry should be held in the presence of the accused person, who should be distinctly informed of the nature of the charge or charges he is required to answer. A copy of the charges should, at the same time, be given to him in writing, and he should be called on to state whether he admits or denies the truth of any or all of them, his answer being duly recorded by the officer holding the inquiry. If the accused denies the truth of the accusations, the evidence in support thereof should be heard and recorded in his presence and he should be permitted to put any questions to the witnesses, relevant to the inquiry, which the officer holding it may think fit to allow.

4. It should be clearly understood that a public servant, by denial of the truth of an accusation made against him, challenges full investigation and is himself liable to be as fully examined as his accuser, if any, or as any witness examined in the case. Consequently, the officer holding the inquiry may at any time put any questions he thinks fit, which are relevant to the inquiry, to the accused, who is bound to answer them. All the answers should be fully and carefully recorded as well as any question which the accused wishes to have put on record, or which the officer holding the inquiry may think fit to record. Refusal by the accused to answer any question put to him will amount to contumacy for which he will render himself liable to punishment quite irrespective of the result of the inquiry.

5. Additional charges may be framed at any stage of the inquiry before the accused is finally called on for his defence, provided that a copy of every new charge should be given in writing to the accused as soon as it has been framed and his plea thereto should be at once recorded.

6. When all the evidence considered necessary to support the charge or charges, or which may be available, has been taken, the accused person should be called on to make orally and on his own behalf any statement, or to give any explanation, he desires and may call any further evidence he may wish to be heard in his defence.

7. Such oral statement of the accused should be carefully recorded by the officer holding the inquiry, and after being read over to the accused it should be signed by him in proof of its correctness. The fact that it was so read over to him, and that it

was signed by him, should be certified by the officer holding the inquiry. The statement should include the replies of the accused to all questions put to him by the officer holding the inquiry in the course of recording his defence or explanation.

* 8. When the investigation is considered completed, the officer holding it shall record his opinion thereon and dispose of the case himself or refer it for the orders of higher authority, according as the orders given to him may direct or the circumstances of the case seem to require:

9. In cases in which dismissal of the accused is ordered as the result of the inquiry by the officer who held it, a copy of his decision should be given to the accused. The decision should set out clearly the charges preferred and an abstract of the evidence in support of them, as well as of the defence and the evidence in support of it. When the order of dismissal is passed by a higher authority on the report of the officer holding the inquiry, a copy of the order as well as of the report should be given.

10. If the accused person so desires, he may be furnished (on payment of the usual copying fees) with copies of the evidence or documents recorded in the course of the inquiry to which he was a party and on which the decision is based. Should a copy of any document be refused, the officer who held the inquiry should state briefly his reasons for such refusal.

11. A person accused of departmental misconduct is not entitled, as of right, to a disclosure of confidential communications or of the source of the information which led to the inquiry affecting him, nor can he claim to be represented at the inquiry by counsel or other legal agency.

12. Whenever it is decided, in cases which may involve the dismissal of a public servant from the public service for misconduct, that a formal inquiry shall be held, the accused person should, as a rule, be suspended from duty pending the result of such inquiry.

13. When the conduct of a public servant is under inquiry, he is prohibited from addressing any petition or statement bearing on his case to the officer holding the inquiry, or to any of the authorities who may ultimately have to review the proceedings. Any such petition or statement if received should forthwith be returned to the person forwarding it.

14. In the event of the head of an office considering that any of his subordinates should be dismissed from the service for neglect of duty, or removed from his appointment for inefficiency, he should state clearly the facts constituting the neglect or proving the inefficiency, and, after giving a copy in writing to the subordinate concerned, and after calling on him to show cause why he should not be dismissed or removed, should record any explanation he may have to offer and examine any witnesses or documents he may produce on his behalf, recording an abstract of such evidence and the grounds for his decision before dismissing such subordinate or removing him from his appointment. A copy of such decision should be furnished to the subordinate concerned, on application, without delay.

10/2/92 *LHF*

From

Dated

189 .

FOR ORDERS.

The rules drawn up by my ^{late} colleagues
deserve some consideration in force mainly
on the following points.

- (1) The requirement that the accused person
shall ~~be~~ give his defence in ~~an oral~~
statement to be recorded by the Enquiry
Officer, first in writing.
- (2) The prohibition of the assistance of
a solicitor or counsel.
- (3) Provision for removal of the accused
to another station.
- (4) Provision that in every case where
a formal enquiry is undertaken, the
accused person shall be suspended.
- (5) Provision for suspension of the accused
from duty in cases of institution.
- (6) ~~Provision for~~ ^{Provision for} the Enquiry
Officer to be empowered to be furnished to the
accused.

On the first point the rules seem to me to be
ultra vires. The rule of the part of the
rule that the accused shall give his defence
in writing or submit to writing and we are bound to give
the station. The "writing" seems to be a
to be in a written statement which he
continues; and I am not aware that
delay or length of time allowed for the
statement have been such as to cause
inconvenience or to be a remedy. If a written
statement is allowed we cannot require
however by whom it is prepared. I cannot
be bound to admit that an oral statement
is better. In the case of an accused person
it is often a ~~disadvantage~~ ^{inconvenience} to be

circulated & this is accorded
with the instructions of the Honble
Mr. Justice.

15th

So it seems to me. The new on his defence is given
the option most distinctly by the orders of India
of 1879.

Surely the officer holding an enquiry can put some
reasonable limit, and warn the defendant that
if he does not put in his defence by a stated time,
the enquiry will go on without it.

W.

to make an oral defence of hand?

(2) On the same point I don't think we can safely prohibit legal assistance. No doubt it is sometimes more of an impediment than an aid to enquiry but in some cases it may be as valuable as it is in courts of justice. The rules in the Bombay Res. as to the admissibility of evidence in departmental enquiries which we have adopted are sufficient to prevent enquiry being defeated by technicalities.

(3) I don't recall any case of Contumacy such as the proposed order is directed to prevent. If an accused refuses to answer, the point already goes to his prejudice, & this is enough.

(4) I think that it is inexpedient to say that in a rule the accused shall be suspended. There are often enquiries in which the accused would be prejudiced by suspension & I think it is better to leave, as now, discretion as to suspension to the superior authority.

(5) On the 5th point the order of Justice of the Court requires that charges of neglect of duty or inefficiency shall be treated in the same way as other charges of delinquency.

(6) The report of a subordinate officer to the superior empowered to discuss is often of a confidential character. It is not part of the judgment or evidence in the case. So far as it deals with the evidence the substance of it is adopted in the judgment. I don't think it is advisable to rule that it shall always be furnished to the accused.

The subject is in the whole a rather delicate one. In my opinion, if an appeal is made to the superior authority, it is not expedient to discuss the merits of the case. I am afraid my language in this draft order will be open to misconstruction.

I think this must be left to the Enquiring Officer.

No - but what power has the Enquiring Officer to commit for contempt of court? he cannot introduce a new Star Chamber.

N. S. C.
I think the present discretionary powers are best. There may well be occasions when it would be extremely inconvenient to be obliged to suspend.

W.

6. I presume this really means a copy of the judgment, i.e. the official report of the officer holding the enquiry. Of course the accused has a right to see this. But I do not see why he should be furnished with a copy of the confidential report - or previous reports furnished by the Enquiring subordinate officer to his superior.

On the whole, I do not think it would be advisable to issue any amended orders. I am much obliged to the hon. Mr. Justice for the trouble he has taken in the matter. But I have to come to the conclusion that we cannot

C. 15 / 2 Over-ride the rules laid down by India, and it appears to me that the Enquiring Officer under existing rules (para 6 - Bombay Resolutions 16 Dec. '05) has plenty of latitude given to him in personal examination of the accused.

19 Feb

DRAFT G.O.

His Excellency the Governor in Council has had under his consideration the question of issuing more clear and precise instructions to regulate the holding of departmental inquiries into charges of misconduct or incapacity on the part of public officers whose dismissal is vested in the heads of departments or of offices. His Excellency in Council has found that the present procedure, based chiefly on the resolution of the Bombay Government of 16th October 1883, No. 7170, is not sufficiently definite and tends to defeat the ends of justice by delaying inquiry unnecessarily, whereas what is wanted is that these inquiries should be as short and summary as possible consistently with giving the accused fair play. The most objectionable feature in such inquiries, at present, is the liberty and length of time usually given to an accused person to put in a written statement of what he has to say on his behalf, [whereas the experience of those most competent to judge in the matter is that such statements are not at all necessary, and that where an accused person is really innocent, his innocence can be established more easily and thoroughly by an oral examination than by a written statement put in by him but written most probably by a petition-writer or vakil. The same remark also applies to the guilt of a person who is guilty, and as the procedure of the Courts of Law in criminal trials makes no provision for any such written statements being put in, but is based on the wholesome principle of bringing accused and accuser face to face and having all the witnesses on either side examined in the presence of both parties, His Excellency in Council sees no reason for not adopting the same principle in the conduct of departmental inquiries, or for permitting the continuance of the present practice any longer. Nor does His Excellency in Council consider that at any such inquiry an accused person should be permitted to be represented by counsel. The inquiry is purely departmental, that is, it is a private and confidential call by the Government, as the

del - "liberty and".

employer, on the accused, as an employé, for a prompt and straightforward explanation of misconduct specifically charged. If the inquiry results in the proof of misconduct so grave as to be criminal, the inquiry may have to be transferred to the Criminal Courts, and then it, of course, becomes public and must be conducted according to law, but until it is so, the matter is one between the Government and its employé, who is bound, as such, to do all in his power to facilitate the inquiry by answering the questions put to him, and who, by any refusal to do so, at once lays himself open to have his guilt suspected if he refuses to plead or to explain his behaviour. Such inquiries are not judicial proceedings and the accused is as much a witness for the purpose of eliciting the truth, as any one else who may be examined. The main object of every such departmental inquiry is to determine whether the public interests will suffer by continuing to be any longer entrusted to the person accused of conduct or malpractices which tend to destroy all confidence in his efficiency or rectitude. In the determination of this point, responsible public officers should not be subjected to artificial restraints not imposed on other employers of labour.] His Excellency in Council is therefore pleased to lay down the following rules for the conduct of departmental inquiries in future, in supersession of all existing rules on the subject.

(Initials) f. d. 4.

10/2/92

*Supl. of the Secretariat
to Heads of Dept.*

97
APPENDIX.

Rules for the conduct of Departmental Inquiries not coming within the scope of Act XXXVII of 1850.

1. When the head of an office suspects, or is informed, that one of his subordinates has been guilty of misconduct which, if proved, would merit dismissal from the public service, he may, as a preliminary measure, make such inquiry as he deems necessary to verify his suspicion or the information he may have received. Such inquiry should be considered confidential.

2. If, as a result of such preliminary inquiry, the head of the office considers that the suspicion or information is sufficiently well-grounded to call for formal investigation, such further inquiry should be made, either of his own motion or under the orders of the head of the department to which he belongs, as the circumstances of the case may require.

3. The inquiry should be held in the presence of the accused person, who should be distinctly informed of the nature of the charge or charges he is required to answer. A copy of the charges should, at the same time, be given to him in writing, and he should be called on to state whether he admits or denies the truth of any or all of them, his answer being duly recorded by the officer holding the inquiry. If the accused denies the truth of the accusations, the evidence in support thereof should be heard and recorded in his presence and he should be permitted to put any questions to the witnesses, relevant to the inquiry, which the officer holding it may think fit to allow.

4. It should be clearly understood that a public servant, by denial of the truth of an accusation made against him, challenges full investigation and is himself liable to be as fully examined as his accuser, if any, or as any witness examined in the case. Consequently, the officer holding the inquiry may at any time put any questions he thinks fit, which are relevant

to the inquiry, to the accused, who is bound to answer them. All the answers should be fully and carefully recorded as well as any question which the accused wishes to have put on record, or which the officer holding the inquiry may think fit to record. Refusal by the accused to answer any question put to him will amount to contumacy for which he will render himself liable to punishment quite irrespective of the result of the inquiry.

5. Additional charges may be framed at any stage of the inquiry before the accused is finally called on for his defence, provided that a copy of every new charge should be given in writing to the accused as soon as it has been framed and his plea thereto should be at once recorded.

6. When all the evidence considered necessary to support the charge or charges, or which may be available, has been taken, the accused person should be called on to make orally and on his own behalf any statement, or to give any explanation, he desires and may call any further evidence he may wish to be heard in his defence.

7. Such oral statement of the accused should be carefully recorded by the officer holding the inquiry, and after being read over to the accused it should be signed by him in proof of its correctness. The fact that it was so read over to him, and that it was signed by him, should be certified by the officer holding the inquiry. The statement should include the replies of the accused to all questions put to him by the officer holding the inquiry in the course of recording his defence or explanation.

8. When the investigation is considered completed, the officer holding it shall record his opinion thereon and dispose of the case himself or refer it for the orders of higher authority, according as the orders given to him may direct or the circumstances of the case seem to require.

9. In cases in which dismissal of the accused is ordered as the result of the inquiry by the officer who held it, a copy of his decision should be given to the accused. The decision should set out clearly the charges preferred and an abstract of the evidence in support of them, as well as of the defence and the evidence in support of it. When the order of dismissal is passed by a higher authority on the report of the officer holding the inquiry, a copy of the order as well as of the report should be given.

Who is to pass sentence?
under what Act?

I presume this is the official
Report? There is? be no
objection to this. W.

10. If the accused person so desires, he may be furnished (on payment of the usual copying fees) with copies of the evidence or documents recorded in the course of the inquiry to which he was a party and on which the decision is based. Should a copy of any document be refused, the officer who held the inquiry should state briefly his reasons for such refusal.

11. A person accused of departmental misconduct is not entitled, as of right, to a disclosure of confidential communications or of the source of the information which led to the inquiry affecting him, nor can he claim to be represented at the inquiry by counsel or other legal agency.

12. Whenever it is decided, in cases which may involve the dismissal of a public servant from the public service for misconduct, that a formal inquiry shall be held, the accused person should, as a rule, be suspended from duty pending the result of such inquiry.

13. When the conduct of a public servant is under inquiry, he is prohibited from addressing any petition or statement bearing on his case to the officer holding the inquiry, or to any of the authorities who may ultimately have to review the proceedings. Any such petition or statement if received should forthwith be returned to the person forwarding it.

14. In the event of the head of an office considering that any of his subordinates should be dismissed from the service for neglect of duty, or removed from his appointment for inefficiency, he should state clearly the facts constituting the neglect or proving the inefficiency, and, after giving a copy in writing to the subordinate concerned, and after calling on him to show cause why he should not be dismissed or removed, should record any explanation he may have to offer and examine any witnesses or documents he may produce on his behalf, recording an abstract of such evidence and the grounds for his decision before dismissing such subordinate or removing him from his appointment. A copy of such decision should be furnished to the subordinate concerned, on application, without delay.

10-2-92.

J. H. G.

Reader for the conduct
of the ~~unpublished~~ ~~unpublished~~
Principles. ~~the~~

Now the ~~unpublished~~ ~~unpublished~~
the ~~unpublished~~ ~~unpublished~~
the ~~unpublished~~ ~~unpublished~~

13/2

PROCEEDINGS OF THE MADRAS GOVERNMENT.

Read ~~petition from S. A. Arupam~~

Lt. Col. Vernacular Record Keeper Collector's office
Tanjore dated 13 July 1891 praying for copies of
certain records.

Order thereon: 27 August 1891 No. 4623

The Petition and its enclosures will
be forwarded to the Collector of Tanjore
who is directed to state his reasons for
refusing to grant to the petitioner copies
of the papers mentioned. It is observed
that under para 6 of B. S. O No. 226 the
Collector is required to record his reasons
in the order respecting an application for
copies of documents: this was not done in
the present instance.

2. The rules regarding the procedure
to be adopted in the dismissal of public
servants are contained in the
marginally noted orders. His Excellency
the Governor in Council is of opinion
that it would be advisable to lay down
a more simple procedure to govern
all departmental enquiries, in place
of the present rules which are somewhat
complicated and of which some of the
provisions appear to be unnecessary.

G.O. 14018/15 Sep: 79
Pub.

(2) .. 22907/3 Dec 83
Pub.

(3) G.O. 13734/23 Sep: 87
Pub.

(4) .. 47507/11 Aug 88
Pub.

(5) .. 47507/11 Aug 88
Pub.

The papers will accordingly be transferred
to the Public Department in view to the
formulation of new rules.

1 True Extract

Chatterjee
Secretary to Govt.

para 1 to

The Coler of Tanjore

The Public Dept. with

note for orders in arigh. S

Govt. of {1891} Madras.
REVENUE.

To

The Public Department

Dated

Recd. 3/8

Encl.

Mis. G.O., 2 August 1891, No. 4623.



Addressing the Public
Department in view
to the formation of
rules re: the procedure
to be adopted in
dismissing public
servants.

Hon. Mr. Barstow C.S.

Submitted to the Hon.
Member with reference
to the concluding cer-
tificate of his note of the
3rd August.

J.B.

4/9

Hon. Mr. Stokes C.S.

Order 9 March 1891

P

Recorded, with

the remark that, on
^{further} consideration, the
Govt is of opinion that
the formulation of new
rules on the subject is
inadvisable.

/From orders/

J.B.

29/2.

To The Revenue Dept.
with view for orders re

SIATOL
IN M.S

DER

12-4/3
R. 9/3

BACK PAPER, No.

18

FURTHER PAPER, No.

OF 18

READ AGAIN ORDER OF GOVERNMENT, DATED
18 , No. , MISCELLANEOUS.

ENCLOSURES.

CURRENT No.

STATEMENT WITH DITTO.

ORDER OF GOVERNMENT.

LETTER OF GOVERNMENT.

STATEMENT WITH DITTO.

PAPERS NOT FILED UP, BRING MOUNT FOR DISPATCH
IN ORIGINAL (not-paged).

N.B.—

A = Copy in full.
B = Not to be copied.
P = Copy abstract only.
Q = Copy heading only.

clerk 11/3/92

A A

Sent 11/3/92