

Public App

Cuo. 3405.

Order 15 Dec 1894 N^o 956

Recorded with the
remark that no further action
is required.

(From orders)

CB.
12. 11

ag. to despo
19/12/94

copy (the Road of Rm. (3 A) a copy

Rec'd
19/12/94

[$\frac{G}{11}$]

3,000-25-9-94

ORDINARY, MS.

Pub DEPARTMENT.	
G.O., DATED	15 Dec 1894
No.	956

INDEXED.

STAMP

When given for copying. 13/12

[Despatch Abstract.]

Recording the acc. Genl's
reply to the enquiry whether
Mr. Kinnock may be
considered to have held
the permanent appoint-
ment of D2 Commr of
Salt and Abkari. Res am
from the 30th March
to the 30th July 1894,
with the remark R that
no further action is
required in the matter

RECORDED

BACK PAPER, No.

OF 189

FURTHER PAPER, No.

OF 189

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

ENCLOSURES.

CURRENT No.

STATEMENT WITH DITTO.

ORDER OF GOVERNMENT.

A A

LETTER OF GOVERNMENT.

STATEMENT WITH DITTO.

PER: NOT FILED UP, BEING MEANT FOR DESPATCH
IN ORIGINAL (not paged)

N.B.—

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

Government {1894} of Madras. PUBLIC.

MISCELLANEOUS.

FOR RECORD ONLY.

Recd.

Regd.

} 1894.

Enclosures

Spare copies

G.O., Mis. No. 956, 15th December 1894.

NP

DECEMBER.

Article 242 of the Civil Service Regulations.

Recording papers connected with the interpretation of —.

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS.

PUBLIC DEPARTMENT.

I

Read—the following paper :—

From T. W. RAWLINS, Esq., Accountant-General, to the Chief Secretary to Government, dated Madras, 20th March 1894, No. 835.

With reference to the notifications by Government, Nos. 118 and 119, published on page 277 of the *Fort St. George Gazette*, dated 13th March 1894, appointing Mr. W. O. Horne to be Head Assistant to the Collector and Magistrate of South Canara and Mr. D. D. Murdoch to be Deputy Commissioner of Salt, Abkari and Separate Revenue, Southern division, I have the honour respectfully to invite the attention of the Madras Government to article 242 of the Civil Service Regulations in accordance with which a local Government may not fill up substantively an appointment in which an officer has a lien without transferring him to another substantive appointment of not less pay. The pay of Mr. Horne's substantive appointment as Deputy Commissioner being Rs. 1,200—40—1,400, and that of the new appointment to which the notification under reference transfers him being only Rs. 768—5—4, the notification is opposed to that article and requires the sanction of the Government of India.

2. The ruling in paragraph 3 of the letter from the Government of India, Financial Department, No. 1765-Ex., dated the 26th April 1893, only covers the case of substantive Secretaries to the Board of Revenue.

Order—R. No. 383A, Public, dated 14th April 1894.

The appointments of Messrs. Horne and Murdoch, notified in Nos. 118 and 119 of the Gazette of the 13th March 1894, will have effect from the 30th idem and not from the 31st as previously notified.

(True Extract.)

J. F. PRICE,
Chief Secretary.

To the Accountant-General.
Gazette.

II

Read—the following paper :—

From T. W. RAWLINS, Esq., Accountant-General, to the Chief Secretary to Government, dated Madras, 26th April 1894, No. 1202.

With reference to G.O., No. 383A, dated the 14th of April 1894, and in continuation of this office letter No. 835, dated 20th March 1894, I venture to submit that the alteration of the dates in the appointments of Messrs. Horne and Murdoch does

not affect the objection pointed out. It is true that article 242 occurs in part III of the Civil Service Regulations regarding leave rules, but it appears to me that the words "except on the ground of the officer's misbehaviour or inefficiency, a local Government may not fill up substantively an appointment on which an officer has a lien without transferring the officer to another substantive appointment of not less pay" are intended to be of much wider application and must at any rate be applied in a case where the transfer is made with effect from the day before and therefore obviously in view of an officer's leave, and as the pay of Mr. Horne's appointment as Deputy Commissioner was Rs. 1,200—40—1,400 per mensem while that of a Head Assistant Collector is only Rs. 768—5—4 per mensem, I must respectfully request that, unless the transfer be made on the ground of Mr. Horne's misbehaviour or inefficiency, Government will be pleased to refer its appointment to Government of India for confirmation.

Order—No. 336, Public, dated 18th May 1894.

The Government of India will be addressed.

(True Extract.)

J. F. PRICE,
Chief Secretary.

To the Accountant-General.

Letter—No. 337, Public, dated 18th May 1894, to the Secretary to the Government of India, Finance and Commerce Department.

Mr. W. O. Horne, I.C.S., who held the permanent appointment of Deputy Commissioner of Salt and Abkari Revenue (pay Rs. 1,200—40—1,400) and was acting as Secretary to the Commissioner (pay Rs. 1,500—60—1,800), was granted nineteen months' furlough from the 31st March last. In view of the facts that his contemporaries in the service hold the permanent appointment of Head Assistant (pay Rs. 768—5—4), that he is certain not to return to the Salt department on the expiry of his leave, and that if he held the permanent appointment of Deputy Commissioner when he proceeded on furlough it would be impossible for this Government, under the restrictions laid down in article 242 of the Civil Service Regulations, to confirm the officer acting in that appointment without transferring Mr. Horne to a substantive appointment of not less pay, His Excellency the Governor in Council appointed, with effect from the day before Mr. Horne proceeded on leave, Mr. Murdoch, the officer selected to fill the Acting Secretaryship, to the Deputy Commissioner of Salt and Abkari Revenue, transferring Mr. Horne at the same time to the substantive Head Assistantship held by Mr. Murdoch. The permanent appointment of Secretary to the Commissioner is at present held by Mr. H. Bradley who is acting as a Collector and as he will, in ordinary course, be confirmed on the next vacancy, it would be possible under the above arrangement to confirm at no distant date in their special appointments both Mr. Murdoch and the officer acting as Deputy Commissioner.

2. The Accountant-General has, in this connection, invited the attention of this Government to article 242 of the Civil Service Regulations, which states that "except on the ground of the officer's misbehaviour or inefficiency, a local Government may not fill up substantively an appointment on which an officer has a lien without transferring the officer to another substantive appointment of not less pay". The pay of Mr. Horne's substantive appointment as Deputy Commissioner being Rs. 1,200—40—1,400 and that of the new appointment to which he has been transferred being only Rs. 768—5—4, the appointments in question are, the Accountant-General considers, opposed to that article and require the sanction of the Government of India. It is true, he observes, that article 242 occurs in part III of the Civil Service Regulations regarding leave rules, but it appears to him that the words quoted above are intended to be of much wider application and must at any rate be applied in a case where the transfer is made with effect from the day before, and therefore obviously in view of, an officer's leave.

Pushed to its logical conclusion, the Accountant-General's argument amounts to this: that under no circumstances can a local Government transfer an officer from one substantive appointment to another on less pay, unless on the sole ground of the officer's misbehaviour or inefficiency. His Excellency the Governor in Council is unable to believe that a rule thus limiting the powers of local Governments, and so general in its effect, could have been intended by the insertion of article 242 in the portion of the Civil Service Regulations, which deals with the "general conditions of leave".

3. His Excellency the Governor in Council is, moreover, of opinion that article 242 of the Civil Service Regulations governs the case of an officer who is *on leave* and that the Accountant-General's reading of lines 3 to 5 of that article independently of the first two lines is incorrect. This view appears to be supported by the use of the word *lien* in the article in question. I am further to observe that Mr. Horne's furlough allowances will, with reference to sections 18 (a) and 346 of the Civil Service Regulations, be in no way affected, that the appointment of Deputy Commissioner of Salt Revenue is a special one for which special selection is made in view to training an officer for the Secretaryship, and that it would be distinctly hard on the officer acting as Deputy Commissioner that he should have no chance of being confirmed in his appointment during the absence on furlough of an officer who is, as stated above, certain not to return on the expiry of his leave to the Salt department.

4. Under the above circumstances, I am to request the sanction of the Government of India to the appointments of Messrs. Horne and Murdoch to which the Accountant-General has taken objection and at the same time to ask for a ruling as to whether article 242 of the Civil Service Regulations is of general application.

J. F. PRICE,
Chief Secretary.

III

Read—the following paper:—

From R. A. GAMBLE, Esq., Officiating Under Secretary to the Government of India, Finance and Commerce Department, to the Chief Secretary to the Government of Madras, dated Simla, 3rd July 1894, No. 3302 P.

With reference to your letter No. 337 (Public), dated 18th May 1894, regarding the application of article 242 of the Civil Service Regulations in the case of Mr. W. O. Horne, I.C.S., who held the permanent appointment of Deputy Commissioner of Salt and Abkari Revenue prior to his proceeding on furlough in March last, I am directed to request that, with the permission of His Excellency the Governor, the Government of India may be informed why it is regarded as certain that Mr. Horne will not return to the Salt department on the expiry of his leave.

2. I am also to request that a copy of the report or reports of the Accountant-General on the subject may be forwarded for the information of the Government of India.

Order—No. 521, Public, dated 17th July 1894.

The following letter will be despatched.

(True Extract.)

J. F. PRICE,
Chief Secretary.

Letter—No. 522, Public, dated 17th July 1894, to the Secretary to the Government of India, Finance and Commerce Department.

In reply to Mr. Gamble's letter of the 3rd instant, No. 3302 P., I am directed to state that Mr. Horne's position in the Civil List renders it certain that he will not return to the Salt department on the expiry of his leave.

2. He cannot hope on his return to oust the officer at present acting as Secretary to the Commissioner of Salt and Abkari Revenue who, as pointed out in paragraph 1 of my letter No. 337 of the 18th May 1894, will probably have been confirmed by them. One of the officers below Mr. Horne has for some time past been acting as a Collector and another has recently been appointed to act as a District Judge. The number of officers likely to be acting in these posts on the 30th October 1895, when his leave expires, makes it certain that his standing will then entitle him to an appointment of like nature. From his position in the list, he may reasonably expect to be promoted to a permanent Sub-Collectorate before the end of 1895. The salary of a head assistant acting as a second-grade Collector or Judge (exclusive of tentage in the former office) is Rs. 1,456-1-9 *per mensem* and as a first-grade Collector or Judge, Rs. 1,811-10-8, that of a Sub-Collector officiating in these offices being Rs. 1,588-14-3 and Rs. 1,944-7-1, respectively. Mr. Horne would therefore lose pecuniarily if he resumed his permanent appointment of Deputy Commissioner in the Salt department.

3. As requested in paragraph 2 of your letter under reply, copies of the reports * of the Accountant-General on the subject are enclosed. Copy of the order † passed by this Government on the first of these also accompanies.

* No. 835, dated 20th March 1894.

No. 1202, dated 26th April 1894.

† R. No. 383A, dated 14th April 1894.

J. F. PRICE,
Chief Secretary.

IV

Read—the following paper:—

From H. J. McINTOSH, Esq., Officiating Under Secretary to the Government of India, Finance and Commerce Department (Leave and Leave Allowances), to the Chief Secretary to the Government of Madras, dated Simla, the 10th September 1894, No. 4536-P.

With reference to the correspondence ending with your letter No. 522, dated 17th July 1894, I am directed to convey the following remarks and orders in regard to the arrangements made by the Government of Madras during the absence on furlough of Mr. W. O. Horne, late Deputy Commissioner of Salt and Abkari Revenue.

2. Mr. Horne, who held the permanent appointment of Deputy Commissioner of Salt and Abkari Revenue (pay Rs. 1,200—1,400), was granted furlough from the 31st March last. In view of the facts that his contemporaries in the service held permanent appointments as Head Assistant, that he was certain not to return to the Salt department on the expiry of his leave, and that if he held the permanent appointment of Deputy Commissioner when he proceeded on furlough it would be impossible for the Government of Madras, under the restrictions laid down in article 242 of the Civil Service Regulations, to confirm the officer acting in that appointment without transferring Mr. Horne to a substantive appointment of not less pay, the Government of Madras appointed, with effect from the day before Mr. Horne proceeded on leave, Mr. Murdoch to be Deputy Commissioner of Salt and Abkari Revenue, transferring Mr. Horne, at the same time, to the substantive Head Assistantship held by Mr. Murdoch, the pay of which is Rs. 768-5-4 a month.

3. I am to point out that the arrangement made by the Government of Madras is contrary to the intention of the rule in article 242 of the Civil Service Regulations. That rule is based on the orders of Her Majesty's Secretary of State for India who, I

am to explain, conceded the existing rates of furlough allowances on the specific ground that they would be (wholly or approximately) met by the savings which would accrue by filling up, by acting arrangements only, the appointments vacated by the officers proceeding on leave. It is obvious that Government fails to secure the saving which results from paying acting allowance, if the absent officer is transferred to an office on less pay the day before he takes leave. Thus, in the case of Mr. Horne, the payment to the officer appointed in his place as Deputy Commissioner in the Salt department of the substantive pay of that appointment, instead of the salary admissible under rule, deprives Government of the saving which might otherwise accrue and which might be taken as a set off against the cost of Mr. Horne's leave allowances.

4. In these circumstances, I am to say that the Governor-General in Council regrets that he is unable to sanction Mr. Murdoch's permanent appointment to the post of Deputy Commissioner of Salt and Abkari Revenue during Mr. Horne's absence on furlough, and I am to request that, if possible, the arrangement may be reversed, that is, that Mr. Murdoch may be appointed to officiate in the appointment and not hold it substantively. I am, however, to add that the arrangement need not be revised with retrospective effect.

Memorandum No. 1945, Public, dated 26th September 1894.

The Government of India intimates that the arrangement under which Mr. Horne was appointed to be Head Assistant of South Canara and Mr. Murdoch to be Deputy Commissioner of Salt Revenue from the 30th March 1894 need not be revised with retrospective effect. Mr. Murdoch has been appointed permanent Secretary to the Commissioner of Salt, Abkari and Separate Revenue with effect from the 31st July 1894. On the analogy of section 292 of the Civil Service Regulations, it would appear permissible for this Government to rule that his appointment as permanent Deputy Commissioner should be considered to have extended to the 10th September 1894. But as he was confirmed as Secretary on the 31st July, the arrangement need not be continued beyond that date. The Accountant-General is requested to report whether, under the circumstances, there is any objection to Mr. Murdoch being considered to have held the permanent appointment of Deputy Commissioner from the 30th March to the 30th July 1894 inclusive.

J. F. PRICE,
Chief Secretary.

To the Accountant-General.

From R. MORRIS, Esq., Officiating Accountant-General, to the Chief Secretary to Government, dated Fort St. George, 6th October 1894, No. 3059.

With reference to your memorandum No. 1945, Public, dated the 26th of September 1894, I have the honour to report that I have made a reference to the Government of India as to whether Mr. Murdoch may be allowed pay in arrears as Deputy Commissioner of Salt and Abkari Revenue up to 30th July, and that the result will be communicated to you on receipt of its orders.

Order—No. 818, Public, dated 31st October 1894.

Recorded.

(True Extract.)

J. F. PRICE,
Chief Secretary.

To the Board of Revenue (Separate Revenue).

V

READ—the following paper :—

From T. W. RAWLINS, Esq., Accountant-General, to the Chief Secretary to Government, dated Fort St. George, 21st November 1894, No. 3531.

In reply to your memorandum No. 1945, Public, dated the 26th September 1894, enquiring whether there was any objection to Mr. Murdoch being considered to have held the permanent appointment of Deputy Commissioner of Salt and Abkari from the 30th of March to the 30th of July 1894, I have the honour to state that, although the Government of India declined to sanction Mr. Murdoch's permanent appointment to the post and requested that, if possible, he might be appointed to officiate in it instead, it proceeded to add that the arrangement need not be revised with retrospective effect. In ordinary circumstances, therefore, there could have been no objection to his being considered to have held the permanent appointment to the 30th of July—a date long anterior to that of the Government of India's letter. But the circumstances are not altogether ordinary. It may, I think, be assumed that in deciding to forego the retrospective revision of the arrangement made, the Government of India was under the impression that Mr. Murdoch had been drawing the full pay of the appointment and really meant that he should not be called upon to refund the difference between that and the acting salary. But, as a matter of fact, as Mr. Murdoch's appointment to the substantive post was held to be opposed to article 242 of the Civil Service Regulations, he has all along been regarded by the audit office as holding the permanent appointment of Head Assistant Collector and has been restricted to the salary to which he would have been entitled on that basis. From a pecuniary point of view, therefore, it would be a revision of the arrangement to consider Mr. Murdoch to have held the permanent appointment of Deputy Commissioner, and if the Government of India meant that the pecuniary arrangements should not be revised, he should continue to be regarded as having substantively held the appointment of Head Assistant.

2. In explanation of the delay that has occurred in answering this reference, I would state that Mr. Morris, then Acting Accountant-General, referred the question to the Government of India informing it that Mr. Murdoch had been restricted to the acting salary, and enquiring whether it was intended that he should now be allowed to draw the difference between that and the substantive pay in arrears. The Government of India being apparently unaware that the question had been referred on a reference made by the Madras Government itself, directed that the orders of that Government should be awaited, and if any doubt was felt as to their propriety, the matter should then be referred through it.

ORDER—Mis. No. 956, Public, dated 15th December 1894.

Recorded with the remark that no further action is required.

(True Extract.)

J. F. PRICE,
Chief Secretary.

To the Accountant-General.

Copy to the Board of Revenue (Separate Revenue).

NOTES CONNECTED WITH G.O., No. 956, PUBLIC, DATED
15TH DECEMBER 1894.

I.

NOTES CONNECTED WITH G.O., R. No. 383-A, PUBLIC, DATED 14TH APRIL 1894

[page 1 of the collection.]

From the Accountant-General, No. 835, dated 20th March 1894.

The following draft order is submitted for approval:—

The attention of the Accountant-General will be drawn to the fact that article 242 of the Civil Service Regulations governs the case of an officer *on leave*. The heading of chapter XI, in which this article occurs, is "General conditions of leave", and section III, like the sections that precede and follow it, relates entirely to leave. The Accountant-General's reading of lines 3 to 5 of article 242, independently of the first two lines, does not, moreover, appear to be correct.

C. M. SCHMIDT—28-3-94.

H.E. the Governor—

The Hon'ble Mr. Bliss, C.I.E.—

There cannot, it is submitted, be any doubt that the article quoted refers to officers on leave and on leave alone.

J. F. PRICE—2-4-94.

I think this is, properly speaking, the Hon'ble Mr. Bliss' special department. I do not follow the Chief Secretary, as from the date of the gazetted appointment of Mr. Horne to Head Assistant, South Canara, viz., 31st March, it certainly looks as if the Accountant-General were correct, as Mr. Horne went on leave *on 30th March*, and therefore the transfer took place when that officer was on leave.

W[ENLOCK]—4-4-94.

Order in Council.

The appointments of Messrs. Horne, and Murdoch, notified in Nos. 118 and 119 of the Gazette of the 13th March 1894, will have effect from the 30th *idem* and not from the 31st as previously notified.

J.F.P.

[G.O., R. No. 383-A., Public, dated 14th April 1894.]

II.

G.O., Nos. 336, 337, PUBLIC, DATED 18TH MAY 1894

[pages 1 to 4 of the collection.]

[No notes.]

III.

NOTES CONNECTED WITH G.O., Nos. 521, 522, PUBLIC, DATED 17TH JULY 1894
[pages 4 and 5 of the collection.]

From the Government of India, Finance and Commerce department, No. 3302-P., dated 3rd July 1894.

For the Chief Secretary—

The following officers are between Mr. Horne and a permanent Sub-Collector:—

Mr. H. A. Sim (58).
Mr. H. Moberly (69).
Mr. B. Macleod (71).
Mr. J. Hewetson (72).

Mr. M. D. Bell (77).
Mr. Manavedan Raja.
Mr. Foster (78).
Mr. Murdoch (79).

There is a vacancy (District Judge, Nellore) unfilled at present. This leaves 7. Taking $4\frac{1}{2}$ as rate of vacancies, Mr. Horne should get a Sub-Collectorship before his return from leave.

Draft letter to the Government of India is submitted for approval.

C. M. SCHMIDT—10-7-94.

H.M. and circ.—

J. F. PRICE—11-7-94.

[Draft passed.]

H. W. B[LISS]—12-7-94.

J. G[ROSE]—13-7-94.

W[ENLOCK]—16-7-94.

[G.O., Nos. 521, 522, Public, dated 17th July 1894.]

IV.

G.O., No. 818, PUBLIC, DATED 31ST OCTOBER 1894

[pages 5 and 6 of the collection.]

[No notes.]

V.

NOTES CONNECTED WITH G.O., No. 956, PUBLIC, DATED 15TH DECEMBER 1894
[page 7 of the collection.]

From the Accountant-General, No. 3531, dated 21st November 1894.

For the Chief Secretary—

Please see the Government of India's letter No. 4536, Public, dated the 10th September 1894. The Accountant-General's present letter certainly appears to beg the question. At the same time there is no doubt but that the Government of India did not understand that the Accountant-General had not recognised Mr. Murdoch's promotion. If this Government were to rule that Mr. Murdoch should be considered to have held the permanent appointment of Deputy Commissioner from the 30th March to the 30th July 1894, the Accountant-General would most probably ask that the matter might be referred to India, who, when they see that they have made a mistake, would probably reverse the ruling of this Government. It seems best to let matters alone and to inform the Accountant-General that no further action is required.

C. M. SCHMIDT—1-12-94.

H.M. and circ.—

J. F. PRICE—3-12-94.

I don't quite see what else we can do.

H. W. B[LISS]—6-12-94.

J. G[ROSE]—6-12-94.

W[ENLOCK]—9-12-94.

[G.O., No. 956, Public, dated 15th December 1894.]

21st Nov. 1894

3531

10

From

To

THE

SIR,

In Memo No. 1945, Public Department, dated the 26th September 1894, enquiring whether there was any objection to Mr. Murdoch being considered to have held the permanent appointment of Deputy Commissioner of the District of Alkari from the 30th of July 1894 to the 30th of July 1895, although the Government of India declined to sanction Mr. Murdoch's permanent appointment to the post and requested that if possible he might be appointed to officiate in it instead, it proceeded to add that the arrangement should not be revised with retrospective effect. In ordinary circumstances therefore there could have been no objection to Mr. Murdoch being considered to have held permanent appointment to the 30th of July, a date long anterior to that of the Government of India's letter.

The arrangement

which has been

made to be

done.

circumstances are not altogether ordinary. It may, I think, be assumed that in deciding to forego the retrospective revision of the arrangement made, the Government of India was under the impression that Mr. Murdoch had been drawing the full pay of the appointment and really meant that he should not be called upon to refund the difference between that and the acting salary. But as a matter of fact, as Mr. Murdoch's appointment to the substantive post was held to be opposed to Article 242 of the Civil Service Regulations, he has all along been regarded by the Audit Office as holding the permanent appointment of Head Assistant Collector and has been restricted to the salary to which he would have been entitled on that basis. From a pecuniary point of view therefore, it would be a revision of the arrangement to consider Mr. Murdoch to have held the permanent appointment of Deputy Commissioner and if the Government of India meant that the pecuniary arrangements should not be revised, he should continue to be regarded as having substantively held the appointment of Head Assistant.

2. In explanation of the delay that has occurred in answering this reference, I would state that Mr. Morris, then Acting Accountant General referred the question to the Government of India informing it that Mr. Murdoch had been restricted to the acting salary and enquiring whether it was intended that he should now be allowed to

to draw the diff. between that and the ~~permanent~~ pay in arrears. The Government of India being apparently unaware that the question had ^{been} referred on a reference made by the Madras Government itself, directed that the order of that Government should be awaited - and if any doubt was felt as to their propriety, the matter should then be referred through it.

I have the honor to be
Sir,

Your most Obedt Servt.

Hailey
Accountant General

W
21-11

From

THE ACCOUNTANT-GENERAL,

MADRAS,

To

THE Chief Secy to Govt
Public Dept.

No.

Dated

Received

Repd

22nd Nov 94.

No. 3531

Subject.

Stating that there was
objection to consider
our memorandum to have
substantially held the
app't of Dy Commr
of Salt & Akbari Revenue
from 30th March to 30th
July 94.

Code
Class.

INDIAN TELEGRAPHS.

Monthly
Number.

To

(Office)

Words.

Day.

Hour.

Minute.

Official
Instructions.

To

(Person)

The Chief Secy
Public Dept

From

(Person)

The Chief Secy
Board, Sepoy.

Please see Govt Order No. 1883 31st Oct 1894
re: Mr. Asst Secy's letter No. 30598 6th
Oct 94. Did Asst Secy communicate
to Govt the result of his reference to the
C of I as to whether Mr. Munder's salary
allowed pay in arrears as Dy Commr
of Salt & Akbari Revenue up to 30th
July 1894? If so will you please
send copy of this reply for reference.

64 Word Form.

F.C.2.

Recd. from

L.N.

Sent to

L.N.

At

Hrs.

Mts. by

At

Hrs.

Mts. by

Telegraph Master.

[G.
25.]

100-20-11-94

Who connected with
No. 986, Pub. 2, 16/12/94
C. No. 3408.

Public DEPARTMENT

[Signature]

FOR ORDERS.

Please see the G. of D's letter
in L.P. of 31. 10 94 No. 818. The
Act Genl's letter present letter
certainly appears to beg the
question. At the same time there
is no doubt ^{but} that the G. of D. did
not understand that the Ag. did
not recognise Mr. Murdoch's
promotion. If this G.O. were
to rule that Mr. M. should
be considered to have held the
permanent appl. of Dy Commr.
from the 30th March to the 30th
July 1894, the Ag. would ~~be~~
most probably ask that the
matter might be referred to
India who, when they see that
they have made a mistake,
would probably reverse the
^{making of this G.O.}
~~order~~. It seems best to let
matters alone to inform the
Ag. that no further action is
required

I don't quite see what else
we can do

to
9 Dec

[Signature]
6/12/94

CS
3/12/94

[Signature]
3/12/94

Copy to
make copy for Board
of Rev. General Rev.

6/12/94

He has

He has