

Government of Madras.

EDUCATIONAL DEPARTMENT.

Recd.

Regd.

} 1913.

Enclosures

Spare copies

G.O. No. 821, 5th September 1913.

Exemption from the examination rules.

Exempting certain persons permanently from the examination rules for employment as sub-overseers.

Government of Madras.

EDUCATIONAL DEPARTMENT.

Recd.

Regd.

} 1913.

Enclosures

Spare copies

G.O. No. 821, 5th September 1913.

Exemption from the examination rules.

Exempting certain persons permanently from the examination rules for employment as sub-overseers.

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS.

EDUCATIONAL DEPARTMENT.

READ—the following papers :—

I

Letter—from W. J. J. HOWLEY, Esq., A.M.I.C.E., Superintending Engineer, III Circle.

To—the Chief Engineer, Public Works Department.

Dated—Bellary, the 29/31st March 1913.

No.—2975.

I have the honour to bring to your notice that M.R.Ry. G. Kesavulu Nayudu was appointed sub-overseer, first grade, in 1906 and when this appointment was reported to you for approval in this office No. 4664, dated 12th December 1905, you observed in paragraph 2 of your Memorandum No. 3630-C, dated 13th June 1906, that “the subordinate has passed the late Middle School Examination and the draftsman’s test, while the examination prescribed for appointment as sub-overseer is the sub-overseer and surveyor’s test”. You were informed in reply (*vide* this office No. 3102, dated 16th July 1906) that he was made permanent in 1899 which was reported to you in this office No. 490 W., dated 1st February 1899, and though he did not pass the requisite examination then prescribed for the post, he was above the average standard of intelligence and the then Superintending Engineer therefore strongly recommended his appointment to the first grade in the new arrangement. In these circumstances you approved of the appointment of the individual to the first grade—*vide* paragraph 1 of your Memorandum No. 5528-C, dated 3rd October 1906.

2. The Public Service Notification for the year 1899 prescribes the surveyor’s test as the qualifying test for sub-overseers and unless M.R.Ry. G. Kesavulu Nayudu had been exempted by Government from passing this test, the appointment would seem to be irregular.

3. I have the honour therefore to enquire whether this man has ever been exempted by Government from passing the test; and if not, whether the draftsman’s test can be considered as a sufficient qualifying test in his case entitling the sub-overseer to draw on promotion a higher salary than he now is in receipt of.

II

Letter—from W. J. J. HOWLEY, Esq., A.M.I.C.E., Superintending Engineer, III Circle.

To—the Chief Engineer, Public Works Department.

Dated—Bellary, the 5/7th May 1913.

No.—4211.

I have the honour to invite your attention to this office No. 2975, dated 29th/31st March 1913, enquiring if sub-overseer G. Kesavulu Nayudu has been exempted from passing the surveyor’s test and is therefore entitled to draw a higher salary than he is now in receipt of; and to request you will be so good as to favour me with a reply thereto. Pending receipt of your reply I have not been able to give effect to the orders of Government in G.O. No. 246-W., dated 31st January 1913, revising the scale of pay of sub-overseers.

III

Memorandum No. 744 R-I, dated 29th May 1913.

With reference to his letters No. 2975, dated 29/31st March 1913, and No. 4211, dated 5/7th May 1913, the Superintending Engineer, III Circle, is informed that the sub-overseer M.R.Ry. G. Kesavulu Nayudu has not been exempted by Government from passing the lower subordinate test of the College of Engineering, that the sanction of Government is necessary for his holding the present post and that fresh exemption will have to be obtained at each stage of promotion that may in future be given to him. The Superintending Engineer is therefore requested to submit the necessary application in the prescribed form.

(By Order.)

D. MARSHALL,

Deputy Secretary to Government, P.W.D.

To the Superintending Engineer, III Circle.

IV

Letter—from W. J. J. HOWLEY, Esq., A.M.I.C.E., Superintending Engineer, III Circle.

To—the Chief Engineer, Public Works Department.

Dated—Bellary, the 4th June 1913.

No.—5122.

Referring to your Memorandum No. 744-R-1, dated 29th May 1913, stating that the sanction of Government is necessary for G. Kesavulu Nayudu’s holding his present post as sub-overseer and that fresh exemption will have to be obtained at each stage of promotion that may in future be given to him, I have the honour to forward herewith for your information copy of a letter from the Accountant-General, No. Spl. 15/P.W. 3177, dated 20th May 1913, wherein he states that it is not known whether any examinations or, if any, of what kind were required to be passed for appointment as a sub-overseer at the time when the unpassed sub-overseers now in this circle were first appointed. He brings to notice that in the Public Service Notification revised up to 31st March 1898 no tests were prescribed for the post of a sub-overseer. The matter has been further looked up and it is found that it is in the Public Service Notification appearing in the *Fort St. George Gazette* of the 1st May 1900 that educational qualifications were for the first time prescribed for appointment as a sub-overseer. Entrants into the service prior to the 1st May 1900 presumably cannot be barred from promotion because they may not be qualified under orders subsequently promulgated.

2. The undermentioned sub-overseers in this circle entered service before the 1st May 1900 :—

- (1) N. Guruswami Ayyar on 23rd May 1895 now in the first grade.
- (2) V. Marimuthu Pillai on 1st October 1895 now in the first grade.
- (3) G. Kesavulu Nayudu on 17th January 1899 now in the first grade.
- (4) K. Sundaram Ayyar on 28th March 1900 now in the second grade.

3. There is now in this Circle an unpassed sub-overseer, second grade, M. G. Subba Ayyar by name—who was appointed on the 10th October 1900 by the late Central Office, Tank Restoration Scheme, then working under the Chief Engineer for Irrigation. There is nothing on record here to show whether the necessary exemption from the examination rules was obtained by the Chief Engineer for Irrigation. The Accountant-General cannot trace any order in his office. If no order is traceable in the Chief Engineer for Irrigation’s or the Secretariat office, an application will be submitted for the requisite sanction being obtained.

I request the favour of early orders on this reference to enable me to give effect to the reorganized scale of pay to sub-overseers.

ENCLOSURE.

Letter—from N. N. PADGETT, Esq., Assistant Accountant-General, Madras.
To—the Superintending Engineer, III Circle.
Dated—the 20th May 1913.
No.—Spl. 15/P.W. 3177.

With reference to your letters Nos. 2976, dated 31st March 1913, and 4212, dated 7th May 1913, I have the honour to state that (a) as regards G. Kesavulu Nayadu, his promotion to sub-overseer, first grade (referred to in E. Dis. No. 3630-C., dated 13th June 1906) was approved of by the Chief Engineer in his Memorandum No. 5628-C., dated 3rd October 1906, and that (b) as regards the other men, the records of this office do not throw any light on the point whether they have been exempted or not from passing the tests required for a sub-overseer.

2. It is also not known whether any examinations, or, if any, of what kind, were required to be passed for appointment as a sub-overseer, at the time when these men were first appointed. It will be seen that in the Public Service Notification revised up to 31st March 1898, no tests were prescribed for the post of a sub-overseer.

3. Your attention is also invited to the Chief Engineer's Memorandum No. 1011-C., dated 14th February 1907.

V

Letter—from W. J. J. HOWLEY, Esq., A.M.I.C.E., Superintending Engineer, III Circle.
To—the Chief Engineer, Public Works Department.
Dated—Bellary, the 29/30th July 1913.
No.—7056.

I have the honour to invite your attention to my letter No. 5122, dated 4th June 1913, relative to the necessity or otherwise for the exemption from the examination rules of certain sub-overseers in this Circle before they could be given the revised rates of pay sanctioned in G.O. No. 246-W., dated 31st January 1913, and to request the favour of early orders thereon, as, pending such orders, it is not found possible to give effect to the revised scale of pay sanctioned in the Government Order referred to above.

VI

Memorandum No. 744/R-5, dated 5th August 1913.

With reference to his letter No. 5122, dated 4th June 1913, the Superintending Engineer, III Circle, is informed that persons permanently appointed to the post of sub-overseer before the 24th April 1900, the date on which it was first notified that candidates for the post of sub-overseer should have passed the sub-overseer and surveyor test, may be considered to be exempt from that test for promotion to any grades of sub-overseer, provided they possessed the general educational qualification for posts carrying a pay of Rs. 15 and upwards at the time of their permanent appointment, viz., Middle School examination, first class, up to 1894 and Upper Secondary or equivalent examination after that year. As G. Kesavulu Nayudu was permanently appointed in 1899 and as he does not appear to have passed the Upper Secondary examination or some other examination equivalent to it, the Superintending Engineer is requested to submit the necessary application for his exemption. The same course should be followed in the case of the other three men mentioned in paragraph 2 of his letter quoted above, if they do not possess the general educational qualifications referred to.

2. In the case of M. G. Subbayar referred to in paragraph 3 of his letter the Superintending Engineer should submit an application for his exemption from the sub-overseer and surveyor test, as he was appointed subsequent to 24th April 1900.

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

To the Superintending Engineer, III Circle.

VII

Letter—from W. J. J. HOWLEY, Esq., A.M.I.C.E., Superintending Engineer, III Circle.
To—the Chief Engineer, Public Works Department.
Dated—Bellary, the 9th August 1913.
No.—7441.

Referring to your Memorandum No. 744/R-5, dated 5th August 1913, I have the honour to forward herewith two exemption applications on behalf of the five sub-overseers in question and to request that orders of Government exempting them from the examination rules may be obtained at an early date to enable me to give effect to the revised scale of pay sanctioned for the Lower Subordinate establishment in G.O. No. 246-W., dated 31st January 1913.

ENCLOSURES.

(1)

APPLICATION for exemption from the examination rules of unpassed candidates for employment in the III Circle.

	Name.	Age.	General Educational qualification.		
1. Name, age and educational qualifications of the unpassed candidate for whose exemption sanction is sought.	(1) M.R.Ry. V. Marimuthu Pillai.	40	Nil.		
	(2) „ N. Guruswami Ayyar	47	Nil.		
	(3) „ G. Kesavulu Nayudu	39	Middle school, first class; has also passed the draftsman's test.		
	(4) K. Sundaram Ayyar	43	Nil.		
2. The post in which it is proposed to employ him and nature of the appointment, i.e., whether acting or sub-pro tem. or temporary.	Sub-Overseer, permanent.				
3. The pay of the post and the pay proposed to be given to the unpassed candidate.	Name.	Date of 1st Appointment. YEAR.	Grade on first appointment. RS.	Present grade. RS.	Present pay. RS.
	M.R.Ry. V. Marimuthu Pillai.	1st Oct. 1895	35—5—45	50—10—70	70
	M.R.Ry. N. Guruswami Ayyar.	23rd May 1895	50—10—70	50—10—70	70
	M.R.Ry. G. Kesavulu Nayudu.	17th Jan. 1899	25—5—35	50—10—70	60
	K. Sundaram Ayyar.	28th Mar. 1900	25—5—35	35—5—45	45
	Pay proposed cannot be fixed, but the same will not exceed the maximum prescribed Rs. 80 under G.O. No. 246 W., dated 31st January 1913.				
4. The examination from which exemption is sought.	Matriculation Examination. On the dates on which the four men were appointed substantively, no other special educational qualification was prescribed for the post of sub-overseer.				
5. The period for which the appointment is expected to last.	Permanent.				

Application for exemption from the examination rules of unpassed candidates for employment in the III Circle—*cont.*

6. The period for which sanction is now sought (with dates of commencement and of termination).	Indefinite, i.e., so long as these men continue in service.
7. Is this a first application or one for a renewal of a previous sanction? If for renewal, quote the previous order granting sanction and state for how long the candidate has been already exempted.	<i>Nil.</i>
8. What steps have been taken to procure the services of a passed candidate and with what result.	<i>Vide</i> Chief Engineer, Public Works Department's Memorandum No. 744/R-5, dated 5th August 1913.
9. Recommendation of the head of the department.	Recommended.
10. Remarks . . .	<i>Nil.</i>

Forwarded to the Chief Engineer, Public Works Department, for favour of obtaining the sanction of Government in reference to his No. 744/R-5, dated 5th August 1913.

9th August 1913.

W. J. J. HOWLEY,
Superintending Engineer, III Circle.

(2)

1. Name, age and educational qualifications of the unpassed candidate for whose exemption sanction is sought.	M. G. Subba Ayyar. Age—40. Qualification— <i>Nil.</i>
2. The post in which it is proposed to employ him and nature of the appointment, i.e., whether acting or sub. <i>pro tem.</i> or temporary.	Sub-overseer—permanent.

Application for exemption from the examination rules of unpassed candidates for employment in the III Circle—*cont.*

3. The pay of the post and the pay proposed to be given to the unpassed candidate.	Data of first permanent appointment—10th October 1900. Grade on permanent appointment, third grade, sub-overseer—25—5—35. Present grade—Second grade, sub-overseer—35—5—45. Present pay Rs. 35. The sub-overseer's pay will not exceed the maximum of Rs. 80 prescribed in G.O. No. 246-W., dated 31st January 1913.
4. The examination from which exemption is sought.	Old sub-overseers' and surveyors' test of the College of Engineering, Madras.
5. The period for which the appointment is expected to last.	Permanent.
6. The period for which sanction is now sought (with dates of commencement and of termination).	Permanent.
7. Is this a first application or one for a renewal of a previous sanction? If for renewal, quote the previous order granting sanction and state for how long the candidate has been already exempted.	<i>Nil.</i>
8. What steps have been taken to procure the services of a passed candidate and with what result.	<i>Vide</i> Chief Engineer, Public Works Department's Memorandum No. 744/R-5, dated 5th August 1913.
9. Recommendation of the Head of the Department.	Recommended.
10. Remarks . . .	<i>Nil.</i>

Forwarded to the Chief Engineer, Public Works Department, for favour of obtaining the sanction of Government.

9th August 1913.

W. J. J. HOWLEY,
Superintending Engineer, III Circle.

Order—No. 821, Educational, dated 5th September 1913.

The following persons are exempted from the examination rules for employment as sub-overseers:—

- | | |
|----------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| (1) M.R.Ry. V. Marimuthu Pillai. | (4) M.R.Ry. K. Sundaram Ayyar. |
| (2) " N. Guruswami Ayyar. | (5) " M. G. Subba Ayyar. |
| (3) " G. Kesavalu Nayudu. | |

(True Extract.)

W. FRANCIS,
Ag. Secretary to Government.

To the Public Works Department with copy of notes.

EDUCATIONAL DEPARTMENT.

NOTES CONNECTED WITH G.O. No. 821, EDUCATIONAL,
DATED 5TH SEPTEMBER 1913.

[SUBJECT.—Inquiry if M.R.Ry. G. Kesavalu Nayudu, sub-overseer, has been exempted by Government from the examination rules and if promotion to higher pay may be given.]

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.

From the Superintending Engineer, III Circle, dated 29th/31st March
1913, No. 2975.

The history of the case is as follows:—

The sub-overseer, M.R.Ry. G. Kesavalu Nayudu, has passed the late Middle School examination and the Draftsman's test of the College of Engineering, Madras. He was appointed by the Superintending Engineer as a temporary sub-overseer, third grade, in 1896 and as a permanent sub-overseer third grade, in 1899. These facts were reported to this office on each occasion and recorded in memorandums No. 2947-C, dated 3rd August 1896 and No. 866-C, dated 8th February 1899, respectively, without the question of his want of educational qualification for the post being raised. The audit officer also appears to have overlooked the matter. The sub-overseer in the usual course was promoted by the Superintending Engineer to the second grade on general duty. When the Irrigation Conservancy establishment was reorganized in 1905, the Superintending Engineer, III Circle, promoted him to the first grade (50—10—70) on that establishment. When the Superintending Engineer came up for the Chief Engineer's approval to this promotion he was asked† to state how the man came to be appointed as a sub-overseer without the requisite qualifications. Please see paragraph (ii) of the Superintending Engineer's reply on pages 1 and 2 of current file of G.O. No. 1846 W., dated 12th September 1906. He added that "though he has not passed the present requisite qualification he is above the average standard of intelligence and I strongly recommend that he may be given the first grade sub-overseer's place." Attention is then invited to the notes in the margin of page 9 of the notes to G.O. No. 1846 W., dated 12th September 1906, in which it was held that as the Audit officer did not object to the man's appointment on the score of want of educational qualifications the question of his exemption need not be raised. Accordingly the question of exemption was dropped and his promotion to the first grade approved.‡

† Vide Memo. No. 5528-C, dated 3rd October 1906. The man has thus not been exempted from examination rules by Government.

2. The question now to be considered is as to what reply should be given to the Superintending Engineer's second query in paragraph 3 of his letter. The irregularity in the man's appointment without exemption having again come to notice, it seems may be set right by obtaining § his exemption once for all and he may be permitted to rise up to the maximum pay of sub-overseers, viz., Rs. 80, if otherwise qualified for it.

K.G.—15-4-13.

W. G. MOLESWORTH—21-4-13.

Secretary for orders.

The file is not complete. There were two cases of exemption of sub-overseers sanctioned in 1911 I think in which the general question of exemption of men for all grades of sub-overseer was raised. I think both sub-overseers were in the I Circle.

C. A. SMITH—21-4-13.

The Secretary apparently refers to the case of G. Pachchaiyappa Pillai disposed of in G.O. No. 670, Educational, dated 23rd September 1911, and the case of V. Muttuswami Mudaliyar which was considered along with the above—*vide* G.O. No. 669, Educational, dated 23rd September 1911. The notes on the subject will be found with the former order. Attention is also invited to G.O. No. 244, Educational, dated 9th May 1910, and paragraph 1 (2) of G.O. No. 593, Educational, dated 4th July 1912. It will be seen from these orders that a man exempted for appointment to a particular grade or on a particular salary requires to be exempted again before he can be promoted to a higher grade or a higher salary. Similarly, in the present case it is necessary to obtain the sub-overseer's exemption not only to enable him to hold his present post but also to enable him to receive further promotion.

K.G.—1-5-13.

This means case is hardly parallel to those dealt with in G.O. No. 670, Educational, dated 23rd September 1911, as the man was not originally appointed on the Conservancy establishment. In this case exemption must be applied for to enable

Yes.
C. A. SMITH—15-5-13. him to draw his present pay and the application must again be renewed at each step of promotion—G.O. No. 244 of 9th May 1910.

D. MARSHALL—10-5-13.

A draft memorandum to the Superintending Engineer is submitted.

B. RAU—26-5-13.

D. MARSHALL—26-5-13.

[Issued as Memorandum No. 744 R-1, dated 29th May 1913.]

From the Superintending Engineer, III Circle, dated 4th June 1913, No. 5122.

The Superintending Engineer now brings to notice that as the man—G. Kesavalu Nayudu—was appointed permanent sub-overseer before 1st May 1900 when for the first time educational qualifications were prescribed for that appointment, he does not appear to require any exemption and cannot be barred from promotion. Please see the Public Service notifications issued in 1899 and 1900. As stated by the Superintending Engineer, no qualifications are prescribed for sub-overseer's appointment in the earlier of the two notifications, while the Sub-Overseer and Surveyor test is prescribed in the latter notification. It is submitted therefore that we may agree with the Superintending Engineer that entrants into the service prior to the 1st May 1900 cannot be barred from promotion because they may not be qualified under orders subsequently promulgated. The concurrence of Educational may be obtained before informing the Superintending Engineer as above.

D. MARSHALL—18-6-13.

C. A. SMITH—19-6-13.

2. With reference to paragraph 3 of the Superintending Engineer's letter, no orders are traceable in this office exempting M. G. Subba Ayyar. The Chief Engineer for Irrigation may be requested to say if any orders are traceable in his office. If not, the Superintending Engineer may be asked to apply for his exemption.

K.G.—14-6-13.

Make an extract to go to the Irrigation office. The case may then go to the Secretary.

D. MARSHALL—18-6-13.

To the Educational Department.

EDUCATIONAL DEPARTMENT.

The question raised by the Public Works Department in this file is whether sub-overseers appointed prior to 1st May 1900, the date on which it was first notified that candidates for the posts of sub-overseers should have passed the Sub-Overseer and Surveyor test, may be considered to be exempt from this test for promotion to higher grades of sub-overseers.

2. Prior to 1896 there were only the "surveyors" and "draftsmen" classes in the College of Engineering for the training of subordinates. In that year the surveyor class was developed into a

Paragraph 11 of report of the college for 1896 on page 6 of G.O. Nos. 541-42, dated 22nd September 1897.

Paragraph 14 on page 18 of G.O. *ibid.*

Paragraph 4 (c) on page 4 of G.O. No. 538, dated 25th August 1898.

"sub-overseer and surveyor" class for the training of candidates for the posts of sub-overseers and surveyors, but it was not until 1900 that the test was first included in the Public Service notification as a qualifying test for sub-overseers. No qualifications were prescribed for sub-overseers in the Public Service notifications of the previous years and it is not known what qualifications were demanded for such subordinates. Some persons who had passed the old surveyor or draftsman class might have been appointed to those posts.

3. As regards the main question, it is submitted that when qualifications are newly laid down for any post it is not generally the practice to give retrospective effect to it, the existing incumbents being generally exempted from the new rule. For example, when the minimum qualification for appointment to posts carrying a pay of more than Rs. 15 *per mensem* was raised from "Middle School, first class" to "Upper Secondary" or "other equivalent or higher examinations," it was laid down that the new rule would not affect those who had passed the Middle School examination in the first class and held permanent appointments in the public service on the date on which the revised notification came into force. Again recently, when it was ruled that Bombay matriculates should not be admitted to posts carrying a pay of more than Rs. 20 in the public service, it was decided that the new rule should not affect the promotion of those who had passed that examination and were already permanently in the public service.

Note 1 to the Public Service notification on page 25 of G.O. No. 317, dated 9th May 1894, and the history of this note in the notes to G.O. No. 737, Educational, dated 14th December 1910.

G.O. No. 127, Educational, dated 12th February 1913.

Following the principle adopted in these cases, this department may, it is submitted, agree with the Public Works Department in considering that persons appointed to the post of sub-overseer before the new test was prescribed as a qualification may be deemed eligible for promotion to the higher grades of sub-overseer. These sub-overseers should have already by their service proved their eligibility to be such and promotion to various grades among sub-overseers apparently depend mainly on service and experience. This exemption would not, however, qualify these sub-overseers for any higher post such as overseers, etc., nor qualify unpassed men who held any post other than that of sub-overseer before the 24th April 1900* to rise to the post of sub-overseer after that date.

W.F.—15-7-13.

W.F.—15-7-13.

* The date on which it was first notified that candidates for the post of sub-overseers should have passed the "Sub-Overseer and Surveyor test."

No. 821, EDUCATIONAL, 5TH SEPTEMBER 1913.

4. The above relates only to technical qualifications. As the minimum pay of the last grade of sub-overseers (viz., Rs. 25—5—35) was in excess of Rs. 15, candidates who were appointed sub-overseers before the year 1900 should have possessed the minimum *general* educational qualification prescribed in the Public Service notification for admission to posts carrying a pay of more than Rs. 15 (now raised to Rs. 20), which was Middle School examination in the first class up to 1894 and Upper Secondary or equivalent examination later on. In the case of Kesavalu Nayudu it is stated that he has passed the Middle School examination, but it is not mentioned whether he passed in the first class. He was permanently appointed in 1899. If he did not pass in the first class, he will require exemption. If the others also had not been qualified, they should have been specially exempted from the examination rules.

W.F.—15-7-13.

S.K.—14-7-13.

C. RAMANUJACHARI—14-7-13.

W. FRANCIS—15-7-13.

To the Public Works Department.

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT

Letter—from the Superintending Engineer, III Circle.
To—the Chief Engineer, Public Works Department.
Dated—the 4th June 1913.
No.—5122.

3. There is now in this circle an unpassed sub-overseer second grade—M. G. Subba Ayyar by name—who was appointed on the 10th October 1900 by the late Central Office Tank Restoration Scheme then working under the Chief Engineer for Irrigation. There is nothing on record here to show whether the necessary exemption from the examination rules was obtained by the Chief Engineer for Irrigation. The Accountant-General cannot trace any order in his office. If no order is traceable in the Chief Engineer for Irrigation's or the Secretariat office, an application will be submitted for the requisite sanction being obtained.

I request the favour of early orders on this reference to enable me to give effect to the re-organized scale of pay to sub-overseers.

From the Superintending Engineer, III Circle, dated 4th June 1913, No. 5122.

2. With reference to paragraph 3 of the Superintending Engineer's letter no orders are traceable in this office exempting M. G. Subba Ayyar. The Chief Engineer for Irrigation may be requested to say if any orders are traceable in his office. If not, the Superintending Engineer may be asked to apply for his exemption.

K.G.—14-6-13.

Make an extract to go to the Irrigation office. The case may then go to the Secretary.

D. MARSHALL—18-6-13.

Papers connected with the *appointment* of Mr. M. G. Subba Ayyar (No. 2064-T., dated 10th October 1900) have been destroyed. No papers relating to his *exemption from examination rules* are traceable in this office. With these remarks the file may, it is submitted, be returned to the Secretary.

G.V.—5-7-13.

P.K.S.—5-7-13.

F. E. MORGAN—7-7-13.

As the Public Works Department (Irrigation) say that the papers connected with the appointment of the sub-overseer M. G. Subba Ayyar have been destroyed, the Educational Department may be requested to state if any orders regarding the exemption of the man are traceable in that department. If not, the Superintending Engineer may be asked to apply for his exemption. The original of the Superintending Engineer's letter No. 5122, dated 4th June 1913, has already been referred to Educational with No. 744 R-3, dated 21st June 1913. * This may be forwarded to Educational in continuation.

* This file was returned to Public Works Department on 15th July 1913 with Educational u.o. No. 1969-1.

Engineer's letter No. 5122, dated 4th June 1913, has already been referred to Educational with No. 744 R-3, dated 21st June 1913. * This may be forwarded to Educational in continuation.

V.S.—12-7-13.

K.G.—14-7-13.

W. G. MOLESWORTH—16-7-13.

To the Educational Department.

EDUCATIONAL DEPARTMENT.

No orders exempting M. G. Subba Ayyar from the examination rules are traceable in this department. Public Works Department may be informed accordingly.

S.K.—19-7-13.

C. RAMANUJACHARI.—19-7-13.

C. S. ANANTARAM AYYAR—21-7-13.

To the Public Works Department.

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.

As Kesavalu Nayudu was permanently appointed in 1899, he should have passed the Upper Secondary or equivalent examination and not Middle School, first class, as stated by Educational. It is clear that he has not passed the former examination and so he requires exemption from passing it. The Superintending Engineer may be asked to submit an application for the exemption. He may be asked to follow the same course in regard to the other three men mentioned in paragraph 2 of his letter on page 2 of current file if they also do not possess the necessary general educational qualifications.

2. In regard to M. G. Subba Ayyar referred to in paragraph 3 of his letter, the Superintending Engineer may be asked to submit an application for his exemption from the Sub-Overseer and Surveyor test, as he was appointed subsequent to 24th April 1900.

3. A draft memorandum as above is submitted.

K.G.—24-7-13.

G. D. PLUMMER—28-7-13.

D. MARSHALL—29-7-13.

C. A. SMITH—31-7-13.

[Issued as Memorandum No. 744 R-5, dated 5th August 1913.]

D. MARSHALL—20-8-13.

To the Educational Department.

EDUCATIONAL DEPARTMENT.

C. RAMANUJACHARI—2-9-13.

Approved.

W. FRANCIS—4-9-13.

[G.O. No. 821, Educational, dated 5th September 1913.]

READ AGAIN G.O., No. _____, dated _____ 19____

" " " " _____, dated _____ 19____

READ ALSO:—

C. No. 2568, From the Imp^l Eng^t, 111 Circ^l No. 2975 dated 29. 3. 1913.
DO 4211. 5. 5. 13.
DO 5722 4. 6. 1913.
DO 2056. 28. 7. 13.
DO 7441, 9. 8. 1913.

ORDER

mis.

No. 82127, dated 5-9-1933

The following persons
are exempted from the exa-
mination rules for employ-
ment as Sub-overseers:—

- (1) M. R. R. V. Narimathu Pillai.
- (2) " N. Guruswami Aiyar.
- (3) " G. Kesavulu Nayudu.
- (4) " K. Sundaram Aiyar.
- (5) " M. G. Subba Aiyar.

8K
2018/13.
OK
7.9.12

W. H. L.

Depd only
order can
4/9/12

4/9/13

To The P.A.D. with scope

~~2006-2007~~ 2006-2007

notes to the committee

Six spare copies only
sent to 605 for 2 parts

London
11/10/42

PRESS SLIP.

ORDINARY.

PREFERENCE.

DEPARTMENT.

URGENT (a).

INSTRUCTIONS FOR THE SECRETARIAT.

(a) If a paper is marked to be printed urgently, the Superintendent of the section concerned should sign the Press slip. The Superintendent should exercise a careful discretion in the matter.

(b) Each letter, memorandum, or order, or set of orders, in the file of correspondence should be headed in succession with the Roman numeral I, II, III, etc., the number being written in red ink or blue chalk above the item. The particular papers to be printed in the special issue-copies should be indicated by the Roman numeral (I, II, etc.) by which that item has been headed in the correspondence file. All matter, including marginal remarks or references, to be printed should be written in ink and matter which should not be printed should be encircled. Initials and signatures that are not quite legible should be re-written distinctly.

(b) For rules regarding printing of notes, see rule 315 of the office Manual.

(c) The number of copies and the details of distribution should be filled in by the Superintendent or Referencer concerned.

(d) In the absence of special instructions to the Press to keep matter standing for a specified period, ordinary papers of 8 pages and under will be kept standing for one week, and larger papers for two weeks only. The type of notes and of all confidential papers is distributed immediately after striking.

(e) This slip, properly and completely filled in, should accompany every paper sent to Press; it will be returned by the Press when proofs are furnished; it should be sent to the Press when a call is made for revised proofs or when a corrected proof is sent for striking. When finally returned by Press it should be filed with the original order or letter.

INSTRUCTIONS FOR THE PRESS.

(a) If, in the opinion of the Superintendent of the Press, a paper has been marked urgent unnecessarily, he should send the Press slip to the Registrar with a remark to that effect.

(b) Unless a note to the contrary is made against the matter, pencil entries should not be printed. The Superintendent of the Press may bring to the notice of the Registrar any instance of incomplete or careless editing.

(c) Signature copies of letters to the Secretary of State or to the Government of India should be printed on hand-made paper.

(d) This slip should be returned by the Press to the Secretariat when proofs are furnished; it will be sent back to the Press when proofs are returned corrected and should be finally returned to the Secretariat when struck-off copies are supplied.

(e) The names of the Secretary and Members should be printed in full when they occur on the right hand side, only the first time when they appear on the left side, the initials alone being printed later.

Current No. dated 191 ..
G.O. No. 821, dated 5th SEP 1913 .. 1913

Number of MS. pages sent { Correspondence
(b) Notes
Measure to ship attached

Brief subject: Exemption from the examination of national revenue

(c) Number of copies required when struck off (not including copies for volumes and editors' table which are retained in the Press).	(d) Copies to supply requisitions for purchase by the public.	Complete correspondence and orders.	Notes.
For RECORD.*			
Madras Records ..		30	15
Coty Records ..		4	4
For filing with original ..		1	1
Total ..		35	20

For ISSUE.†	Letter only.	Complete G.O.	Special issue copies of G.O.	Notes.
			No. Papers.	

Signature copies.....				
India Office.....				
Govt. of India.....Dept.....				
Revenue Department.....				
Public Works Department.....				
Local and Municipal Department.....				
Educational Department.....				
.....Dept.....				
Public Dept.....				
Judicial Dept.....				
Political.....				
Financial Dept.....				
Marine Dept.....				
Ecclesiastical Dept.....				
Total				

Spare copies				
The.....				
The.....				
The.....				
The.....				
The.....				
The.....				
The.....				
The.....				
The.....				
The.....				
The.....				
The.....				
The.....				
The.....				
Total				

* Copies distributed on..... (Press Clerk.)

† Copies distributed on..... (Press Despatcher.)

TO PRESS, MADRAS OOTY.

A

Please send proof in duplicate. The papers have been carefully edited.

B

Proof returned corrected. Please strike off and send number of copies as indicated.

Type may be released after usual interval.
at once.

C

As the matter is clear manuscript and has been carefully edited, (b) proof need not be sent. Please print and supply number of copies as indicated.

Type may be released after usual interval.

8/19/13
8/19/13
for Supdt.

Referencer.
Clerk.

Referencer.
Clerk.

SPECIAL INSTRUCTIONS.

TO BE FILLED IN BY THE PRESS.

Diary.	Initials of Press official.
Received in Press on.....	10/19/13
First proof furnished on.....	10/19
Call for revised proof received on.....	
Revised proof furnished on.....	
Corrected proof received for striking on.....	8/10/13
Final copies supplied on.....	10/10/13

Account of copies.	Complete copies.	Notes.	Issue copies.	Special E.T. edition.
Supplied to Secretariat for Record.....	36			
" " " Issue.....	6			
" " " for Extra E.T. copies to supply requisitions for sale to the public.				4
For Volumes.....	16			
For supply to newspapers and institutions admitted to the privileges of the E.T.				
Total ...	57			