

Revenue (1897) Department.

MISCELLANEOUS SERIES.

G.O., No. 2601

DATED 21st May

[Despatch Abstract.]

Declaring that, under Art. 1225 of the C.S.B.,
Mr. Popond's presence & that of the establishment
accompanying him viz, a clerk & two peons is
required on duty during their stay at Cotacambid
which shall be limited to 2 months.

BACK PAPERS.

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

FURTHER PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.	G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.
Cuo	1826/03						

Revenue (1897) Department.

D.O.
CURRENT No. 85

Order

From

J. Storrock, Esquire,
Ootacamund

No.

Dated 13th May 1897

Received 13.5.97

Registered 14.5.97

Enclosures

Spare copies

SUBJECT.

Reg. Mr. Popert's residence
at Ootacamund.

BACK PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

FURTHER PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

REVENUE DEPARTMENT.

D.O. No. 85

From the Hon: Mr Sturrock

Dated 13th May 1897.

FOR ORDERS.

The Hon: Mr Goss C.E.

~~The Hon: Mr Blair C.E.~~

Mr Popert is required on duty at Ootacamund, because he is not allowed to go there he will take privilege leave. There is nothing in Art 1225 which implies that the duty must be special or local. Accordingly I think a certificate might be given as regards travelling expenses provided Mr Popert and Messrs at Ootacamund 2 months. But apparently Mr P & his set are with them be entitled to daily allowances for 10 days. I do not think it would be right to give Mr P. any such allowance. The set are with want daily allowances for the full period. How can these difficulties be got over?

JG
17/5/97

C 15797
11/5/97

A D.O. from Mr Sturrock regarding Mr Popert's residence at Ootacamund is submitted for information and orders. Mr Sturrock, it will be seen, points out that the concession granted to Mr Popert in G.O. No 1555 of 20th March 1897 has not been of any material benefit to him as under Art 1221 of the C.E.R. he would, in case he avails of it, have to pay out of his pocket not only the travelling allowance expenses of himself and his establishment but also ^{States} ~~that~~ the latter. Mr Sturrock ~~thinks~~ ^{thinks} that Mr Popert is now eligible ^{an can get a medical certificate} for privilege leave, but that it


Revenue Board Office,

(Land Revenue),

Camp MADRAS, 10th

13th May 1897

1897

W.A.
My dear Stokes,

L.G.O. No 1555 his D/20-3-97

Govt has permitted report to reside
at Ottacumund during this hot weather.
Under this wording it appears that
owing to the provisions of Sec 122 of the
C. S. Regulations he will have to pay
his own way here and that of his
establishment - besides giving bath
to his establishment while it is here.

You will remember that in support of the proposal that he should be allowed to come to city I wrote to you D. O. mentioning - amongst other things - that he was entitled to ^{leave} privilege, and could no doubt get a medical certificate in support of an application for leave.

It is undoubtedly in the public interest that he should carry on his work without a break, but as matters now stand he not only gains nothing by continuing to do Govt. work, but

will be actually out of pocket by the amount he has to pay to his establishment and I think that in the circumstances it would only be fair for Govt. to declare under Sec 1225 of the C. S. Regs that his presence is required on duty throughout the period - which might - if Govt. so desires - be reduced to two months. Mr. Roberts writes that he has no intention of drawing halting allowance while up here were it admissible. He only wants his fair up and down and

halting allowances for a clerk and
two privs -

I would be obliged if you would
obtain the early orders of Genl. as
this matter - I write D.O. as I am
here on tour and move out into
camp in a few days.

Yours sincerely

J. Hurrook

Revenue Board Office,
(Land Revenue),
MADRAS.

17 May 1897.

My dear Stokes,

As I go into camp
to-morrow (Pykara & Kudiwallam)
I should be glad if you would let
Pepant-Kuar direct the orders that
may be passed on my D.O. about
his staying on the hills. - He is with
Banglas at Sandrock - a letter
addressed to the only Post Office
will find me.

Yours sincerely
Sturrock

D.O. No. 85

From the Hon: Mr Sturrock

Dated 13th May 1897.

FOR ORDERS.

BACK PAPERS.

G.O.	No	Department.	Date.

FURTHER PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

The Hon: Mr Goss C. E.

~~The Hon: Mr Sturrock~~ ^{with ref to his}

Mr Popert is regimented on duty at Ootacamund, because if he is not allowed to go there he will take privilege leave. There is nothing in Art 1225 which implies that this duty must be special or local. Accordingly I think a certificate might be given as regards travelling expenses provided Mr Popert only stays at Ootacamund 2 months. But apparently Mr P & his set are with them be entitled to daily allowances for 10 days. I do not think it would be right to give Mr P. any such allowance. The set are with want daily allowances for the full period. How can these difficulties be got over?

JG
17/5/97

A D.O. from Mr Sturrock regarding Mr Popert's residence at Ootacamund is submitted for information and orders. Mr Sturrock, it will be seen, points out that the concession granted to Mr Popert in G.O. No. 1555 of 20th March 1897 has not been of any material benefit to him as under Art 1221 of the C.R. he would, in case he avails of it, have to pay out of his pocket not only the travelling allowance expenses of himself and his establishment but also ^{states} that the latter. Mr Sturrock ~~thinks~~ that Mr Popert is now eligible ^{an can get a medical certificate} for privilege leave, but that it

halting allowance for
10 days only (Mr Popert under-
standing not to draw halting
allowance for himself).

It is not clear whether
Mr Popert wishes to forgo
T.A. for his clerk & peons
& whether he does not
want his clerk & peons
to get halting allow-
ance for the whole 2 months
under Act 1159(b). A D.O.
to Mr Smurrock to put up-

Do.

My dear Smurrock

In your D.O.

of the 13th inst regarding
Popert's visit to you, you
say (of Popert) "He only
~~wants his fare up & down~~
~~& halting~~ " Mr Popert
writes that he has no
intention of drawing
halting allowance ^{while} up
here even if admissible.
He only wants his fare
up & down & halting
allowance for a clerk
& 2 peons. Am I to
understand that Mr Popert

Mr Popert + his clerk & peons
may have T.A. up & down
but the peons cannot have
halting allowance for more
than 10 days.

JS
21/5/97

forgoes the claim for
T.A. up & down for his
clerk & 2 peons as well
as that for halting
allowance for himself?
And with regard to halting
allowance for his clerk
& 2 peons does he
wish them to ^{be entitled to} draw it
during the whole 2 months
under Act 1159(b) or for
10 days only?

Wiles
19/5/97

