

Government of Madras.

EDUCATIONAL DEPARTMENT.

FOR RECORD ONLY.

MISCELLANEOUS.

Recd.

Regd.

} 1910.

Enclosures

Spare copies

G.O., No. 244, 9th May 1910.

Exemption from the Examination Rules

Sanctioning, with remarks, the permanent exemption from the Sub-overseer and Surveyor's test of M. Subba Rao Nayudu for employment as a second-grade sub-overseer.

Government of Madras.

EDUCATIONAL DEPARTMENT.

FOR RECORD ONLY.

MISCELLANEOUS.

Recd.

Regd.

} 1910.

Enclosures

Spare copies

G.O., No. 244, 9th May 1910.

Exemption from the Examination Rules

Sanctioning, with remarks, the permanent exemption from the Sub-overseer and Surveyor's test of M. Subba Rao Nayudu for employment as a second-grade sub-overseer.

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS.

EDUCATIONAL DEPARTMENT.

READ—the following papers:—

I

G.O., R. No. 415, Educational, dated 9th August 1907.

II

Letter—from S. B. MURRAY, Esq., A.M.I.C.E., Superintending Engineer, II Circle.
To—the Chief Engineer, Public Works Department.
Dated—Bezwada, the 13th January 1909.
No.—541 W.

I have the honour to inform you that in March 1902 one M. Subba Rao Nayudu was appointed a delta superintendent on Rs. 40 *per mensem* in this circle. His qualifications were—

- (1) Draftsman's test, College of Engineering,
- (2) Matriculation and Hand-writing,
- (3) Levelling and Surveying—Intermediate test.

In 1905 he was made sub-overseer, third grade, permanent, on Rs. 40, *i.e.*, Rs. 35 *plus* 5, personal allowance. He had not the necessary qualifications for this appointment, but his exemption was obtained—see your No. 4208 C., dated 22nd August 1907.

2. In 1907 he was favourably reported on by his Executive Engineer, and on 6th August 1907 was promoted to sub-overseer, second grade, on Rs. 40 *per mensem*. The exemption referred to above applies only to the third grade, and I now request you will obtain the sanction of Government to the exemption of the sub-overseer for employment in the second grade.

III

Memorandum No. 5001 C., dated 19th November 1909.

The sub-overseer was promoted to the second grade in August 1907. It is understood that the Examiner objected to the man's promotion, revised his grading by altering it from second to third grade in the accounts for that month and repeated the objection during the succeeding months. The Superintending Engineer's application for exemption read above is dated January 1909. The undersigned is directed to request that an explanation be obtained as to why no notice was taken of the Examiner's objection during the interval between August 1907 and January 1909.

2. The Executive Engineer's explanation should be obtained as to why he signed the certificate required under G.O., No. 2150 W., dated 10th August 1901, to accompany the salary bill every month—to the effect that the sub-overseer required no exemption from the Examination Rules.

C. A. SMITH,
Ag. Chief Engineer, P.W.D.

To the Superintending Engineer, II Circle.

IV

Telegram—from the Chief Engineer, Public Works Department.
To—the Superintending Engineer, II Circle.
Dated—the 23rd February 1910.
No.—856 C.

Please expedite reply to my No. 5001 C., dated 19th November last.

V

Letter—from M.R.Ry. Rao Sahib A. V. RAMALINGA AIYAR Avargal, B.A., B.C.E.,
Executive Engineer, Kistna Western division.
To—the Superintending Engineer, II Circle.
Dated—the 9th December 1909.
No.—511-S.

With reference to your endorsement No. 350-K.W., dated 1st December 1909, on Chief Engineer's Memorandum No. 5001 C., dated 19th November 1909, I have the honour to reply as follows:—

Immediately on the receipt of the Examiner's disallowance list in which the objection was raised the very first time, an extract was communicated to you with this office No. 224-S., dated 25th October 1907, with the request that the necessary sanction of Government may be obtained. As this was however not accorded till December following, the objection was repeated by the Examiner in the disallowance list for October received in this office in December 1907. An extract was again communicated to you with this office No. 253-S., dated 27th January 1908, in reply to which you were pleased to say that the subject would be taken up separately and Chief Engineer addressed. But nothing having been heard, the Examiner repeated the objection again in the disallowance list for May and July 1908, extracts from which were also communicated to you with this office No. 21-S. and No. 50-S., dated 10th August 1908 and 1st October 1908, respectively. Even after the submission of these extracts, the sanction applied for having not been accorded, a special letter was addressed to you in this office No. 610-S., dated 29th November 1908, explaining the urgency of the case. Thus it will be seen that due notice was taken of the Examiner's objection and all the necessary steps that had to be taken were actually taken.

As regards the signing of the certificate, I beg to say that, as there was no actual difference in pay and that the man was entitled to the same pay in either of the grades and that the question of his grading was separately taken up and was under correspondence, I believed there was nothing wrong in my doing so.

Endt. No. 443 W., dated 13th March 1910.

Copy forwarded to the Chief Engineer, Public Works Department, with reference to his letter No. 5001 C., dated 19th November 1909.

Disallowance list extracts were received on four occasions, viz., 25th October 1907, December 1907, August 1908 and October 1908. They were disposed of in the usual way, without copies being maintained, and the necessity for a reference to the Chief Engineer on the subject appears to have been lost sight of until the receipt of a special letter from the Executive Engineer, Kistna Western division, which was received on 30th November 1908. It was then found that the clerk who had been dealing with the matter had neglected to make a reference asking for sanction. This omission is much regretted, and in the circumstances now explained it is requested that the necessary sanction of Government may be obtained.

S. B. MURRAY,
Superintending Engineer, II Circle.

Order—No. 244, Educational, dated 9th May 1910.

M. Subba Rao Nayudu will be exempted from the Sub-overseer and Surveyor's test for appointment with effect from the 6th August 1907 as second-grade sub-overseer. The exemption does not extend to any other or higher appointment.

2. The great carelessness in the office of the Superintending Engineer (Lieut.-Col. W. M. Ellis) firstly with reference to the irregular promotion of Subba Rao Nayudu to the second grade in 1907, and secondly with reference to the omission to act on the Executive Engineer's representation that application for exemption should be made to Government when the Examiner's objection was first received, has not been satisfactorily explained. Such carelessness should not be allowed to recur.

(True Extract.)

L. M. WYNCH,
Ag. Secretary to Government.

To the Public Works Department.

NOTES CONNECTED WITH G.O., No. 244, EDUCATIONAL, DATED
9TH MAY 1910.

[SUBJECT.—*Exemption from the Sub-Overseer's test of M. Subba Rao Nayudu for employment as a Second grade Sub-Overseer.*]

Previous paper.

G.O., No. 415, Educational, dated 9th August 1907.

From the Superintending Engineer, II Circle, No. 541 W., dated 13th January 1909.

Please see G.O., No. 415, Educational, dated 9th August 1907, in which M. Subba Rao Nayudu was, among others, permanently exempted from passing the examination prescribed for the Sub-Overseer and Surveyor class of the College of Engineering for employment as a Third grade Sub-Overseer on a pay of Rs. 35 per mensem.

2. The Superintending Engineer, II Circle now states that as Subba Rao was favourably reported on by the Executive Engineer under whom he was serving, he (Subba Rao) was promoted to the post of a Second grade Sub-Overseer (pay Rs. 40) with effect from 6th August 1907. But as G.O., No. 415, dated 9th August 1907, restricts Subba Rao's appointment as a Third grade Sub-Overseer, the Superintending Engineer requests that Subba Rao may now be exempted from the examination rules for employment as a Second grade Sub-Overseer.

3. One of the main grounds on which Subba Rao Nayudu and 11 others were exempted from the examination rules was that unless they were brought on the reorganised staff "they would have no posts to fall back upon."

Vide Public Works Department note on page 10 of G.O., No. 415 R., dated 9th August 1907.

Page 11 *ibid*

The Secretary (Mr. Taylor) then observed that they might be given exemption only "in respect of the posts specified, but not for further promotion."

4. It is for consideration whether the Superintending Engineer's request may be complied with. If this is done, it is very likely that the same request will be made in respect of the other six candidates exempted in G.O., No. 415, dated 9th August 1907, who are now Second and Third grade Sub-Overseers in order that they may be promoted to higher grades.

P.R.—26-3-09.

No reasons have been urged in support of the present proposal except that the candidate has been favourably reported on by the Executive Engineer. There do not appear to be sufficient grounds for the grant of the further exemption asked for.

K. RANGASWAMI AYYANGAR—29-3-09.

The above is my view.

C. A. SOUTER—29-3-09.

The man has passed Matriculation, Handwriting Test, Draftsman's Test and Surveying and Levelling Test. He has 14 years' service. He is reported to be suitable for promotion and I think it is a mistake when a man has been exempted to take the heart out of him by refusing him promotion when he shows himself fit for promotion. The rule prescribing the Sub-Overseer and Surveyor class certificate has been waived to allow of appointment as sub-overseer and, if he proves himself fit for promotion as sub-overseer, he ought, I submit, to have it.

A. BUTTERWORTH—31-3-10.

This is an instance of what is of frequent occurrence in the Public Works Department. A man is employed by an Executive or Superintending Engineer in defiance of all rules as to qualifications—being thus not only against the definite orders of Government but to the prejudice of Government's getting competent men for their work and also creating a plain discouragement to other men to qualify.

2. After being employed sometime an application for exemption is sought, and the hard case of turning him out after having done work represented. Exemption is grudgingly given limited to a certain grade. The Executive Engineer again in defiance of such limitation promotes the man to a higher grade and then two or three years afterwards applies for further exemption to cover this breach of orders. The hardship of refusal is again represented and so on.

3. It has been more than once pointed out that the Public Works Department cannot expect to find qualified men if a seeker after employment in that department finds it easier to get round an Executive Engineer or the Manager of his office than to undergo studies which will qualify him.

4. In the present case there is no real variation of duties between a 3rd class and a 2nd class overseership: and the man who was exempted only for the purpose of holding the former class of post should not have been given and need not now be given the higher pay of the second grade, and so deprive qualified men of the emoluments to which they are preferentially entitled.

5. What I want to know, in the first place, is how in a case like this the man's pay came to be passed during the last two years? Who is responsible for passing pay to unqualified men? In particular who was the Executive Engineer responsible for the promotion in 1907 and what explanation has he to offer? Until this matter is settled, the man should revert to Rs. 35 pay until further orders. I do not propose to retrench what has been actually paid him.

6. To stop this sort of thing and this trick of forcing the hand of Superintending Engineer, the Chief Engineer and Government, it seems necessary that every pay sheet should show in some way clearly whether the man has qualified for the pay or not. I should like any proposals the Chief Engineer and Secretary to Government, Public Works Department, may have to make in this connection.

7. Mr. Butterworth refers to the hardship to the individual. This hardship is of a hundred times less consequence than the damage to the public service by flooding the department with unqualified men. All our endeavours to improve the execution of works by obtaining a better staff are minimised by action such as has taken place in this case—action which is constantly recurring. Moreover it adds to the corruption of the public service

My meaning merely was that, if exemption is once given, it should be given so as not to restrict promotion in case of merit, for then Government gets only grudging work. I had in view the public interest rather than the individual benefit.

A. BUTTERWORTH.
10-4-09.

for not one of these exemptions is sent forward without bribing the Managers, Head Clerks, etc., in the district offices.

G. S. F[ORBES].
9-4-09.

With reference to paragraphs 1 to 3 of the Honourable Member's note on the previous page, the whole question of these exemptions from examination rules has now been re-examined. Attention is invited to Mr. Davidson's note, dated 6th April 1906, and the Honourable Mr. Forbes' remarks thereon, dated 25th April 1906,

Memo. No. 3630-C., dated 13th June 1906. which have now been added to the file. In these notes, the case for the exemption of men already in the department and who were brought as sub-overseers on the reorganized conservancy staff, has been clearly put. Subba Rao Nayudu, whose exemption for promotion from Sub-overseer, Third to the second grade, is now the subject of consideration, belongs to the class which under the special circumstances detailed in the notes were considered to merit exemption and does not, it is respectfully submitted, answer the description of men who were employed in defiance of all rules as to qualifications.

2. With regard to paragraphs 4 and 5 of the Honourable Member's note, it is submitted that Subba Rao Nayudu drew the maximum pay of the third grade, Rs. 35, plus a personal allowance of Rs. 5. His promotion to the second grade (pay Rs. 35—5—45) does not thus give him any immediate increase of pay and he has not drawn any increased allowance. On the other hand, the personal allowance already paid to him will be absorbed by the promotion.

3. With regard to paragraph 6 of the Honourable Member's note, attention is invited to the terms of a sample form which, under existing rules, has to accompany every monthly salary bill. This form provides, it is submitted, every safeguard for pay being passed only to duly qualified men.

4. This note may be sent to Educational who may be asked to say whether, under the circumstances, a further explanation from the Executive Engineer is necessary.

C.V.—24-6-09.

The promotion of this man has so far been merely on paper, in that he has drawn no extra pay. His exemption and the confirmation of his appointment would have the effect that his personal allowance of Rs. 5 would be absorbed by promotion in due course and he would eventually on further promotion draw another Rs. 5.

Please see Mr. Davidson's notes and the Honourable Member's reply thereto.

P. HAWKINS—29-6-09.

This case is not quite as understood by the Honourable Member. The man has been drawing Rs. 40 per mensem ever since he was appointed as a Delta Superintendent in 1902. Since 1905 his pay has been Rs. 35 as Sub-overseer, third grade, plus Rs. 5, personal allowance. The order of Government of 1907, which exempted him from the requirement as to the Sub-overseer's test only applied to this grade and he cannot thus be promoted without a further Government order.

The point for orders is whether he may be brought on to the second grade by which he may after five years' service rise to Rs. 45 per mensem.

It is probable considering his educational qualifications and his experience that he is quite as useful a subordinate as one who has passed the Sub-overseer test, and in the circumstances I would submit that he might be exempted from the operation of the rule.

If it were decided to rigidly enforce the passing of a Sub-overseer test to the holding of these posts, then I submit that in regard to men appointed, as in this case, before the operation of the rule it would only be fair to give them an opportunity of passing the test now. Practical objections were found to this being done in another case.

Whether the Government permit or do not permit the promotion of this man to the second grade makes no difference in the amount of the pay of Rs. 40 which he has been drawing, but it makes a difference to his prospects as the pay of the second grade is Rs. 35—5—45 and promotion to this grade means a prospect of rising to Rs. 45.

The certificate required to accompany the salary bill seems sufficient to bring to notice any cases where appointments of unqualified men have been made.

F. J. WILSON—2-7-09.

To the Educational Department u.o.

EDUCATIONAL DEPARTMENT.

The file may now be submitted to the Honourable Member with reference to the Hon'ble Sir George Forbes' remarks on page 2 *supra*.

K. RANGASWAMI AYYANGAR—9-7-09.

C. A. SOUTER—10-7-09.

I do not understand the use of the certificate accompanying pay bill. The letter (current file) says that the subject of it, Subba Rao Nayudu, was promoted on 6th August 1907, to Sub-Overseer, Second grade, and now (13th January 1909) the exemption is applied for. How then in the month of August 1907, when this man was promoted without exemption, was the certificate given that he had passed the necessary examination or that exemption had been applied for—neither was the case?

M. H[AMMICK]—12-7-09.

To the Public Works Department u.o.

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.

The salary bill for August 1907 in which Subba Rao Nayudu's promotion to the Second grade is shown together with the certificate (slip O) which accompanied the bill, has been obtained from the Examiner's office and is now put up. Subba Rao Nayudu is not mentioned in the certificate. The Executive Engineer evidently thought that he needed no exemption from the Examination rules, Subba Rao Nayudu

G.O., R. No. 415, Educational, dated 9th August 1907. having had already to be exempted from the Sub-overseer test, when he was

brought on the reorganized conservancy staff as Sub-overseer, Third grade. The Examiner however objected to the promotion and revised the man's grading by altering it from Sub-overseer, Second grade, to Sub-overseer, Third grade, on the accounts for the month of August. The Executive Engineer noted the objection and sent it to the Superintending Engineer for necessary action. The objection was repeated by the Examiner until apparently the Superintending Engineer took action by applying for the man's exemption in

Not here.

W. FRANCIS—31-8-09.

January 1909. These facts have been ascertained from a perusal of the disallowance lists in the Examiner's office.

It will thus be seen that the Executive Engineer gave the certificate in the mistaken view that the man needed no fresh exemption on promotion to the second grade, but that the Examiner, on a scrutiny of the requirements under the certificate, challenged the promotion.

C.V.—18-8-09.

P. HAWKINS—23-8-09.

F. J. WILSON—26-8-09.

To the Educational Department u.o.

EDUCATIONAL DEPARTMENT.

Will Public Works Department please say—

(1) Why the man was given the personal allowance of Rs. 5.

(2) Whether the increments in the pay of second grade overseer (Rs. 35—5—45) are triennial.

(3) What check the Examiner of Public Works Accounts has in his office to prevent omissions from slip certificate O of names which really ought to be in it.

(4) Whether, if (in this present case) the absence of proper exemption had made a difference in the man's pay his pay would have been disallowed in whole or in part by the Examiner pending the receipt of proper exemption. From the note on the preceding page it appears that the Executive Engineer was able successfully to ignore the Examiner's objection from August 1907 to January 1909, but it is not clear whether he would have been able to do so if the objection had been, not merely to the showing of the man as second grade when he should have been third, but to his drawing more pay than he was entitled to.

W. FRANCIS—31-8-09.

To the Public Works Department u.o.

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.

To the Examiner, Public Works Accounts u.o. Will you kindly reply?

C.V.—4-9-09.

P. K. SUBBA AIYAR—4-9-09.

OFFICE OF THE EXAMINER OF PUBLIC WORKS ACCOUNTS.

Herewith the information asked for—

(1) M. Subba Rao was a Delta Superintendent on Rs. 40 per mensem. On the re-organisation of the Conservancy Establishment, sanctioned in G.O., No. 1272 W., dated 10th July 1905, he was brought on the Lower Subordinate Establishment with effect from 1st November 1905, as a Sub-Overseer, third grade, and was given Rs. 35 as pay and Rs. 5 as personal allowance—Civil Service Regulations, article 157-A (b).

(2) The increments of second grade sub-overseers are quinquennial—Public Works Department Code, Volume I, paragraph 14, page 8.

(3) The Examiner, Public Works Accounts, has no means of preventing the omission of names that ought to be included in the certificates attached by heads of offices to salary bills. The heads of offices are responsible either that the men for whom salary is claimed, are qualified under the examination rules, or that action has been taken to obtain exemption. This procedure was approved of by Government in G.O., No. 2150 W., dated 10th August 1901.

(4) If the absence of proper sanction (in the present case) had made a difference in the man's pay, the difference would have been disallowed pending receipt of sanction to exemption. The Examiner is not able to recover personally disallowances made by him in audit, as payments are made by the Executive Engineers themselves. Public Works Department Code, paragraph 1205, however requires the Executive Engineers to recover in full, and without question, from next payment to the officer concerned amounts retrenched by the Examiner. Such recovery is without prejudice to the final decision on the point in dispute. If such amounts are not recovered they appear in the accounts as items "paid but not audited" and are reported monthly to the Superintending Engineer for orders.

A. L. WRIGHT—2-10-09.

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.

The Examiner's replies may be sent u.o. to the Educational Department.

C.V.—14-10-09.

P. HAWKINS—15-10-09.

To the Educational Department u.o.

EDUCATIONAL DEPARTMENT.

Please see Honourable Member's note on page 4 above. The subsequent notes show that M. Subba Rao's name was not included in the certificate for August 1907 because, apparently the Executive Engineer, who has to give the certificate, thought that his exemption as a sub-overseer, though only for the third grade, covered his employment as a sub-overseer of the second grade. This seems

rather thin. The notes on page 5 *supra* show that the Examiner has to trust Yes. He must depend on the Executive Engineers for this.

M.H.

This is what is so wrong.

M.H.

is paid more than he should be, the Examiner can effectually disallow his pay in whole or in part.

2. As Executive Engineers are entirely responsible, therefore, that a man is not paid a salary for which he is not qualified by examination rules or exemptions therefrom, it seems that Public Works Department may be asked to deal with the Executive Engineer who omitted the man from the certificate for August 1907.

M.H.

3. Orders are solicited on the main issue—whether this man should be exempted for promotion to sub-overseer, second grade. The notes on page 1 *supra* discuss the point.

W. FRANCIS—19-10-09.

A I will not exempt this man until I see what explanation is offered for the neglect of the Superintending Engineer to take any notice of the Examiner's objection to the man drawing pay he was not entitled to. It looks as if it

There is no overdrawn pay—*vide* page 3.

would be a good thing to recover all the overdrawn pay from the Engineer. The

Public Works Department Establishment seem to care nothing for their Examiner and the Examiner seems to be a careless auditor. I should like to see how an officer in the Revenue line would be treated by the Accountant-General in similar circumstances.

M. H[AMMICK]—20-10-09.

W. FRANCIS—21-10-09.

To the Public Works Department *u.o.*

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.

A draft memorandum to the Superintending Engineer, II Circle, is submitted for approval. With regard to the remark at A above, the man has not drawn any increased pay as has already been explained. This may be pointed out to Edu-

This has already been pointed out—*vide* page 3

tional when returning the file with the explanation now called for from the Superintending Engineer, II Circle.

C.V.—2-11-09.

P. HAWKINS.

12-11-09.

You had better also call for Mr. Ramalingam Aiyar's explanation for signing the certificate to the effect that the sub-overseer was exempted.

C. A. SMITH—13-11-09.

Paragraph 2 has been added to the draft embodying Secretary's direction and is submitted for approval.

C.V.—15-11-09.

Issue.

P.H.—18-11-09.

[Memorandum No. 5001 C., dated 19th November 1909.]

Telegram to Superintending Engineer, II Circle, dated 23rd Feb. 1910, No. 856 C.

From the Superintending Engineer, II Circle, dated 13th March 1910, No. 443 W.

The Executive Engineer's and the Superintending Engineer's explanations have been received.

The Executive Engineer appears to have taken the requisite steps to obtain the man's exemption. His signing the certificate to the effect that the sub-overseer needed no exemption is explained as due to the sub-overseer drawing the same pay he would draw on promotion and that, as the question of the man's grading was under correspondence, he believed there was nothing wrong in signing the certificate. The delay in applying for sanction occurred in the Superintending Engineer's office. The clerk who dealt with the matter neglected to make a reference asking for sanction. The omission is regretted by the Superintending Engineer who asks that the requisite sanction may now be obtained.

C.V.—16-3-10.

P. HAWKINS—18-3-10.

It is not the case that this man has drawn pay to which he is not entitled—*vide* page 3 of the notes, also page 5 showing how his pay of Rs. 40 became Rs. 35 + Rs. 5.

F. J. WILSON—21-3-10.

To the Educational Department *u.o.*

EDUCATIONAL DEPARTMENT.

Honourable Member's query at A on page 6 *supra* has been answered by the Chief Engineer's note, dated 21st March 1910 above.

K. RANGASWAMI AIYANGAR—25-3-10.

The responsibility has now been traced. It has to be divided between the Executive Engineer and the Superintending Engineer. Please note from Public Works Department Code or the current file whether the promotion of 6th August 1907 (which was irregular and ought to have been known to be irregular) was made by the Superintending Engineer; also from Civil List or otherwise the names of the Executive Engineer and Superintending Engineer from 6th August 1907 to 30th November 1908.

A. GALLETTI—25-3-10.

Please see paragraph 293 (O) on page 97 of the Public Works Department Code, Volume I, under which the Superintending Engineers have the power to promote, on the occurrence of vacancies, Lower Subordinates and Petty and Office establishments.

2. In paragraph 2 of his letter No. 541 W., dated 13th January 1909, the Superintending Engineer states thus:—

"In 1907 he (Subba Rao Nayudu) was favourably reported on by his Executive Engineer, and on 6th August 1907 was promoted to Sub-Overseer, second grade on Rs. 40 per mensem." From this also it would appear that the promotion of the 6th August 1907 was made by the Superintending Engineer on the favourable report of the Executive Engineer.

3. During the period extending from 6th August 1907 to 30th November 1908 the office of Superintending Engineer, II Circle, was held by Lieutenant-Colonel William Montague Ellis, R.E., and that of Executive Engineer, Kistna Western division, was held by M.R.Ry. A. V. Ramalinga Aiyar, B.A., B.C.E., Rao Sahib.

K. RANGASWAMI AIYANGAR—1-4-10.

A. GALLETTI—1-4-10.

There is no overdrawn pay to be recovered or refunded in the case. Overseer was on Rs. 35 + 5 (personal allowance). On promotion he drew pay Rs. 40 and the personal allowance became merged in the pay.

The Superintending Engineer's office are responsible for the neglect to obtain exemption when the overseer was promoted in the first instance on 6th August 1907 and secondly for taking no action on the Executive Engineer's representations that application should be made to Government when the Examiner's objection was first received. The Examiner would appear to have been very long suffering in the case.

He is a Matriculate, has passed Handwriting, Draftsman's Test, Surveying and Levelling, and has about 15 years' service and is reported fit for promotion.

L. M. WYNCH--3-4-10.

M. II[AMMICK]—5-4-10.

Draft for Secretary.

R. F. AUSTIN—7-4-10.

The draft order placed below is submitted for approval. If approved, it may issue with the concurrence of the Public Works Department.

P.R.—9-4-10.

K. RANGASWAMI AIYANGAR—9-4-10.

A. GALLETTI—12-4-10.

L. M. WYNCH—13-4-10.

To the Public Works Department u.o.

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.

The draft order may be accepted in this department.

C.V.—20-4-10.

May be accepted.

P. HAWKINS—3-5-10.

Accepted in Public Works Department.

F. J. WILSON—5-5-10.

To the Educational Department.

EDUCATIONAL DEPARTMENT.

Issue.

L. M. WYNCH—7-5-10.

[G.O., No. 244, Educational, dated 9th May 1910.]

READ ALSO:—

C. No. 631, From the Supdy Engineer, II Circle, No. 541 W., dated 13-1- 1909.

2653 W, do 443 W, 13-3-1960

" "? " " , " ? " 19

O R D E R.

No. 244, dated 9. 5. 1910

(To be printed for record only.)

M. Subba Rao Nayudu will be exempted from the Sub-overseer and Surveyor's test for appointment with effect from the 6th August 1907 as second grade Sub-overseer. The exemption does not extend to any other or higher appointment.

2. The great carelessness in the office of the Superintending Engineer (Lt. Col. W.M. Ellis) firstly with reference to the irregular promotion of Subba Rao Nayudu to the second grade in 1907, and secondly with reference to the omission to act on the Executive Engineer's representation that application for exemption should

2.

should be made to Government when the Examiner's objection was first received, has not been satisfactorily explained. Such carelessness should not be allowed to recur.

12/16

13/4/10

To

The P.W.D.

✓ Despatch
1075710.

9

