No. 132. Read the following Endorsement of the Accountant-General, Madras, dated Fort St. George, 19th November 1873, No. 409 :—

Read the following Proceedings of the Board of Revenue, dated 14th November 1873, No. 2,308 :—

Read the following letter from H. SEWELL, Esq., Acting Collector of Cuddapah, to H. E. STOKES, Esq., Acting Secretary to the Board of Revenue, dated 9th October 1873, No. 134 :—

Referring to the Notification of 8th May 1873, No. 303, published in the *Fort St. George Gazette*, dated 20th May 1873, page 902, the Accountant-General disallowed Rupees 41-0-6 from the pay of E. Rama Row, Sheristadar of Kadiri Taluq, for twenty-one days absence on privilege leave from 17th March to 6th April 1873, on the ground that he was not entitled to it for having overstayed one day after the Christmas holidays, and his pay for the day stopped and credited to Government.

2. The privilege leave ought not to have been granted by the Acting Sub-Collector, but as it was it seems hard that E. Rama Row should suffer for it.

3. The Acting Sub-Collector having intimated to me that A. Venkatasoobbiah, Revenue Inspector of Kadiri Taluq, was also granted $2\frac{1}{2}$ months privilege leave from 5th June to 19th August last, and that the Treasury Deputy-Collector refuses to pass the salary for the days he was absent on privilege leave, on the ground that he was not entitled to it under the Notification above alluded to, for having absented himself for three days in January last, and his full salary for those days stopped, I request the sanction of the Board for payment of salary now withheld, as the Sub-Collector requests that pay deducted for three days may be considered as a fine imposed on him.

4. In this case also the Sub-Collector should not have granted leave without ascertaining that the applicant was entitled to it. I have pointed out his mistake to him.

Submitted for the orders of Government through the Accountant-General.

2. In one case a man was absent from duty one day after the Christmas holidays in January 1873 and his pay was stopped. The Sub-Collector gave him twenty-one days privilege leave in March, and when he returned to duty the Accountant-General disallowed his pay for that period on the ground that his service having been interrupted by one day's absence in January he was not entitled to Privilege Leave.

3. In the other case a man was absent from duty for three days in January and his pay was stopped. The Sub-Collector gave him $2\frac{1}{2}$ months privilege leave in June, and when he returned the Treasury Deputy-Collector refused his pay on the ground that he was not entitled to the leave because his service was interrupted in January.

4. In both these cases the decision is in accordance with the Notification of the Government of India, dated the 8th May 1873, No. 303, and published in the *Fort St. George Gazette* of the 20th idem, but it is undeniably harsh.

5. The Board think the forfeited pay may be given in these instances as a special case because the date of the Notification was subsequent to the grant of the leave in one, and preceded it by only a short time in the other. They propose to instruct Collectors that in such cases leave without allowances may be granted retrospectively, so that whilst ensuring the adequate punishment of loss of pay the extravagant penalty of losing all claim to privilege leave may not be inflicted.

SUBMITTED for the orders of Government with the remark that the grant of leave without allowances retrospectively as proposed by the Board of Revenue would as much as absence without leave constitute a break in continuity of service and involve forfeiture of privilege leave previously earned.

2. It is to be remarked that officers granting leave in the Mofussil do not appear to pay proper attention to the very plain rules published for their guidance, which if consulted on all occasions before subordinates were granted leave of absence, could not fail to prevent much of the correspondence, delay and inconvenience which now takes place in this and other Government Offices.

No. 133. ORDER THEREON, 11th December 1873, No. 1,393.

Miscellaneous.

UNDER the circumstances stated by the Board of Revenue and agreeably to their recommendation, the Accountant-General is authorized to withdraw the retrenchments in the two instances alluded to, as a special case.

2. As remarked by Mr. Ledwick, proper attention on the part of the officers in the Mofussil to the rules will obviate all such irregularities. The Board will issue a Circular on the subject and inform the Collectors that no exceptions will be made to the rules which are clearly laid down.

3. The Board's attention will be called to paragraph 1 of the Accountant-General's remarks. The best course to be followed when Public servants absent themselves for a day or two without leave, is to treat such absence as casual leave fining them in moderate sums for irregularity in attendance if they are not able to render satisfactory explanation. Longer absence without leave must of course carry with it all the consequences and forfeitures prescribed in the rules.

(True Extract.)

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

To the Board of Revenue.
" the Accountant General.

Edd. G. A. Turton.

Revenue Department

No. 1393

PROCEEDINGS of the MADRAS GOVERNMENT.

Under date the 17th December 1873.

Read the following Proceedings of the Board of Revenue

Submitting for Orders Collector's application for sanction for forgiveness of Salaries of Circle Shanistadar, Colar Range Police of Kadiri Taluq, in Cuddapah Dist., and to Revenue Inspector & Circuit Vakils of that Taluq, for periods of their absence on furlough leaves &c. &c.

(G. O. 14 November 1873 No. 2,308)

Under the circumstances stated by the Board of Revenue in their proceedings, the accompanying G. O. is sanctioned to meet the case, the retrenchments in the establishments allowed to proceed on furlough cease.

2. The usual official letter to Collector & proper attestation pm

to

the part of the Officers in
to the rules
the Masonic will eliminate
all such irregularities - The
Board will issue a Circular
on the subject and inform
the Collectors that no exemp-
tions will be made to the
rules which are clearly
laid down.

3. The Board's attention
will be called to cases of
the Accountants Generals re-
mark. The Lords cannot think
sufficient that Parliament should
be asked to pass an Act, or
even an Order in Council,
every time any slight irregu-
larity in attestation
if they are not able to render
such exemptions

satisfactory explanation.
Proper observance without leave
must of course carry with it
all the consequences annexed for
forfeiture prescribed in
the rules.

14 Pt. 9 Parcel 3 Bx
6 Cent Sec E 312 Box 93