

MADRAS RECORD OFFICE.**Government of Madras.***Revenue* **DEPARTMENT.**

G.O. No.	2188	Press
		Mis.
	129	130
Dated	10.10.1862	

Not to be folded or roughly handled

Proceedings of the Madras Government, Revenue Department,
10th October 1862.

No. 129. Read the following letter from W. J. RAYNOR, Esq., Officiating Civil Paymaster, to the Honorable T. PYCROFT, Chief Secretary to Government, dated Fort Saint George, 30th September 1862, No. 149:—

SIR,

1. I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of the Proceedings of Government dated 27th instant, No. 2,107, Revenue Department, and in reply to state that the ruling of 10th September 1858, quoted in the Resolution of the Government of India, dated 14th July 1862, is applicable only to Officers transferred from one *substantive* appointment to another, and does not affect Officers appointed *at act* at a distance from their stations, even though in *higher* appointments and *at their own request*. These are entitled to travelling allowance, which is always passed to them.

Vide Government Order dated 3rd July 1861,
No. 8,297, copy accompanying.

2. The certificate required by the Notification from this Office, published at page 382 of the Gazette, is necessary only in the case of Officers transferred *permanently* from one appointment to another without increase of salary, and not in the case of Officers proceeding to join, or returning from, acting appointments. This will be explained by a Notification in the Gazette in order to obviate future applications to Government similar to those made by Messrs. Hutchins and Foord.

From C. H. LUSHINGTON, Esq., Secretary to the Government of India, Financial Department, to the Civil Paymaster, Bombay, No. 8,297, dated the 3rd July 1861.

SIR,

1. In reply to your letter No. 1,676, dated 13th October 1860, I am directed to inform you that the practice reported in the 1st paragraph thereof, viz., to hold that the Financial Ruling of 10th September 1858, is applicable only to cases in which Officers are transferred from one *substantive* appointment to another, is correct.

2. In respect to your enquiry as to whether the above Ruling is applicable to *acting* appointments in so far as to bar a claim to travelling allowance in any case in which an Officer is deputed to act at his own request, I am directed to state that there is a distinct Rule for cases of *acting* appointments, viz., Section 23 of the Covenanted Civil Absentee Rules, which permits of the travelling expenses of Officers appointed to act, being paid in all cases, whether they have applied for such acting appointments or not.

(A true Copy.)

(Signed) C. H. LUSHINGTON,
Secretary to the Government of India.

(True Copy.)

(Signed) C. A. VINT,
Acting Head Assistant to Civil Paymaster.

No. 130. ORDER THEREON, 10th October 1862, No. 2,185.
Ordered to be communicated to Messrs. A. R. Hutchins and E. B. Foord, with reference to their letters dated 12th and 16th September last respectively.

(Signed) P. P. HUTCHINS,
Acting Deputy Secretary to Government.

