

Public (1896) Department.

ORDINARY MS.

G.O., No. 711

Dated 7 July 1896.

[Despatch Abstract.]

PRESENTS TO MEDICAL OFFICERS.

Declining to sanction the presentation of a medical by certain inhabitants of Harpanahalli to M.R.R.Y.C. Mangayya Nayudu, the Civil Apothecary of the place, who has ^{been} transferred to the Vizagapatam district, but stating that there is no objection to a pecuniary recognition of the apothecary's services.

Sir James Hanbury recommended that though I chain without previous sanction, he might be permitted always having borne a good character in the department.

His Excellency Lord Wenlock approved, but, objected and wrote: "I think Mr. Moore should retain the gift in consideration of his watch and chain, as was arranged, honourable Mr. Garstin repeated his pecuniary recognition, Apothecary Sir C. G. Arbuthnot concurred with the Honourable Mr. Garstin and was of opinion Mr. Moore should be allowed to retain the watch and chain and orders issued accordingly. (No. 1356, Military, dated 5th March 1891.)

9. The inhabitants of Buntwal requested permission award a gold medal to Civil Apothecary A. F. Mathias.

The Honourable Sir Henry Stokes, K.C.S.I., wrote The case is on all fours with those disposed of in G.O.s, dated 25th June 1888 and 13th August 1890. Permission to accept the medal should be refused." The Honourable Mr. Garstin, K.C.S.I., quoted Rule 5 of the Government of India Resolution, and added: "If the people choose to give this apothecary the Rs. 200 and ask him to get a gold medal for himself it, the gift is permissible by the rules. I would therefore reply to these people that if they like to give Apothecary Mathias the Rs. 200 to get a medal they may, but they must not be the medal and give it to him. This will bring out the absurdity of the rule, of which I don't approve; but there it is." His Excellency Lord Wenlock wrote: "Rule 5 certainly makes exception in favour of medical officers as regards pecuniary recognition of their services, and appears to me that this body of persons can present the money they have collected to Civil Apothecary Mathias, though not a medal." But as the ruling in G.O., No. 1356, Military, dated 5th March 1891, differed from those of the Civil department, the matter was discussed in Council and the order issued as follows (G.O., No. 671, dated 23rd September 1892):—

"The proposed presentation of a medal cannot functioned, but there is no objection to Civil Apothecary Mathias receiving the sum subscribed as a recognition of his services."

10. The official and non-official public of Harpanahi now represent that in November 1893 they resolved upon presenting a gold medal to the Civil Apothecary of the station and got one made by Messrs. P. Orr and Sons for Rs. 66. Evidently the money cannot now be recovered and the value of the medal paid to the Apothecary; a case is therefore submitted for orders, as opinions have differed so widely in the past and a general circular to all Medical officers seems desirable to enable them to prevent similar disappointments to the public, in future. There is reason to believe that very few cases of the kind are reported to the Government for orders. Supposing the permission to accept the medal were refused and it was afterwards found that some one of the memorialists took over the medal and advanced Rs. 66 for formal presentation to the Apothecary, and that the latter subsequently repaid the amount to the tender of the money, and made a show of purchasing it, would his conduct be reprehensible?

46/96

I do not think that there is any harm in the slightest double as to the meaning of the rules. I do not know why the Rs. 22 is considered necessary, but I think such a thing would be as this and immediate consideration should be given to the members of the staff.

I remark that the C. I. somewhat frequently finds fault with the Ag. 2nd Asst. and therefore suggest that he should appoint someone whose work would give him more satisfaction. Many cases, notes with which the C. I. is not satisfied should not be submitted to the members of the staff.

I agree - The rule as to medical officers seems to be plain enough - Their patients may give them what they please in money; but their services as public officers cannot be acknowledged by testimonials or valuable addresses.

29/10/96

25/7/96

I submit that the order in this case should be on the same lines as all other orders issued. The case of No. 11000.

20/10/96

I am sure that the C. I. is a very good man and that he is a very good officer. I am sure that he is a very good officer and that he is a very good officer.

BACK PAPERS.

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

FURTHER PAPERS.

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

Handwritten notes on the right page, including the phrase "Handwritten notes" and other illegible text.

PRESENTS TO MEDICAL OFFICERS.

Rule 52 of the Public Servants' Manual la.
"Medical officers are not prohibited from

Rule No. 5 in India Resolution in G.O., No. 1107, Public, dated 6th August 1887, re-issuing the rules in the Resolution, dated 11th May 1885.

follows:—

pecuniary recognition of their services a community or body of persons which desire to acknowledge these, but the sanction of the Government must be obtained by Medical officers before receiving public complimentary address."

2. In June 1888, Dr. Iyasawmy Pillai, from his friends there a silver and silver cup, a in accepting the gifts. The Honourable Sir P. Mohini, K.C.S.I., pointed out that the testimonial in this case was not pecuniary, that it did not appear to be in recognition of services, and that the Doctor's private friends did not constitute a body of persons within the meaning of the rule. The gifts were returned. (G.O., No. 8th February 1889.)

3. Permission to present a watch and gold in G.O., No. 767, dated 3rd August 1888.

4. The inhabitants of Kamptee desired to present good service during cholera; it was stated that Government sanction was not required for pecuniary recognition, but that "no medal or public address" (G.O., No. 961, dated 1st October 1888.)

5. The Devarkota Paragana community of address and a gold bangle worth Rs. 75 to the Apothecary; the order ran: "There is no objection to a pecuniary recognition of the Apothecary's services, but the presentation of a public address or of a bangle is inadmissible." (G.O., No. 719, dated 28th August 1889.)

6. The admirers of Mr. S. E. Carrapiett, Apothecary of Gooty, wished to present him with a testimonial and public address without stating the signature of the testimonial. The order was: "There is no objection to a pecuniary recognition of the Apothecary's services, but the presentation of any other form of gift, or of a public address is inadmissible." (G.O., No. 893, dated 7th November 1889.)

7. The Secretary, Kannan Medical Fund, Mysore, represented that at a public meeting it was decided to present O. Kannan, the medical officer of the station, with a gold medal and chain. The Hon'ble Mr. Garstin, C.S.I., wrote as follows: "A medical officer may take a purse of money, and if Government gives sanction may receive a complimentary address. There is no practical difference between a purse of money and a gold medal. I would give the required sanction, or refer the matter to India, if necessary."

The Hon'ble Mr. Grose remarked: "It seems to me that the case falls within the rule which prohibits testimonials of any kind, though they are certain definite exceptions with regard to medical officers. It was so decided in G.O., No. 1107, dated 28th August 1889."

The Hon'ble Mr. Garstin, C.S.I., added: "The wording of this Government Order is, I think, wrong. The rules distinctly admit of an address being presented with the permission of Government. It is wrong therefore to say that a course is inadmissible. It should have been said that the Government declined to permit Medical officers don't come under Rule 1, so far as money gifts are concerned. However, my Hon'ble Colleague thinks the distinction between the value of the gold medal and the gold medal itself should be maintained, I won't press the point and the Government Order may be officers differently from others."

His Excellency Lord Connemara noted: "It seems to me that the rules of the Government of India are perfectly plain. All public servants are forbidden to receive valedictory addresses or testimonials. The exception to this is in the case of medical officers who are permitted to receive pecuniary recognition from some community. As this request does not come within the exception, it cannot be entertained. I think the Government Order ought simply to state the presentation proposed is inadmissible." Orders issued accordingly. (G.O., No. 573, dated 13th August 1890.)

8. Certain residents of Pallavaram presented a gold watch and chain to Military Apothecary J. Moore, and as they were friends and patients who had received medical aid at his hands, he accepted the honoraria in lieu of fees, on the understanding that they would be returned if exception were taken to his action in accepting them.

* Rule 1. Save as in these rules otherwise provided, all servants of Government, covenanted or uncovenanted, are forbidden to receive complimentary or valedictory addresses in any form; or to accept testimonials of any kind; or to attend public meetings or complimentary entertainments of a formal and public character held in their honour.

His Excellency Lord Connemara noted as follows: "I incline to adhere strictly to the rule. If such a practice becomes general or even frequent it may be inconvenient."

Presents to
Medical Officers.

FOR ORDERS.

H. E. THE GOVERNOR. 3

THE HON'BLE MR. H. W. BLISS, C.I.E. 1

THE HON'BLE MR. J. GROSE. 2

I

His Excellency the Right
Hon'ble Sir Arthur Elibank
Havelock - G.C.M.G.,
Governor in Council of
St. George, at Madras.

The humble memorial of the
official and non-official pub-
lic of Haraparahalli most
respectfully sheweth: —

That the memorialists, in the
month of November 1893, resolved
upon presenting a gold medal
to Mr. C. Mangaya Naider, the
Civil Apothecary of the Station.

2. They accordingly got
a medal valued at Rs 66 pre-
pared by Messrs P. Orr & Sons,
Madras.

3. They then applied to
the District Surgeon, Bellary,
for getting sanction to the award
of the medal, who with his
recommendation submitted
the petition to the Surgeon-General
with the Government of Madras.

4. The latter officer, the
memorialists are very sorry to say,
declined to accord sanction,
saying that under the existing
rules of Government, the award
could not be sanctioned.

5. The District Surgeon and the Surgeon-General are one in viewing with pleasure the popularity earned by this medical officer, but could not transgress the orders of Government.

6. The memorialists now see no other course than to beg your Excellency in Council to comply with their humble request.

7. The apothecary who is now transferred to the Vizagapatam District is a good, popular, affable and able medical officer; and the memorialists are unanimously of the opinion that he is an acquisition to the Department he now belongs to, and are very loathe to lose an opportunity of demonstrating their recognition of his very useful services.

8. Your Excellency's memorialists humbly beg to state that cases of like nature have received the approval of your benign Government and as instances they beg to point out the cases of some medical subordinates in the Krishna District who were allowed to receive presents and addresses on the occasions of their departures on transfer &c.

9. Under the above circumstances, the memorialists humbly request that, in consideration of their

(Contd) of their anxiety, orders may be passed early for awarding the medal to Mr. Ellangaya Naidu, especially as he has to leave this station very shortly.

Praying as in duty bound for your Excellency's long life and prosperity,

The memorialists ever beg to remain,
Your Excellency's most devoted and
loyal servants,

Signature	Designation
1 B. Gopalachari	Shrotriendar & Schoolmaster
2 Annamantla	Shrotriendar
3 Annamachari	Land-owner
4 Annamachari	Merchant
5 Annamachari	do -
6 Annamachari	do -
7 Annamachari	do -
8 Annamachari	do -
9 Annamachari	Mydair
10 Annamachari	Union Chairman
11 M. Annamachari	Police
12 Sh. Annamachari	School Master
13 D. Annamachari	School Master
14 K. Annamachari	Sub-Register

and several others.

Public Dept

From B. Gopala Chari & others
Harapanaballi

Dated }
Recd. 8 } June '96
Regd 9 }

Subject

Requesting sanction to
presenting a gold medal to
M. R. Qy. C. Mungaya Naider
Chief Apothecary, Harapanaballi.

C.S.

Order No 711. 27 July 1896.
Mis

The proposed
presentation of a medal
cannot be sanctioned,
but there is no objection
to a pecuniary recog-
nition of the Apothecary's
services.

from Orders!
C.S. 4.7.96
3.7.96

Petitioners (9)

Pub go. 671 d. 23-9-92 (Preceda)
205 d. 17-3-91 mis
July 1356 d. 5-3-91 mis
Pub 573 d. 13-8-90 mis
893 d. 7-11-89 mis
719 d. 28-8-89 mis
135 d. 8-2-89 mis
961 d. 1-10-88 mis
767 d. 3-8-88 mis
641 d. 25-6-88 mis
1107 d. 6-8-87 mis
Pub Servants Manual
JUN. 1896
DEPARTMENT OF MEDICINE

When given for copying
When copied
When examined
When signed

189

AD AGAIN G.O., No.
189

DATED

CURRENT No.

ENCLOSURE TO C. No.

ORDER OF GOVERNMENT

LETTER OF GOVERNMENT.

STATEMENT WITH DITTO.

PAPERS NOT FILED UP, BEING MEANT FOR DISPATCH
IN ORIGINAL.

N.B.-

A = Copy in full.
B = Not to be copied.
F = Copy abstract only.
G = Copy heading only.

Public (1896) Department.

ORDINARY MS.

G.O., No. 711

Dated 7 July 1896

INDEXED.

[Despatch Abstract.]

PRESENTS TO MEDICAL OFFICERS.

Declining to sanction the presentation of a medical by certain inhabitants of Harpanahalli to M.R.RY.C. Mangayya Nayudu, the Civil Apothecary of the place, who has ^{been} transferred to the Vizagapatam district, but stating that there is no objection to a pecuniary recognition of the apothecary's services.

BACK PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.	G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.
		<i>mt</i>					

FURTHER PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.	G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.
		<i>mt</i>					

Note for orders

PRESENTS TO MEDICAL OFFICERS.

Rule 52 of the Public Servants' Manual is.
"Medical officers are not prohibited from

Rule No. 5 in India Resolution in G.O., No. 1107, Public, dated 6th August 1887, re-issuing the rules in the Resolution, dated 11th May 1885.

2. In June 1888, Dr. Iyasawmy Pillai, R. from his friends there a *salver and silver cup*, a in accepting the gifts. The Honourable Sir Ph monial in this case was not *pecuniary*, that it did that the Doctor's private friends did not const the rule. The gifts were returned. (G.O., No. 8th February 1889.)

3. Permission to present a *watch and gold* in G.O., No. 767, dated 3rd August 1888.

4. The inhabitants of Kamptee desired to put good service during cholera; it was stated that Govt recognition, but that "no medal or public address" (October 1888.)

5. The Devarkota Paragana community of address and a *gold bangle* worth Rs. 75 to the objection to a pecuniary recognition of the Apo public address or of a *bangle* is inadmissible. (G.O.,

6. The admirers of Mr. S. E. Carrapiett, Apo testimonial and public address without stating that "There is no objection to a pecuniary recognition of any other form of gift, or of a public address" (7th November 1889.)

7. The Secretary, Kannan Medical Fund, M. was decided to present C. Kannan, the medical officer. The Hon'ble Mr. Garstin, C.S.I., wrote as follows: and if Government gives sanction may receive a difference between a purse of money and a gold medal. I would refer the matter to India, if necessary."

The Hon'ble Mr. Grose remarked: "It seems to me that the case falls within the rule which prohibits testimonials of any kind, though there are certain definite exceptions with regard to medical officers. It was so decided in G.O., No. 19, dated 28th August 1889."

The Hon'ble Mr. Garstin, C.S.I., added: "I think, wrong. The rules distinctly admit of an address being presented with the permission of Government. It is wrong therefore to say that such a course is inadmissible. It should have been said that the Government declined to permit it. Medical officers don't come under Rule 1, so far as money gifts are concerned. However, as my Hon'ble Colleague thinks the distinction between the value of the gold medal and the gold medal itself should be maintained, I won't press the point and the Government Order may be. The real mischief is in treating medical officers differently from others."

His Excellency Lord Connemara noted: "It seems to me that the rules of the Government of India are perfectly plain. All public servants are forbidden to receive valedictory addresses or testimonials. The exception to this is in the case of medical officers who are permitted to receive pecuniary recognition from some community. As this request does not come within the exception, it cannot be entertained. I think the Government Order ought simply to state the presentation proposed is inadmissible." Orders issued accordingly. (G.O., No. 573, dated 13th August 1890.)

8. Certain residents of Pallavaram presented a *gold watch and chain* to Military Apothecary J. Moore, and as they were friends and patients who had received medical aid at his hands, he accepted the honoraria in lieu of fees, on the understanding that they would be returned if exception were taken to his action in accepting them.

* Rule 1. Save as in these rules otherwise provided, all servants of Government, covenanted or uncovenanted, are forbidden to receive complimentary or valedictory addresses in any form; or to accept testimonials of any kind; or to attend public meetings or complimentary entertainments of a formal and public character held in their honour.

OFFICERS.

as follows:—

g pecuniary recognition of their services a community or body of persons which desire to acknowledge these, but the sanction of the Government must be obtained by Medical officers before receiving public complimentary address."

adur, Civil Surgeon, Cuddapah, received instructions whether he was right. Johns, K.C.S.I., pointed out that the testimonial appears to be in recognition of services, and a body of persons within the meaning of dated 25th June 1888, and No. 135, dated

to Assistant Surgeon Chalke was refused

a small medal to the local apothecary for sanction was not required for pecuniary address." (G.O., No. 961, dated 1st

alipatam wished to present a valedictory apothecary; the order ran: "There is no objection to the presentation of a testimonial for the apothecary's services, but the presentation of a medal is inadmissible." (G.O., No. 893, dated

ary of Gooty, wished to present him with a testimonial. The order was: "There is no objection to the presentation of a testimonial for the apothecary's services, but the presentation of a medal is inadmissible." (G.O., No. 893, dated

ary, represented that at a public meeting of the station, with a gold medal and chain. A medical officer may take a purse of money, a complimentary address. There is no practical objection. I would give the required sanction, or

to me that the case falls within the rule which prohibits testimonials of any kind, though there are certain definite exceptions with regard to medical officers. It was so decided in G.O., No. 19, dated 28th August 1889."

The wording of this Government Order is, I think, wrong. The rules distinctly admit of an address being presented with the permission of Government. It is wrong therefore to say that such a course is inadmissible. It should have been said that the Government declined to permit it. Medical officers don't come under Rule 1, so far as money gifts are concerned. However, as my Hon'ble Colleague thinks the distinction between the value of the gold medal and the gold medal itself should be maintained, I won't press the point and the Government Order may be. The real mischief is in treating medical officers differently from others."

His Excellency Lord Connemara noted: "It seems to me that the rules of the Government of India are perfectly plain. All public servants are forbidden to receive valedictory addresses or testimonials. The exception to this is in the case of medical officers who are permitted to receive pecuniary recognition from some community. As this request does not come within the exception, it cannot be entertained. I think the Government Order ought simply to state the presentation proposed is inadmissible." Orders issued accordingly. (G.O., No. 573, dated 13th August 1890.)

* Rule 1. Save as in these rules otherwise provided, all servants of Government, covenanted or uncovenanted, are forbidden to receive complimentary or valedictory addresses in any form; or to accept testimonials of any kind; or to attend public meetings or complimentary entertainments of a formal and public character held in their honour.

His Excellency Lord Connemara noted as follows: "I incline to adhere strictly to the rule. If such a practice becomes general or even frequent it may be inconvenient."

9. The inhabitants of Buntwal requested permission
 cary A. F. Mathias.

The Honourable Sir Henry Stokes, K.C.S.I., wrote disposed of in G.O.s., dated 25th June 1888 and 13th medal should be refused." The Honourable Mr. Garment of India Resolution, and added: "If the people the Rs. 200 and ask him to get a gold medal for himself rules. I would therefore reply to these people that if Rs. 200 to get a medal they may, but they must not bring out the absurdity of the rule, of which I don't think Lord Wenlock wrote: "Rule 5 certainly makes as regards pecuniary recognition of their services, and can present the money they have collected to Civil Ap But as the ruling in G.O., No. 1356, Military, dated 5th Civil department, the matter was discussed in Council No. 671, dated 23rd September 1892):—

10. The official and non-official members of the Civil Apothecary Mathias receiving the sum subscribed for a recognition of his services."

10. The official and non-official public of Harpanah now represent that in November 1893 they resolved upon presenting a gold medal to the Civil Apothecary of the station and got on made by Messrs. P. Orr and Sons for Rs. 66. Evidently the money cannot now be recovered and the value of the medal paid to the Apothecary; the case is therefore submitted for orders, as opinions have differed so widely in the past and a general circular to all Medical officers seems desirable to enable them to prevent similar disappointments to the public in future. There is reason to believe that very few cases of the kind are reported to Govt for orders. Supposing the permission to accept the medal were refused and it was afterwards found that some one of the memorialists took over the medal and advanced Rs 66 for formal presentation to the Apothecary, and that the latter subsequently repaid the amount to the lender of the money, and made a show of purchasing it, would his conduct be reprehensible?

I do not think that there can be the slightest doubt

as to the meaning of the rules - I do not know

why the H2: p. considered it necessary.

write such a long letter like as this a

March 26.

• I dubnub that the order in this case ^{is the} ~~then~~

is on the same line as all other orders excepted

that in the case of Mr. Moore

20

2/5786

referred in accepting the watch and
retain the gift in consideration of his

nourable Sir Henry Stokes, K.C.S.I.,
watch and chain, as was arranged,
nourable Mr. Garstin repeated his
pecuniary recognition, Apothecary
rable Sir C. G. Arbuthnot concurred
r. Moore should be allowed to retain
No. 1356, Military, dated 5th March

award a gold medal to Civil Apothe-

The case is on all fours with those of 1890. Permission to accept the C.S.I., quoted Rule 5 of the Government case choose to give this apothecary the gift, the gift is permissible by the like to give Apothecary Mathias the medal and give it to him. This is proved; but there it is." His Excellency's exception in favour of medical officers appears to me that this body of persons, Apothecary Mathias, though not a medal." In March 1891, differed from those of the order and the order issued as follows (G.O.,

I agree - The rule as to medical officers serves to
 explain enough - Their patients may give them what
 they please, in private; but their services as public
 officers cannot be acknowledged by testimonials or val-
 uetory addresses

29/5/96

AS
2576796

Remark that the C.S. somewhat frequently
1. is 1. 16 with the Ag. 2nd as a result.

therefore suggest that he should appoint
someone whose work would give him

infection - many cases, notes with which
not satisfied should not be submitted
unless about 100 - 150 words for

3 containing
of the funds
which he is acting
in a very heavy
of the

...the ...
...the ...
...the ...

1. Week 1
 2. Week 2
 3. Week 3
 4. Week 4
 5. Week 5
 6. Week 6
 7. Week 7
 8. Week 8
 9. Week 9
 10. Week 10
 11. Week 11
 12. Week 12
 13. Week 13
 14. Week 14
 15. Week 15
 16. Week 16
 17. Week 17
 18. Week 18
 19. Week 19
 20. Week 20
 21. Week 21
 22. Week 22
 23. Week 23
 24. Week 24
 25. Week 25
 26. Week 26
 27. Week 27
 28. Week 28
 29. Week 29
 30. Week 30
 31. Week 31
 32. Week 32
 33. Week 33
 34. Week 34
 35. Week 35
 36. Week 36
 37. Week 37
 38. Week 38
 39. Week 39
 40. Week 40
 41. Week 41
 42. Week 42
 43. Week 43
 44. Week 44
 45. Week 45
 46. Week 46
 47. Week 47
 48. Week 48
 49. Week 49
 50. Week 50
 51. Week 51
 52. Week 52
 53. Week 53
 54. Week 54
 55. Week 55
 56. Week 56
 57. Week 57
 58. Week 58
 59. Week 59
 60. Week 60
 61. Week 61
 62. Week 62
 63. Week 63
 64. Week 64
 65. Week 65
 66. Week 66
 67. Week 67
 68. Week 68
 69. Week 69
 70. Week 70
 71. Week 71
 72. Week 72
 73. Week 73
 74. Week 74
 75. Week 75
 76. Week 76
 77. Week 77
 78. Week 78
 79. Week 79
 80. Week 80
 81. Week 81
 82. Week 82
 83. Week 83
 84. Week 84
 85. Week 85
 86. Week 86
 87. Week 87
 88. Week 88
 89. Week 89
 90. Week 90
 91. Week 91
 92. Week 92
 93. Week 93
 94. Week 94
 95. Week 95
 96. Week 96
 97. Week 97
 98. Week 98
 99. Week 99
 100. Week 100

to the same

G.]
25
-5-11-93

DEPARTMENT

C. No.

FOR ORDERS.

Presents to:
Medical Officers.

FOR ORDERS.

H. E. THE GOVERNOR. 3

THE HON'BLE MR. H. W. BLISS, C.I.E. 1

THE HON'BLE MR. J. GROSE. 2

I

His Excellency the Right
Hon'ble Sir Arthur Elibank
Havelock - G.C. & G.,
Governor in Council of
St. George, at Madras.

The humble memorial of the
official and non-official pub-
lic of Haruparahalli most
respectfully sheweth: —

That the memorialists, in the
month of November 1893, resolved
upon presenting a gold medal
to Mr. R. C. Mangaya Naider, the
Civil Apothecary of this Station.

2. They accordingly got
a medal valued at Rs 66 pre-
pared by Messrs. P. Orr & Sons,
Madras.

3. They then applied to
the District Surgeon, Bellary,
for getting sanction to the award
of the medal, who with his
recommendation submitted
the petition to the Surgeon-General
with the Government of Madras.

4. The latter officer, the
memorialists are very sorry to say,
declined to accord sanction,
saying that under the existing
rules of Government, the award
could not be sanctioned.

5. The District Surgeon and the Surgeon-General are one in viewing with pleasure the popularity earned by this medical officer, but could not transgress the orders of Government.

6. The memorialists now see no other course than to beg your excellency in Council to comply with their humble request.

7. The apothecary who is now transferred to the Vizagapatam District is a good, popular, affable and able medical officer; and the memorialists are unanimously of the opinion that he is an acquisition to the Department he now belongs to, and are very loathe to lose an opportunity of demonstrating their recognition of his very useful services.

8. Your Excellency's memorialists humbly beg to state that cases of like nature have received the approval of your benign Government and as instances they beg to point out the cases of some medical subordinates in the Krishna District who were allowed to receive presents and addresses on the occasions of their departures on transfer &c.

9. Under the above circumstances, the memorialists humbly request that, in consideration of their

(Contd) of their anxiety, orders may be passed early for awarding the medal to Mr. Collangaya Naidu, especially as he has to leave this station very shortly.

Praying as in duty bound for your Excellency's long life and prosperity,

The memorialists ever beg to remain, your Excellency's most obedient and loyal servants,

Signature	Designation
1 B. Gopalachari	Shrotriendar & Schoolmaster
2 Channamma	Shrotriendar
3 Chakrabarti	Landowner
4 Chakrabarti	Merchant
5 Chakrabarti	do -
6 Chakrabarti	do -
7 Chakrabarti	do -
8 Chakrabarti	do -
9 Chakrabarti	do -
10 Chakrabarti	do -
11 Chakrabarti	do -
12 Chakrabarti	do -
13 Chakrabarti	do -
14 Chakrabarti	do -

and several others.

Public Dept

From B Gopala Chari & others
Harapanaballi

Dated }
Recd. 8 } June '96
Rego 9 }

Subject

Requesting sanction to
presenting a gold medal to
M. R. Dy. C. Mungaya Naidu
Civil Apothecary, Harapanaballi.

Pub. 6712.23-9-92 (Preced.)
205217-3-91 mis
July 135625-3-91 orig
Pub. 573213-8-90 mis
893217-11-89 mis
7192128-8-89 mis
135218-2-89 mis
961211-10-88 mis
767213-8-88 mis
641215-6-88 mis
1107216-8-88 mis
Pub. Servants Manual
JUN. 1896
DEPARTMENT OF MADRAS

C.S.
Order N=711.21 July 1896.
mis

The proposed
presentation of a medal
cannot be sanctioned,
but there is no objection
to a pecuniary recog-
nition of the Apothecary's
services.

from Orders!
C.S. 4.7.96
3.7.96
26.7.96

Petitioners (9)

When given for copying
When copied
When examined
When signed

189

READ AGAIN G.O., No.
189

DATED

CURRENT No.

ENCLOSURES TO O. No.

ORDER OF GOVERNMENT A A A A A A A

LETTER OF GOVERNMENT.

STATEMENT WITH DITTO.

PAPERS NOT FILED UP, BEING MEANT FOR DESPATCH
IN ORIGINAL.

N.B.-

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