

Proceedings of the Madras Government, Revenue Department,
28th April 1871.

Read the following papers:—

No. 326. From F. H. WOODROFFE, Esq., Madras Civil Servant on leave, to the Secretary to Government, Revenue Department, Fort Saint George, dated Bangalore, 17th April 1871.

I beg myself the honour to request you will represent the following matter for the favourable consideration of His Excellency the Governor in Council.

After return from long furlough on 9th January 1867, I served continuously in the Revenue Department up to 31st October 1868, when I was transferred to the Judicial Department; it thus appears that I then wanted but nine days to entitle me to two months' privilege leave. After five months' judicial service, I took two months' Court adjournment on 5th April, and after eleven and-a-half months' further like service (excepting five days in August 1869), another of the same duration, after which I continued the service up to 12th October last, when I was transferred to the Revenue Department, and in it remained till I went on present preparatory leave. Subsequently I applied to the Accountant-General to inform me for how many days of subsidiary leave I might be entitled to privilege leave pay, and following is the Officiating Deputy-Accountant-General's reply, dated 6th instant, and No. 150:—

"The undersigned has the honour to state that, as you availed yourself of the adjournments of your Court, you are not entitled to the months' privilege pay which was at your credit, prior to your joining the Judicial Department."

If I am right in attributing Mr. Fitzgerald's communication to a general principle, that taking Court adjournment *ipso facto* cancels privilege leave previously earned, I would submit I cannot find such a ruling.

I would further represent that Rule II., "privilege leave, Judicial officers," that appears to form part of Financial Resolution, G. I., 22nd January 1869, No. 378, is not at all applicable to my case. It commences, "If any officer having privilege leave to his credit be appointed to act *temporarily*" (the italic is mine); *vide* also Rule III.; on the other hand, I certainly was not temporarily in the Judicial Department, as I spent therein almost two continuous years, excepting a few days. In the absence, therefore, of rule to the contrary, I would submit it is equitable that my two adjournments having been all but earned by nineteen and-a-half months' judicial service, I should be held entitled to two months' privilege leave for the two and-a-quarter years' revenue service.

If, however, it be maintained that Rule II. abovementioned is applicable to me, I would represent, in the third place, that, although the one month's privilege leave to which I stood entitled on 31st October 1868 be considered cancelled in consequence of my having taken two months' recess in April 1869, when I had earned only one of it by judicial service, the almost eleven months which, at the time I entered the Judicial Department, were counting towards a second month's privilege leave, cannot be held to have lapsed merely by my transference from one department to another. No doubt when an officer goes on furlough, the precedent service counting towards privilege leave becomes thereby cancelled, and on return he has to make a fresh start; in my case, however, the act

28th April 1871

Rev

My dear Sir

1150.

From the Civil Servant on leave to the Secretary to Government, Revenue Department, Fort Saint George, dated Bangalore, 17th April 1871.

With kind regards to the Secretary to Government, Revenue Department, Fort Saint George, dated Bangalore, 17th April 1871.

1150.

From the Civil Servant on leave to the Secretary to Government, Revenue Department, Fort Saint George, dated Bangalore, 17th April 1871.

28th April 1871.

Communicated to the

Board of Revenue with the

information that the

proceedings of this Government

are confidential by the

of which are those dated

21st December 1870 &

19th & 20th April 1871.

28th April 1871.

14th April 1871

Proceedings of the Madras Government, Revenue Department,
28th April 1871.

Read the following papers —

No. 326. From F. H. WOODROFFE, Esq., Madras Civil Servant on leave, to the Secretary to Government, Revenue Department, Fort Saint George, dated Bangalore, 17th April 1871.

I beg myself the honour to request you will represent the following matter for the favourable consideration of His Excellency the Governor in Council.

After return from long furlough on 9th January 1867, I served continuously in the Revenue Department up to 31st October 1868, when I was transferred to the Judicial Department; it thus appears that I then wanted but nine days to entitle me to two months' privilege leave. After five months' judicial service, I took two months' Court adjournment on 5th April, and after eleven and-a-half months' further like service (excepting five days in August 1869), another of the same duration, after which I continued the service up to 12th October last, when I was transferred to the Revenue Department, and in it remained till I went on present preparatory leave. Subsequently I applied to the Accountant-General to inform me for how many days of subsidiary leave I might be entitled to privilege leave pay, and following is the Officiating Deputy-Accountant-General's reply, dated 6th instant, and No. 150 :—

"The undersigned has the honour to state that, as you availed yourself of the adjournments of your Court, you are not entitled to the months' privilege pay which was at your credit, prior to your joining the Judicial Department."

If I am right in attributing Mr. Fitzgerald's communication to a general principle, that taking Court adjournment *ipso facto* cancels privilege leave previously earned, I cannot find such a ruling.

I would further represent that Rule II, "privilege leave, Judicial officers," that appears to form part of Financial Resolution, G. I., 22nd January 1869, No. 378, is not at all applicable to my case. It commences, "If any officer having privilege leave to his credit be appointed to act *temporarily*" (the italic is mine); *vide* also Rule III.; on the other hand, I certainly was not temporarily in the Judicial Department, as I spent therein almost two continuous years, excepting a few days. In the absence, therefore, of rule to the contrary, I would submit it is equitable that my two adjournments having been all but earned by nineteen and-a-half months' judicial service, I should be held entitled to two months' privilege leave for the two and-a-quarter years' revenue service.

If, however, it be maintained that Rule II, abovementioned is applicable to me, I would represent, in the third place, that, although the one month's privilege leave to which I stood entitled on 31st October 1868 be considered cancelled in consequence of my having taken two months' recess in April 1869, when I had earned only one of it by judicial service, the almost eleven months which, at the time I entered the Judicial Department, were counting towards a second month's privilege leave, cannot be held to have lapsed merely by my transference from one department to another. No doubt when an officer goes on furlough, the precedent service counting towards privilege leave becomes thereby cancelled, and on return he has to make a fresh start; in my case, however, the act

22nd Jan 1871

Dec

1871

1871

1871

Mem

1871

1871

1871

Dec

1871

1871

1871

Dec

1871

1871

1871

Dec

1871

1871

1871

Dec

1871

1871

1871

*Proceedings of the Madras Government, Revenue Department,
28th April 1871.*

which threatens to cancel the eleven months was not to suit my own convenience, (as a man's taking furlough is), but that of the public; and so, on my being transferred to the Revenue Department last October on account of service exigency, the eleven months must be considered as having recommenced counting towards privilege leave, and, as I subsequently served five months, there are at least fifteen months' revenue service for which there is one month's privilege leave to my credit.

In conclusion, I would solicit that Government would be pleased to assign me privilege leave pay for so much of my subsidiary leave as it may deem proper.

REFERRED to the Acting Accountant-General for his remarks.

18th April 1871.

(Signed) W. HUDLESTON,
Secretary to Government.

No. 327. Memorandum from the Acting Accountant-General, Madras, to the Secretary to Government, Revenue Department, dated Fort Saint George, 20th April 1871, No. 285.

THE undersigned has the honour to report that Mr. Woodroffe was, as stated by him, entitled to one month's privilege leave when he joined the Judicial Department in October 1868, but this privilege leave must be held to have lapsed on his having regularly availed himself of each judicial recess since he joined the department. The same view was taken of Mr. Daniel's case, and approved by Government—vide their Proceedings in the Judicial Department, dated 22nd November last, No. 1,531.

Mr. Woodroffe was, however, retransferred to the Revenue Department on 12th October last, but as he has not completed eleven months' duty since that date, he is not entitled to privilege leave, and cannot, therefore, be allowed full salary during his subsidiary leave.

(Signed) R. W. LODWICK,
Acting Accountant-General.

No. 328. From the Acting Accountant-General, Madras, to the Acting Chief Secretary to Government, dated Fort Saint George, 25th April 1871, No. 26.

WITH reference to your memorandum, No. 86, dated 21st instant, I have the honour to state that Mr. Woodroffe returned from sick leave to Europe on 9th January 1867, and took charge of the office of Assistant Collector, Salem, on 24th idem. He continued in the Revenue Department without leave of any kind until transferred to the Judicial Department, which he joined on 1st November 1868, and left on 12th October 1870. During this period he adjourned his Court on two occasions, and the last of these adjournments terminated on 24th July 1870. He reverted to the Revenue Department as above stated on 12th October 1870, and continued therein, without any leave, up to the 17th March, the date on which his present subsidiary leave commenced.

*Read by Mr. Woodroffe at Babbin Hotel 59
Bangalore
from T. D. Woodroffe Esq. 17 April/71
Madras Civil Servant on Leave
of the Secretary to Govt. H. D.
Fort St. George.*

*Proceedings of the Madras Government, Revenue Department,
28th April 1871.*

No. 329.

ORDER THEREON, 28th April 1871, No. 761.

Miscellaneous.

ORDERED that the foregoing reports be communicated to Mr. Woodroffe.

2. The Government observe that the four months' recess enjoyed by Mr. Woodroffe, while in the Judicial Department, must be considered as cancelling all claim to privilege leave on account of previous revenue service, and that since his last recess he has not served a sufficiently long time to have earned leave under the rules. His application, therefore, cannot be complied with.

(True Extract.)

(Signed) D. F. CARMICHAEL,
Acting Secretary to Government.

*1/2 months' further leave accepted
excepting 5 days in August 1869.*

Proceedings of the Madras Government, Revenue Department,
28th April 1871.

which threatens to cancel the eleven months was not to suit my own convenience, (as a man's taking furlough is), but that of the public; and so, on my being transferred to the Revenue Department last October on account of service exigency, the eleven months must be considered as having recommenced counting towards privilege leave, and, as I subsequently served five months, there are at least fifteen months' revenue service for which there is one month's privilege leave to my credit.

In conclusion, I would solicit that Government would be pleased to

WITH reference to your memorandum, No. 86, dated 21st instant, I have the honour to state that Mr. Woodroffe returned from sick leave to Europe on 9th January 1867, and took charge of the office of Assistant Collector, Salem, on 24th idem. He continued in the Revenue Department without leave of any kind until transferred to the Judicial Department, which he joined on 1st November 1868, and left on 12th October 1870. During this period he adjourned his Court on two occasions, and the last of these adjournments terminated on 24th July 1870. He reverted to the Revenue Department as above stated on 12th October 1870, and continued therein, without any leave, up to the 17th March, the date on which his present subsidiary leave commenced.

Read in open Court. Babbin Hotel 59
Bangalore
27/3/71
From T. H. Woodroffe Esq. 17 April/71
Madras Civil Servant on Leave
To the Secretary to Govt. H. D.
Fort St. George.

Sir,
I do myself the honour to request
you will represent the following
matter for the favourable consid-
eration of His Excellency the Governor
in Council: -

After return from long furlough
on 9th Jan'y 1867, I served Comptroller
advisory in the Rev. Dept., up to
31st Oct/68, when I was trans-
ferred to the Judicial Dept. it was
agreed that I then wanted but
9 days & entitle me to two months
Priv. Leave: after 5 months' Judi-
cial Service, I took 2 months' Court
adjournment; on 5th April & after
11 1/2 months' further like service
excepting 5 days in August 1869/70.

another, of the same duration, after
which I continued the service up to
12th Oct last when I was transfer-
red to the Rev. Dept. & in it re-
mained till I went on present Pube-
along leave. Subsequently I applied
to the Accountant General, & inform-
me for how many days of Subordi-
ary leave, I might be entitled to.
Priv. leave pay, & following is the
offg Dy Accountant General's reply,
dated 6th Inst & No. 180:
"The undersigned has the honor to
state that as you availed yourself
of the adjournment of your Court,
you are not entitled to the month's
Privilege leave, which was at your
credit prior to your joining the
Judicial Dept.
If I am right in attributing Mr.
Fitzgerald's communication, to a general
principle, that taking Court adjourn-
ment, ipso facto, cancels Priv. leave
previously due, I would submit I
cannot find such a ruling —

Mukadunk
Dy. Accountant General

Camp 11

3

(2) I would further represent that Rule II, Privilege Leave, Judicial Officers, that appears to form part of the Finance Act Resolution of 22 Jan'y 1869 No 378, is not at all applicable to my case, it commences, "If any Officer having Priv. Leave & his credit, be appointed to act temporarily (the italic is mine; vide also Rule III; on the other hand, I certainly, was not temporarily in the Judicial Dept, as I spent therein almost 2 continuous years, excepting a few days - In the absence thereof & rule to the contrary, I would submit it is equitable, that my two adjournments having been all interrupted by 19 1/2 months' Judicial Service, I should be held entitled to 2 Priv. Leave, for the 2 1/4 years' Rev. Service."

(3) If however it be maintained that Rule II, above mentioned is applicable to me, I wd represent in the third place, that although the 1 month's Priv. Leave, to which I am entitled on

Per Adair
Adj. Accounts General

Campbell

117
on 31 Oct/68, he considered cancel-
led, in consequence of my having
taken 2 months' leave, when I had
earned only one of it, by Judicial
service, the almost 11 months, which
at the time I entered the Judicial Dept.
were counting towards a second
month's Priv. Leave, cannot be held
to have expired, merely, by my trans-
ference from one department to
another. No doubt, when an officer
goes on Furlough, the precedent ser-
vice, counting towards Priv. Leave,
becomes thereby cancelled & on return
he has to make a fresh start: in
my case, however, the Act, which
thru the 8th Cancel the 11 months, was
not to suit my own convenience,
(as a man's taking Furlough is),
but that of the Public & so on my
being transferred to the Rev. Dept.
last October, on account of Service
emergency, the 11 months must be
considered as having recommenced. Can -

Per Adm.

Adj. Accounts General

Camp

Treasury.

No. 26

Fort Saint George,
Accountant General's Office,

25 April 1871.

FROM THE ACCOUNTANT GENERAL
TO THE GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS,

TO THE *Chief Secretary*
to Government
Madras.

SIR,
With reference to your Memo: 4986 dated 21st instant I have the honor to state that Mr Woodroffe returned from sick leave to Europe on 9th January 1871 and took charge of the Office of Assistant Collector Salem on 25th id. He continued in the Revenue Department without leave of any kind until transferred to the Judicial Department which he joined on 1st November 1870 and left on 12th October 70. During this period he adjourned his Court on two occasions, the last of these adjournments terminated on 21st July 70. He reverted to the Revenue Department as above stated on 12th October 70 and continued therein without any leave up to the 17th March the date on which his present subsidiary leave commenced.

I have the honor to be,
Sir
Your Obedt Servt
M. Madank
C. J. Accounts General

Audit DEPARTMENT.

No 285.

The undersigned has the honor to report that Mr Woodroffe was on furlough by him, entitled to one month's privilege leave when he joined the Judge's Office in October 1868 but this privilege leave must be held to have expired by him having regularly availed himself of each furlough leave since he joined the Judge's Office. The same view was taken of Mr. Daniel's case and approved by Government. His furlough proceedings in the Judge's Office dated 22nd November last, viz 1871.

Mr Woodroffe was however returned to the Revenue Department on 12 October last but as he has not completed eleven months duty since that date he is not entitled to privilege leave and cannot therefore be allowed full salary during his subsidiary leave.

To the Accountant General
of the Madras District
20th April 1871

Perth
C. J. Accounts General

To the Secretary to Government
Revenue Department

Camp 1871



Perth
C. J. Accounts General

18. 4. 71

Perth
C. J. Accounts General

Perth
C. J. Accounts General

Perth
C. J. Accounts General

Perth
C. J. Accounts General

Perth
C. J. Accounts General

Perth
C. J. Accounts General

Perth
C. J. Accounts General

Perth
C. J. Accounts General

Perth
C. J. Accounts General

Camp 1871

Camp H.

Revenue Department.

PROCEEDINGS of the MADRAS GOVERNMENT.

Read the following paper from the

Reporting on Mr. Woodroffe's application for privilege leave pay for so much of his subsidiary leave pay. Stating that Mr. Woodroffe was continuously on duty since his return from last adjournment viz 24th July 1870 up to 17 March 1871 the date on which his subsidiary leave commenced.

Mr. Accountant Genl. H. E. to the Govt. 20th April 1871. Mr. 23rd April 1871. Mr. Secy. to the Govt. 23rd April 1871.

Ordered that the foregoing report be communicated to Mr. Woodroffe. 2. The Govt observe that the 4 months recess enjoyed by Mr. Woodroffe while

N. S. P. J. S. P.

Revenue.

77-1329.

FROM THE ACCT. GENERAL.

TO THE GOVT. OF MADRAS,

To The Secy to Govt. Madras.

Dated 25th April 1871. Received 26th April 1871.

No. ENCLOSURES.

State that Mr. Woodroffe was continuously on duty since his return from last adjournment viz 24th July 1870 up to 17 March 1871 the date on which his subsidiary leave commenced.

No. 328

while in the Judicial
Dept must be con-
sidered as cancelling
all claim to Privilege
leave on account of
previous Revenue Service,
& that since his last
release he has not served
a sufficiently long
time to have earned
leave under the rules.
His application therefore
cannot be complied

with

In C. of J. F. A. Woodroffe Esq. 22 Dec 1830
In S. of J. A. H. L. Esq. 20th Dec 1830

Ed. M. P.

Mr. Woodroffe
 Application for
 Privilege Leave

No.	Dated	No.
	Recd.	
NOS.		

Govt. of M.S. } Muzung

Des. Secy

Mr. Woodroffe, you are
 the Chairman, League
 of Nations.

There is a person
 who is a member of
 the League of Nations
 but it is not
 the same person as
 the one who is a member of
 the League of Nations.