0/y. 3,000—5-8-98.

Revenue (1898) Department.

MISCELLANEOUS SERIES.

G.O., No. 3/33

DATED 26th July 98

[Despatch Abstract.]

Stating that the Govt sees no reason to interfere on behalf of Syed Jehal Sahib, late Attender, Coll's Office, Trivandy, in the matter of his retirement from Service

BACK PAPERS.

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

FURTHER PAPERS.

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

Revenue (1898) Department.

G.O. Misc No: 3133 d/26th July 1898

CURRENT No. 4763.

The Govt. see no reason to interfere on the petitioners behalf.

25/7/98

To the petitioner
~~Order~~
The collector of Tinnevelly
with their return

29-7-98

Endorsement R.

Transferred to the Pension Department.

The pension Dept. has nothing to do with appeals from orders directing a man's retirement - only issue late briefs

22/7/98

Ag: Under Secy. to Govt.

Octacamund,
July 1898

To the Pension Deptt.

From The Collector of Tinnevelly

Rep. in Petn. Cn. **No.** 136 / 1898.

Dated 9th & 5 July 1898.

Received 11 "

Registered 15 "

Enclosures Five.

Spare copies

SUBJECT.

Submitting the appeal petition of Syed Jelal Sahib late attender Collector's office Tinnevelly against the order of his retirement from Service.

BACK PAPERS.

G O.	No.	Department.	Date.
Lo	86 oR	d 19-5-98.	

FURTHER PAPERS.

G O.	No.	Department.	Date.

PC 1312
95

RECEIVED
15 JUN. 1898
DEPUTY COLLECTOR OF

Put up to Board
4.6 PM

Give credit to India Stock
Have Return

56 5d

original Memorial
The N. Reports have
land with Memorialist
Appeal. It is in the
Acc. of the Case: But
Col. of the history of
Severin is here. +
is put up:—
on the petition
appeals. It Bd have
sanctioned the Payt
of an unbuilt Godown
of 42 Rs:

Yes sir
7.6.98

Sir

His Excellency
the Right Honorable
The Governor in Council
Fort Saint George

Through the Collector
of Tinnevelly.

May it please your
Excellency.

That the
memorialist begs to
appeal on the following
among other grounds
against the Proceedings
of the Board of Revenue,
Land Revenue No 1028
mis dated 22nd April
1898 declining to interfere
with the order of the acting
Collector retiring the
memorialist from
1st April 1898.

D. The memorialist
was first appointed
by Mr R. H. Puckle
the then Collector of the

District and was transferred to the Surgeon as attender on equal pay on 10-7-74. Ever since he had been doing his duty without any fault.

II. In the year 1876 Mr. G. S. Forbes the then Collector of this District sent the memorialist for the examination of the District Surgeon as to his fitness for further service. The District Surgeon certified that the memorialist was fit to be retained in service for some years more. In the year 1876 Mr. A. W. B. Digges the permanent Collector of the District after personal inspection & examination retained the memorialist in service.

III. In February 1878 on the list of persons who attained the age of 55 years the acting Collector ordered the Treasury Deputy

Collector to enquire and report as to whether the individuals referred to in the list were willing to retire or to be retained in the service. The Treasury Deputy Collector recommended the retention of all the individuals in service for one year more of whom the memorialist was one.

IV. The acting Collector in approving the recommendation ordered the memorialist alone to retire from 1st April 1878. While the memorialist is quite able to serve for some years more.

V. According to memorialist's horoscope he reckons his age is 57 while according to the age entered in the Service Book he is 61 years old. When the memorialist was discovered in the Imminently Today he was sent back

for Collection in the villages. At that time the Taluq people without ascertaining from him the real age, entered an approximate age in the Service Register. After the transfer of the memorialist to the Nuzvid he came to know that a wrong age had been entered therein and showing his horoscope to Mr. S. R. Locke & M. R. Ry C. Narasayya Pantulu &c. requested them to Correct the age in the Service Register. They ordered that the memorialist might be retained in Service as long as he was able to do his duty & that the entry in the Service Register would not affect his retention after his sixtieth year. The memorialist has shown the Horoscope to all the former Collectors and represented to them the above facts.

VI. On 27-1-98 memorialist represented everything in writing to the acting Collector and prayed for retention for one year more as he is only 57 years old according to his horoscope and not 61. The 1st endorsement was then given to the petitioner. Again on 8-3-98 he sent in another petition stating all the facts, for which the 2nd endorsement was given.

VII. The acting Collector subsequent to the order refusing the petitioner from 1st April 1898 has ordered one Sudalaimuthu Kone who was transferred from Provincial Service to Local Funds as attender and who has completed 34 years Service and has attained the age of 64 years to be retained in Service for one year more.

VIII. The Board's Standing

order on the subject says
that the ~~memorial~~ Memidl. Servants
may be retained in Service
as long as they are able
enough to do the work.
The Memorialist is able
to Serve for some more
years as was certified
by the District Surgeon
last year.

IX. The Memorialist
has served the Government
for 28 years without any
fault to the entire Satis-
faction of his Superiors
and hoped to eat the
Government Salt till
his life time. It is unjust
that the Memorialist
after a Good Service
of 28 years should be
ordered to retire without
any pension for his
future maintenance
while persons who have
put in more than 30 years
Service and who are very old
and infirm are allowed
to Continue in Service.

X. The Memorialists

former

further begs to represent
that one Mukhia Pallac
Jallah Hazuri Treasury
whose name was included
in the list of persons of
55 years old, was ordered
to appear before the District
Surgeon who examined
him & certified that he
might be retained in
Service for another year.

XI. It is not understood
why the Memorialist alone
who is stronger than any
of the individuals who are
retained in the Service should
be ordered to retire even
without giving him the
benefit of Medical exa-
mination

XII. That in order to
earn a pension the Memo-
rialist has to Serve the
Government for some
2 or 3 years more for
which he is quite able
and strong enough and
if he is made to retire
now he is to get only
a gratuity which is
not quite a recompence
for his long & ~~useful~~

Order on the Subject of
unblemished
~~Sincere~~ Service of 28 years.

XIII. That further it is
unjust to deprive the Memo-
rialist even before complet-
ing 30 years Service which
may entitle him to a
pension inasmuch
he has served 28 years and
is strong enough to serve
for some more years.

XIV. That the Memorialist
most humbly prays that
your Excellency may be
graciously pleased to take
pity on the Case of the poor
Memorialist and to order
his retention in Service
till his Completing 30 years
Service or if he is found
unfit for further Service
on Medical Examination
to Confine 2 or 3 years
Service & to grant him
a pension.

For which act
of charity and benevolence
the Memorialist shall as
in duty bound ever pray.

4th June 1828.

Mr. Mahony

Report Petn Case No 1312/98.

Submitted to Government.

2. The order directing petitioner to retire from 1st April 1898 was passed by the Acting Collector Mr. Clegg after personal inspection of the petitioner. The appellant's petition to the Board of Revenue was submitted by Mr. Clegg with the following Endorsement:—

"Submitted to the Board of Revenue.

"There is nothing on record to "verify the appellant's statements "regarding the age entered in his "service register from which it "appears he is 61 years and eleven "months old; and as for the horos- "-cope, there is nothing to show that "it has ever been produced before. "In 1894 when he was sent to the "District Surgeon for medical exami- "-nation, it was stated in the "District Surgeon's Certificate that "he was then about 57 years old. "I think the age in his service register "must be taken to be correct. I "have personally seen all the old "servants before passing orders "regarding their retirement. This "appellant appeared to me to be old "and feeble and fully 61 years of "age and I consequently retired "him. The service register has been "sent to the Accountant General "with the application for gratuity."

The Board of Revenue declined to interfere with the acting Collector's order and granted petitioner a gratuity of Rs 42.

Received 9 Nov 98

Collector

Read Triennially Collectors Report
Petition C. No 1312 of 1898
(C. No. 4963)

In the Under Secy:-

The petitioner Syed Jalal Sahib late an attender in the Collector's office Trichy Dt. was retired from service with effect from 1st April 1898 by Mr Clegg then Collector of the Dt. as according to his service register the petitioner was 61 years old at the time and on personal examination he appeared old and feeble. On appeal the Board of Revenue declined to interfere on his behalf and he now appeals to Govt.

2. The petitioner states.—

(1) That the age given in his service register is incorrect and that according to his horoscope (which is now produced and which he states was shown to various officers from time to time) he is only 57;

(2)

(2) That he is strong and able enough to work and that persons younger than himself have been retained in service; and

(3) That as his service is only 28 years he is eligible only for a gratuity and that if he served two years longer he would get a pension.

The petitioner accordingly requests that he may be retained in service for a few years longer as he is able to discharge his duties.

3. In submitting the petition Mr Higgins invites attention to the endorsement of Mr Clegg on the petitioners appeal to the Board. He states that there was nothing on record to show that the horoscope was ever [illegible] before; that the age in the register, according to which the petitioner was 61 years and [illegible] old, must be taken to be correct as in 1894 the Dr Lumsden mentioned the petitioner was and that he was then about 57 and that he had personally seen all the old servants before passing orders regarding their retirement. He also observed:- "The appellant appeared to me to be old and feeble and fully 61 years of age and I consequently retired him".

4. Submitted that in these circumstances there seems no reason to interfere on the petitioners behalf. Please see a draft order put up on the back of the current.

WPR
14.7.98

Seen
MG
25/7/98

Horace Rabener Esq
S.R. 29/7