

Educational (191 /) Department.

ORDINARY MS.

G.O., No. 474

DATED 15-7-11.

21

[Despatch Abstract.]

Dismissal.

Declining to interfere
on behalf of K. Srinivasarayan, Sub-protem
Supervisor of Elementary Schools in
regard to his appeal against the proceedings
of the D.P.S. in removing him from
foot-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.

[E & L.]
68
2,100-15-5-39.

EDUCATIONAL DEPARTMENT.

CURRENT FILE.

CONTENTS.

From	Number.	Date.	Pages.
CM-584. K. Sooryanarayana		3. 3. 11	1 to 7
memo	504-1	3-5-11	8
[1640] D.P. 9.	1574/11	7-7-11	9 to 21

Papers of the department to which the current belongs.

Number.	Date.	Original (=O.) or spare copy (=S. C.)	Remarks. (In this column such of the papers as have been removed for copying, printing, etc., should be marked with a cross.)	Initials of Referencer with date in token of return to Reference department.

Papers of other departments.

Department.	Number.	Date.	Original (=O.) or spare copy (=S. C.)	Despatcher to note the return of the papers to the departments concerned.



EPEN-504
Regd-8-3-11
3

To

His Excellency the Governor in Council,
M a d r a s.

Encl. No.

Through

Transferred to the Director of
Public Instruction
Amended 7-11-11

The Director of Public Instruction,

M a d r a s.

East of George

14-3-11

AP

14-2-11

NO

14-3-11

By Secretary.

15-5-11

The humble petition of Kandala Sooryanarayana, late sub-
protem Supervisor of Elementary Schools, Ellamanchily in the
Vizagapatam District, sheweth that

1. The petitioner entered the Educational Department in 1898 as a teacher in the Board Primary School, Narasapatam.
2. The petitioner was made a permanent Board Supervisor in the year 1904 and was retained as a subprotem Supervisor in the provincialization of the office in 1909.
3. The petitioner thus put in a service of 12 years in the Department and has passed all the necessary tests required of a Supervisor for promotion.
4. The work and conduct of the petitioner have never -- been subjected to criticism all these years.
5. In the year 1908 when proposals were submitted for -- provincialization of the Supervisors' services M.R.Ry. Babu Sesibhushana Palit the then Assistant Inspector of Schools -- found the petitioner's work to be satisfactory and made him a subprotem Supervisor.
6. In the year 1909 M.R.Ry. Ch. Bhagavanulu Pantulu the present Assistant Inspector of Schools took charge and to the petitioner's misfortune commenced to lay out foundations.

22
h
to see him ruined for the reasons shown in the petitioner's explanation submitted to the Inspector of Schools on 2-11-1910

7. The Assistant Inspector not having succeeded in open enquiries in central classes began to encourage School masters in the range to make false statements against the Supervisor.

8. Accordingly the Board Elementary School masters at -- Ellamanchily and a few others in the petitioner's range being emboldened at the formidable prop of the Assistant Inspector gave statements before him against the petitioner behind his back.

9. The sum and substance of the complaints constitutes the following offences.

(a) That the Supervisor made a false entry in his diary on the 17th of June 1910 as having inspected the Board School at Satya/varam, while he did no inspection but only visited the school on the following day i.e., 18th evening.

(b) That the Ellamanchily teachers paid a sum of Rs65 to the Supervisor for being transmitted to the superior offices in order to secure their confirmation in their posts.

(c) That the Supervisor took a loan of Rs100 from S. Buchi-sastry a teacher of Pulaparti in the sub-range.

10. The petitioner before entering on his explanations for the above three items begs leave to add that the items of charges are only inferences drawn from the lengthy enquiry and correspondence but that the petitioner was not furnished with any -- definite and formal charges against him in respect of any item.

11. That the charge against item (a) is false is quite clear from the following facts.

(1) The complainant himself gave a voucher dating 17th of June 1910 and noting the station as Satyavaram to the effect -- that he was supplied with service postage stamps by the Supervisor

3

Supervisor whereas he states in his complaint that his school was visited by the Supervisor on the evening of the 18th June and not on the 17th.

(2) The complaint was made on the 19th of July i.e., the very next day on which the Sub-Assistant Inspector visited his school and remarked very seriously against his bad work. The delay in making the complaint and that, immediately after the Sub-Assistant's unfavourable remarks on his school is very --- significant.

(3) The then Assistant teacher of the same school directly contradicts the statement of the complainant.

(4) The statement of the Brahmin gentleman in whose house the petitioner was fed on the day of his visit to the village is also in favour of the petitioner.

(5) The statements obtained by the petitioner from the Salt Sub-Inspector Payakaraopeta, Branch Post master, Village Karnam and Board School master of Pentakota, Village officers of Sri-rampuram completely exculpate the Supervisor. All these were enclosed with the explanation submitted to the Director on --- 23--11--1910.

12. That the charge against item (b) is equally false is clear from the following facts.

(1) Under the instructions of Mr. Yates, the then Inspector of Schools, who was not pleased with the work of the school, M.R.Ry. Babu Palit the then Assistant Inspector of schools --- abstained from recommending the confirmation of the Ellamanchi-ly teachers and appointed them on probation for one year. After the probationary period, he was pleased with their work and -- recommended their confirmation. From this it is evident that the Supervisor could have had no part whatever in getting the teachers confirmed. This being evident, the complainant -----

4
6

complainant teachers, it cannot be believed even for a moment, would be so foolish as to entrust the money to one who could not help them in any way.

(2) That the supposed transaction refers to a time two and a half years previous to the enquiry is quite significant and it was not at all supported by any independent evidence.

(3) That with no formal complaint secret depositions were taken from the teachers proves the attitude of the Assistant -- Inspector towards the petitioner.

(4) That the petitioner found it necessary in the discharge of his duties as Supervisor to record and report the unsatisfactory work of the teachers in face of clear and numerous --- instructions from himself and the Sub-Assistant Inspector. This must have placed the teachers in a tepid state which soon ---- reached its boiling point when they are confident in the heat of wrath of the Assistant Inspector against the petitioner.

(5) That Assistant Inspector's construction on the petitioner's cross questioning of the complainant's that the petitioner indirectly admitted the charge is a misconstruction as clearly explained in the petitioner's explanation offered to the Director of Public Instruction on 23--11--1910.

13. The charge under item (c) was a dead letter to which life was instilled by the Assistant Inspector by encouraging the teacher. The loan was taken when the petitioner was in -- straightened circumstances and when the petitioner was not a Government servant. It was liquidated and the documents returned duly endorsed by the claimant long before the Assistant Inspector took statement from the teacher Suo moto. That this man was set up by the Assistant Inspector is clear from the record of the enquiry made by the Inspector in which he deposed that he was compelled by the Assistant Inspector to make false statements and that the statement he made was nothing but the dicta-
ti

-5- 1

dictation of the Assistant Inspector. No complaint was ever made by him against the petitioner.

14. That though the whole record of enquiry was only on record since the witnesses cited in defence of the petitioner were not made to appear before the Inspector yet there are, on record, the most important portions in favour of the petitioner to the following effect.

(1) That the complainants were set up by the Assistant Inspector.

(2) That witnesses were first examined by the Assistant Inspector just before they were presented before the Inspector -- and those that happened to speak the truth were rejected.

(3) That the Assistant Inspector even wrote a letter to -- some requesting them to give evidence against the petitioner and with all that they sent statements in favour of the petitioner.

(4) That the witnesses were even compelled to give statements against the petitioner.

15. That the Assistant Inspector was prejudiced with this unfortunate petitioner may also be seen even from the moment he took charge when in his recommendations for the petitioner's confirmation as Supervisor he remarked to the petitioner that his probation would be made to cease. The petitioner also begs to point out that the Assistant Inspector having failed in all the above attempts purposely made this a point in his tours to blast the prospects of this unfortunate young petitioner whose probation was ceased by the Director of Public Instruction. A copy of the order is herein enclosed. On receipt of the order by the petitioner from the Sub-Assistant Inspector's office -- Ellamanchili on 5-12-1910, he handed over charge of the office the same evening and has since then been vacant.

-6-

6

16. The petitioner places the above facts before His Excellency and begs that they may be verified with the record which is completely filed in Director's office. Though the petitioner prayed for copies of all the records filed they have not as yet been favoured to him and hence copies could not be enclosed.

17. Last though not least that the petitioner a young man, fully qualified was thus broken down in the midst of his career for no fault of his, that he put in twelve years service and that he was unjustly deprived of his hard earned footing.

18. That the petitioner therefore most humbly approaches His Excellency to beg that the entire records in the case may be kindly perused with a kind appreciation of the evidence and that he may be restored to his appointment.

19. That the petitioner begs to add that he submitted his original petition through the Director of Public Instruction -- and a copy direct to His Excellency.

The petitioner most humbly begs to remain,

K. Sooryanarayana

3rd March 1911

Lathi Subprotim Supervisor

Elementary Schools

Elamanchili Sub Ra

Vizagapatam District

Address.

K. Sooryanarayana,

Nemarivari house, Tittivari Street,

Vizagapatam.

2
9
OFFICIAL MEMORANDUM

-----e0o-----

Moulani Muhammed Auzam Sahib Bahadur, B.A. Acting Inspector
Schools, I Circle.

R.C.No.3110 of 1910, Dated 2nd Dec: 1910.

In Proceedings R.C.No.7000 of 1910 dated 12-11-10 the ---
Director of Public Instruction has approved the recommendation
of the Inspector of Schools that the probation of K. Sooryana-
rayana, subprotem Supervisor, Ellamanchili Sub range be termi-
nated.

2. The Sub-Assistant Inspector of Schools, Ellamanchili
Range is requested to communicate a copy of this order to Sur-
yanarayana and relieve him at once. He will have charge of the
office of the Supervisor until the vacancy is filled up.

(Signed) Muhammed Auzam,

Ag: Inspector of Schools.
I Circle.

To the Sub-Assistant Inspector of Schools, Ellamanchili Range.
Copy to the Assistant Inspector of Schools, Vizagapatam Dist.

R.C.No. 415 of 10 dated 5-12-10.

(True Copy)

Communicated to K. Suryanarayana, Supervisor of Elementary
Schools, Ellamanchili Sub range for information and handing over
charge of the records in this office this forenoon.

5th December 1910.

(signed) James M. Bhaktul,

Sub-assistant Inspector of
Schools, Ellamanchili Range

(True Copy)

K. Suryanarayana
3rd March 1911
Subprotem Supervisor of
Elementary Schools,
Ellamanchili Sub Range

88/

NOTES. 10 Page

©

Keep file intact

Educational Depart
[Cm 5.]

Memo No 504-173-5-

The S. P. I is requested to state whether any action has been received in his office from K. Subbarayana, late sub-pro-supervisor of elementary schools, Elamanchili Range in the Vizagapatam Dt, appealing against the removal from Govt service and if it has been received to forward it to Govt for his remarks at an early date.

W. K. M.

SK
2.5.11
2.5.11


SP 3/5

To

The S. P. I.
Keep
2/5/11.

EDUCATIONAL DEPARTMENT.

Received



191

Registered

191

Subject.

Submitting with remarks the petition of K. Suryanarayana,
late sub pro tem Supervisor of Elementary Schools, Ellamanchili
sub-range, Vizagapatam District.

ENCLOSURES.

No.

Spare copies

Ref on Cur No. 1514 / 11.

Station Madras, Dated the 7th July 1911

From (Name) The Hon'ble Mr. J.H. Stone, M.A., F.R.H.S.,

(Designation) Ag. Director of Public Instruction,

To The Secretary to the Government of Madras, Madras.

Sir,

Educational Department.

With reference to Memorandum No. 504 - 1,
Educational, dated 3rd May 1911, I have the honour to submit
herewith the petition of K. Suryanarayana, late Sub pro tem
Supervisor of Elementary Schools, Ellamanchili.

2. The petitioner was one of those Board Supervisors
who were appointed sub pro tem under Government when the agency
of Supervisors was provincialized with effect from 1st March
1909, their confirmation being made conditional on the receipt
of a favourable report as to their work and conduct. He was,
however, not confirmed last year as the Assistant Inspector
reported unfavourably of his work and character and the Inspec-
tor recommended that his probation be extended. In the meantime
there were some complaints against him and the circumstances

under

10/10
12

under which his probation had to be terminated will be found fully explained in the enclosed copy of a letter from the Inspector of Schools, First Circle, R. C. No. 3110 V., dated 13th October 1910. Page 1

3. When the petitioner asked for copies of the correspondence in his case, the Inspector was requested by me to furnish him with copies of all the relevant papers on the subject.

4. In January last the petitioner prayed that he might be permitted to be employed as a Board Schoolmaster and his petition was forwarded to the Inspector with the remark that there was no objection to his being so employed. The Inspector now informs me that K. Suryanarayana has been appointed as a teacher under the Parvatipur Taluk Board.

I have the honour to be,

S i r,

Your most obedient servant,

R. Sundaram
for Director of Public Instruction.

M. S. S.

MS

#11
R.C. No. 3110 V.

Office of the Inspector of Schools,
First Circle,
Camp, Rajahmundry, Dated 13th October 1910

From

O.J. Couldrey Esquire, M.A.,

Principal in charge of the office of the
Inspector of Schools, First Circle,
W a l t a i r.

To

The Director of Public Instruction,

M a d r a s.

Sir,

In submitting the enclosed papers regarding the case of K. Suryanarayana, Supervisor of Ellamanchili Sub Range (on probation) I have the honour to remark as follows :

The enquiry was originally held by the Assistant Inspector of Schools, Vizagapatam District, being led to it in the manner described in para (6) of his covering letter enclosed herewith. Subsequently (on October 2nd and 3rd) I proceeded to Ellamanchili and Tuni and myself took statements from the principal witnesses. The statements there taken down in English by me in the presence of the Assistant Inspector of Schools, and the Supervisor are enclosed; at the same time, I examined the documents and statements collected by the Assistant Inspector of Schools being for the most part those enumerated in his list herewith enclosed.

The charges were three in number.-

(1) that in 1907, the Supervisor borrowed Rs. 100 from a subordinate, one S. Buchishastri, now of Etikoppaka Board School, but then working in a results school: that he paid nothing

12/2
14

nothing back for two years, and then only Rs. 80, reserving the rest of the principal and the interest for mamools.

(2) That in 1908, he took Rs. 65/- from the staff of the Ellamanchili Board Elementary School as the price of their confirmation, being one month's salary from each teacher.

(3) That he submitted a false diary with respect to his work on the 16th, 17th, 18th, 19th of June last.

With regard to (1) the Supervisor admits having taken the loan, and that it was arranged through another subordinate. He produces the receipted pronote (Z. enclosed) as proof that the whole amount with interest was repaid on 26th December 1909, two years after the date of borrowing. Buchishastri stated before the Assistant Inspector of Schools (statement V. Y) that only 80 Rs. was paid; but on being brought before me by the Supervisor at Tuni he declared that statement to be false, and to have been given in fear of the Assistant Inspector of Schools.

Charge No. (2) relates to the year 1908. In support of it, there is the evidence of all 5 of the Ellamanchili Board school teachers, who made statements both before the Assistant Inspector of Schools and before me, this evidence is circumstantial and consistent. When I took their statements before the Supervisor, he at one point drew my attention to a circumstance noted by most of them, that he had told them that "the money did not go into his own pocket"; this has no meaning unless the taking of the money is admitted.

The 3rd charge concerns itself mainly with the question when the Satyanaram School was examined. According to the diary the Supervisor spent the better part of Friday (17th June) in this school. According to the teacher Th. Jogiah then acting as Headmaster, however, the Supervisor did not put

13/13
15

in an appearance until next day, Saturday at 5 O'Clock, when he handed over some 'labels' and returned to Tuni, which is about 6 miles away. In support of this, he produces a note (enclosure 10 of the Assistant Inspector's list) written to him by a friend. The writer of this note says he has been asked by the Supervisor to tell the Headmaster to keep the school open for him, until 5 O'Clock, but not to mark the attendance. This was dated Saturday 18th, and the remark about attendance could only have reference to a Saturday. The Satyanaram teacher further declares that he accompanied the Supervisor to Tuni that night, slept in the same house and spent ^{the} whole of the Sunday forenoon in company with the Supervisor and the assistant teacher of Payakarowpet school: the Supervisor dictating notes to the two teachers and scrutinizing the records of Satyanaram school, which had been brought in for the purpose. The statement is supported by the Payakarowpeta teacher and also by a receipt (enclosure 15 of the Assistant Inspector's list) given to the Headmaster by the Assistant Master, who paid the cooly carrying the registers and was refunded by the Headmaster. The Supervisor's diary shows the forenoon of Sunday as having been given to the inspection of Mangaram school.

In defence, the Supervisor shows two letters one from an inhabitant of Satyanaram to the effect that the Supervisor took meals in his house one day some 3 or 4 months before (enclosure 11 of the Assistant Inspector's list): the other from an assistant teacher, apparently a relative of the last mentioned individual, declaring that the Supervisor's inspection was conducted during both forenoon and afternoon of one day, date unknown. Both letters are vague and non-committal and might have been written as a grace. The writer of the second had also given the receipt above mentioned (enclosure 15 of the Assistant Inspector's list) which shows that the school records went to the Supervisor to Tuni on Sunday 19th morning, this

14/14 16

would not have been necessary had the time shown in the diary been spent in the school on the 17th. The Supervisor also called the teachers of Sreerampuram and Gopalapatnam schools to shew that the time of the inspection of those schools correspond^{ed} with that entered in the diary. Theirs are the two last of the statements taken ~~by~~ me and enclosed. They are not of much value.

From the evidence and from the general results of my enquiry, I have no doubt as to the diary for the days in question having been falsified. As regards the other charges, what is admitted is bad enough, and the rest, if not proved home, is matter for grave suspicion.

I see no good in prolonging the probation of such an officer. I have to recommend with regret that his probation be terminated.

I have the honour to be,

S i r,

Your most obedient servant,

(Sd) O.J. Couldrey,

Principal in charge of the office of
the Inspector of Schools, First
Circle.

(True Copy)

R. Sundaram
for Director of Public Instruction.

OK
M. S. S.

15/15
17
To

His Excellency the Governor in Council,
M a d r a s.

Through

The Director of Public Instruction,
M a d r a s.

The humble petition of Kandala Sooryanarayana, late sub-
protem Supervisor of Elementary Schools, Ellamanchily in the
Vizagapatam District, sheweth that

1. The petitioner entered the Educational Department in
1898 as a teacher in the Board Primary School, Narasapatam.
2. The petitioner was made a permanent Board Supervisor
in the year 1904 and was retained as a subprotem Supervisor
in the provincialization of the office in 1909.
3. The petitioner thus put in a service of 12 years in
the Department and has passed all the necessary tests required
of a Supervisor for promotion.
4. The work and conduct of the petitioner have never --
been subjected to criticism all these years.
5. In the year 1908 when proposals were submitted for --
provincialization of the Supervisors' services M.R.Ry. Babu
Sesibhushana Palit the then Assistant Inspector of Schools --
found the petitioner's work to be satisfactory and made him a
subprotem Supervisor.
6. In the year 1909 M.R.Ry. Ch. Bhagavanulu Pantulu the
present Assistant Inspector of Schools took charge and to the
petitioner's misfortune commenced to lay out foundations to

17/17
16/16
18
to see him ruined for the reasons shown in the petitioner's explanation submitted to the Inspector of Schools on 2-11-1910

7. The Assistant Inspector not having succeeded in open enquiries in central classes began to encourage School masters in the range to make false statements against the Supervisor.

8. Accordingly the Board Elementary School masters at -- Ellamanchily and a few others in the petitioner's range being emboldened at the formidable prop of the Assistant Inspector gave statements before him against the petitioner behind his back.

9. The sum and substance of the complaints constitutes the following offences.

(a) That the Supervisor made a false entry in his diary on the 17th of June 1910 as having inspected the Board School at Satyavaram, while he did no inspection but only visited the school on the following day i.e., 18th evening.

(b) That the Ellamanchily teachers paid a sum of Rs65 to the Supervisor for being transmitted to the superior offices in order to secure their confirmation in their posts.

(c) That the Supervisor took a loan of Rs100 from S. Bachi-sastry a teacher of Pulaparti in the sub-range.

10. The petitioner before entering on his explanations for the above three items begs leave to add that the items of charges are only inferences drawn from the lengthy enquiry and correspondence but that the petitioner was not furnished with any -- definite and formal charges against him in respect of any item.

11. That the charge against item (a) is false is quite clear from the following facts.

(1) The complainant himself gave a voucher dating 17th of June 1910 and noting the station as Satyavaram to the effect -- that he was supplied with service postage stamps by the Supervisor

Supervisor whereas he states in his complaint that his school was visited by the Supervisor on the evening of the 18th June and not on the 17th.

(2) The complaint was made on the 19th of July i.e., the very next day on which the Sub-Assistant Inspector visited his school and remarked very seriously against his bad work. The delay in making the complaint and that, immediately after the Sub-Assistant's unfavourable remarks on his school is very --- significant.

(3) The then Assistant teacher of the same school directly contradicts the statement of the complainant.

(4) The statement of the Brahmin gentleman in whose house the petitioner was fed on the day of his visit to the village is also in favour of the petitioner.

(5) The statements obtained by the petitioner from the Salt Sub-Inspector Payakaraopeta, Branch Post master, Village Karnam and Board School master of Pentakota, Village officers of Sri-rampuram completely exculpate the Supervisor. All these were enclosed with the explanation submitted to the Director on --- 23--11--1910.

12. That the charge against item (b) is equally false is clear from the following facts.

(1) Under the instructions of Mr. Yates, the then Inspector of Schools, who was not pleased with the work of the school, M.R. Ry. Babu Palit the then Assistant Inspector of schools --- obtained from recommending the confirmation of the Ellamanchi-ly teachers and appointed them on probation for one year. After the probationary period, he was pleased with their work and -- recommended their confirmation. From this it is evident that the Supervisor could have had no part whatever in getting the teachers confirmed. This being evident, the complainant -----

complainant teachers, it cannot be believed even for a moment, would be so foolish as to entrust the money to one who could not help them in any way.

(2) That the supposed transaction refers to a time two and a half years previous to the enquiry is quite significant and it was not at all supported by any independent evidence.

(3) That with no formal complaint secret depositions were taken from the teachers proves the attitude of the Assistant -- Inspector towards the petitioner.

(4) That the petitioner found it necessary in the discharge of his duties as Supervisor to record and report the unsatisfactory work of the teachers in face of clear and numerous --- instructions from himself and the Sub-Assistant Inspector. This must have placed the teachers in a tepid state which soon ---- reached its boiling point when they are confident in the heat of wrath of the Assistant Inspector against the petitioner.

(5) That Assistant Inspector's construction on the petitioner's cross questioning of the complainant's that the petitioner indirectly admitted the charge is a misconception as clearly explained in the petitioner's explanation offered to the Director of Public Instruction on 23--11--1910.

13. The charge under item (c) was a dead letter to which life was instilled by the Assistant Inspector by encouraging the teacher. The loan was taken when the petitioner was in -- ~~straightened~~ circumstances and when the petitioner was not a Government servant. It was liquidated and the documents returned duly endorsed by the claimant long before the Assistant Inspector took statement from the teacher Suo moto. That this man was ~~sent~~ up by the Assistant Inspector is clear from the record of the enquiry made by the Inspector in which he deposed that he was compelled by the Assistant Inspector to make false statements and that the statement he made was nothing but the dictation

dictation of the Assistant Inspector. No complaint was ever made by him against the petitioner.

14. That though the whole record of enquiry was only one-sided since the witnesses cited in defence of the petitioner were not made to appear before the Inspector yet there are, on record, the most important portions in favour of the petitioner to the following effect.

(1) That the complainants were set up by the Assistant Inspector.

(2) That witnesses were first examined by the Assistant Inspector just before they were presented before the Inspector -- and those that happened to speak the truth were rejected.

(3) That the Assistant Inspector even wrote a letter to -- some requesting them to give evidence against the petitioner and with all that they sent statements in favour of the petitioner.

(4) That the witnesses were even compelled to give statements against the petitioner.

15. That the Assistant Inspector was prejudiced with this unfortunate petitioner may also be seen even from the moment he took charge when in his recommendations for the petitioner's confirmation as Supervisor he remarked to the petitioner that his probation would be made to cease. The petitioner also begs to point out that the Assistant Inspector having failed in all the above attempts purposely made this a point in his tours to blast the prospects of this unfortunate young petitioner whose probation was ceased by the Director of Public Instruction. A copy of the order is herein enclosed. On receipt of the order by the petitioner from the Sub-Assistant Inspector's office -- Ellamanchili on 5-12-1910, he handed over charge of the office the same evening and has since then been vacant.

16. The petitioner places the above facts before His Excellency and begs that they may be verified with the record which is completely filed in Director's office. Though the -- petitioner prayed for copies of all the records filed they have not as yet been favoured to him and hence copies could not be enclosed.

17. Last though not least that the petitioner a young man, fully qualified was thus broken down in the midst of his career for no fault of his, that he put in twelve years service and that he was unjustly deprived of his hard earned footing.

18. That the petitioner therefore most humbly approaches His Excellency to beg that the entire records in the case may be kindly perused with a kind appreciation of the evidence and that he may be restored to his appointment.

19. That the petitioner begs to add that he submitted his original petition through the Director of Public Instruction -- and a copy direct to His Excellency.

The petitioner most humbly begs to remain,

K. Suryanarayana
3rd March 1911
Late subprotem Supervisor of
Elementary schools,
Umananchili sub Range
Vizagapatam Dt.

Address.

K. Sooryanarayana,
Nemarivari house, Tittivari Street,
Vizagapatam.

2121
23
OFFICIAL MEMORANDUM

-----e0o-----
Moulani Muhammed Auzam Sahib Bahadur, B.A. Acting Inspector of
Schools, I Circle.

R.C.No.3110 of 1910, Dated 2nd Dec: 1910.

In Proceedings R.C.No.7000 of 1910 dated 12-11-10 the ---
Director of Public Instruction has approved the recommendation
of the Inspector of Schools that the probation of K. Sooryana-
rayana, subprotem Supervisor, Ellamanchili Sub range be termi-
nated.

2. The Sub-Assistant Inspector of Schools, Ellamanchili
Range is requested to communicate a copy of this order to Sur-
yanarayana and relieve him at once. He will have charge of the
office of the Supervisor until the vacancy is filled up.

(Signed) Muhammed Auzam,

Ag: Inspector of Schools.
I Circle.

To the Sub-Assistant Inspector of Schools, Ellamanchili Range.
Copy to the Assistant Inspector of Schools, Vizagapatam Dist.

R.C.No. 415 of 10 dated 5-12-10.

(True Copy)

Communicated to K. Suryanarayana, Supervisor of Elementary
Schools, Ellamanchili Sub range for information and handing over
charge of the records in this office this forenoon.

5th December 1910. (signed) James M. Bhaktul,


Sub-assistant Inspector of
Schools, Ellamanchili Range

(True Copy)

K. Suryanarayana
3rd March 1911

Subprotem Supervisor of
Elementary Schools
Ellamanchili Sub Range
Vizagapatam Dist.

NOTES.



191

C. No. 574 From the K. Suryanarayana No. , dated 3. 3. 1911.

Late Supervisor of Schools.
SUBJECT.

Appeal against the orders of
his dismissal.

"Await receipt of the original"

G. J. P.
15. 3. 11.

"Ask the D. P. I if he has received it"

L. D.
29. 4. 11.

Secretary's remarks
the weekly arrears
it submitted on the
8th April 1911.

The draft memo placed below is sub-
mitted for approval.

SK
2. 5. 11. AD
2. 5. 11

mom
27/5/11

[Memo. no. 504 -1 dated 3rd May 1911]
From the D.P.I. Memo 1514/11 dated 7th July 1911

The D.P.I. submits the petition of K. Surya-
narayana ~~late~~ late Supervisor of Elementary Schools,
Ellamanchili sub. range, with his remarks.

2. Suryanarayana's case is fully dealt with
in Mr. Coulbrey's letter dated 13th October 1910
on pages 11 to 14 of the current file.

3. There seems to be
on Suryanarayana

informed accordingly.

4. The draft below is for approval.

$\frac{7\%}{11-7-11}$ $\frac{800}{11-7-11}$

Cited in Box N-22.

H.M.

The order complained of terminated the petis. probation as a supervisor in Provincial service. He has since been appointed as a board schoolmaster. The Enquiry did not clear the petitioner & it was, I submit, inexpedient to confirm him.

$\frac{Ld.}{127 \times 1}$



Lague M
14. VII. 11

[fo. No 474 misd 15-7-11]

26
Educational DEPARTMENT.

" " " " , " " 19

No. 474, dated 15 7. 1911.

The petr. ^{will} ~~should~~ be informed
that the Govt. see no reason
to interfere on his behalf.

74
11-7-11

$$\frac{LD}{12.7}$$

N.B.—

A = Copy in full.
B = Not to be copied.
P = Copy abstract only.
Q = Copy Heading only.

When given for copying _____
When copied _____
When examined _____
When signed _____ } 191

READ AGAIN G.O., No. _____, DATED
191 _____

CURRENT No. _____

ENCLOSURES TO G. No. _____

ORDER OF GOVERNMENT.

A A A A A A A

LETTER OF GOVERNMENT.

STATEMENT WITH DITTO.

PAPERS NOT FILED UP, BRING MEANT FOR DESPATCH
IN ORIGINAL.

N.B.—

A = Copy in full.
B = Not to be copied.
P = Copy abstract only.
Q = Copy Heading only.