

Law (1925) Department.
(Education)

Ordinary SERIES.

G.O. No. 1319

DATED 30-7-1925

[Despatch Abstract.]

Indian Educational Service.

M. R. RY. M. C. S. Anantapadmanatha Rao
Avargal - Exempted from the pause ~~xxx~~ at Rs.600/- and
permitted to draw increased pay with effect from 1st
September 1925.

BACK PAPERS.

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

FURTHER PAPERS.

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

C.F. 30-41,000-8-9-24.

LAW (EDUCATION)

DEPARTMENT.

Received.....192 . Registered.....192 .

Subject.

Memorial from M.R.Ry., M.C.S. Anantapadmanabha Rao, Avl., Offg:

Professor of Physics, Presidency College, Madras, dated 18-3-25, requesting exemption from the pause at Rs.600/- in the Indian Educational Service Scale.

ENCLOSURES.
No.
Spare copies.

N.R.CNo. 549-C/25.

Station Madras , Dated the 7th April, 1925 .

From (Name) R.G.Grieve, ESQ., M.A., F.R.G.S.,

(Designation) DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC INSTRUCTION.



To The Secretary to the Government of Madras,

LAW (EDUCATION) Department.

Six,

Submitted to Government, Law (Education) department and recommended.

2. Attention is invited to this office endorsement N.R.C.No.202-C/24 dated 5-2-24 and letter R.C.No.576-C/24 dated 29-2-24 and the G.O.No.713 Mis., Law (Education) dated 8-5-1924.

3. The facts stated in para 3 of the Memorial are correct - vide G.O.No.232 R.Educational, dated 17-7-1911.

for Director of Public Instruction.

M.R.P.8/4.

The Presidency College,

Madras the 18th March, 1925.

From

M.R. Ry M.C.S. Anantapadmanabha Rao, Avl., M.A., L.T.,
Additional Professor of Physics,
Presidency College,
Madras.

To

The Secretary to the Government of Madras,
Law (Education) Department,
Madras.

Through

The Director of Public Instruction,
Madras.

Sir,

In January 1924 I memorialised the Government with a view to the removal in my case of the pause at the stage of Rs.600/- in the time scale of pay fixed for the Indian Educational Service Officers. I submitted two factors for the consideration of the Government in this behalf. Firstly, that I was an officer who was promoted to the I.E.S. at a late stage in life and that unless the pause was removed I would not have derived material benefit by my transfer to the I.E.S. and secondly in view of the rule of pay by age that the pause at the Rs.600/- stage would not have been intended to apply to cases like mine. I understood from the permanent Director of Public Instruction Mr. Littlehales that he viewed my application with favour. But the Government in their order No.713 Law, (Education) dated the 8th May 1924 were unable to grant the request presumably because the financial commitment by the extension of the concession to officers like me would involve a heavy extra expenditure to which the Government was not then prepared for.

2. Now that the financial conditions are more favourable I venture to approach the Government once again with a request that they will be pleased to consider my application on its

merits and pass favourable orders.

3. I wish to add also the following consideration in this connection. In 1911 myself along with Messrs. P.V. Seshu Iyer and K.R. Ramswami Aiyengar were promoted to the gazetted ranks in the same month i.e. July 1911, but while the other two were allowed to join their new posts immediately, I was under the orders of Government detained, specially to train a successor in the Presidency College at the same time attending to the laboratory fittings and arrangements at the new post in the Teachers' College, Saidapet. I joined the new gazetted appointment in October 1911. The result of this was not material then; but the recent orders of the Secretary of State fixing our pay in the I.E.S. with reference to the pay drawn by us in the M.E.S. affected me and not the others and I became a loser of Rs.50/- a month throughout the rest of my service, in as much as my basic pay was fixed with reference to the pay I was drawing on the 1st September and not what I should have drawn if I had joined the gazetted post in July 1911 as in the case of Mr. P.V. Seshu Iyer.

4. It is hardly necessary for me to state that the Physics chair in the Presidency College which I now hold is considerably more onerous than most of the appointments included in the service and I have no doubt that both the Principal of the Presidency College and the Director of Public Instruction will be able to bear testimony to the efficiency with which the Department of Physics is now being run. Further, I have four more years to serve the Government and the grant of my request will besides adding to my pension a few rupees more have conferred on me a real benefit which I will always cherish as a special favour that I received by reason of my promotion from the M.E.S. to the I.E.S.

I enclose herewith a copy of a memorial I submitted to Government in this behalf.

I beg to remain,
Sir,
Your most obedient Servant,

Anantapadmanabha Rao
Additional Professor Physics.

Re 178/25
19.3.25

Submitted. I commend this
request for favourable consideration.
It is desirable that a rule of
seniority should be fixed
for the promotion of officers
to the gazetted ranks.

Department, Madras.

dated the 1st Decem-
S. at Rs.550/- on the

the Government for the concession they
in having taken into consideration the actual emolument
drawn at the time of promotion in fixing the initial pay. This
involves a pause at Rs.600/- stage in my case. I understand
that the Secretary of State has empowered the Local Government
to remove the pause at this stage in special cases. I beg to
submit this representation in that behalf.

2. I am an officer promoted to the I.E.S. from the M.E.S.
at a late stage of life. I venture to state only two considerations
with reference to this request. The first is my age - I am already
49 years old. I believe it would not have been the intention of
the Secretary of State to apply the pause to cases of officers
promoted late in their service, when in the case of aged direct
recruits their pay is fixed with reference to their age. This
argument, I believe, does not require any elaborate demonstration.
The second is that my promotion to the I.E.S. which I think, has
been done solely on account of my merit and qualifications, to the
recognition of which I am grateful, would not give me as much
material benefit, as it should if the pause is not removed.

3. I beg that the Government will be so pleased to take
these facts into consideration and direct the removal of the pause
at Rs.600/- stage in my case.

* A direct recruit aged 49 will, ~~not~~ according to the orders of
the Secretary of State, start on Rs.1250/-.



The Presidency College,

Madras, the 18th March, 1925.

D.O.

Dear Mr. Krishnamachariar,

I am submitting through the proper channel a petition
to the Government in regard to the removal of the pause at
Rs.600/- stage in my case. In a conversation with Mr.
Littlehales I was led to believe that he made a special
recommendation on my behalf for the removal of the pause
but the Government were unable to grant that request in
1923. I should be grateful if you could kindly place
before the Hon'ble the Minister and His Excellency the Governor
the special circumstances of my case. The more recent recruits
in the service have considerably benefitted by the recent orders
but we of the older generation could not in the nature of things
expect all the benefits but it will be some solace if at least
what little concession could be shown to us is given us.

Yours sincerely,

Krishnamachariar
as. Any of Officer

(and 250) Dept

The receipt of the original petition
submitted through the D.P. way
he awaited.

7/4/25
My
8/14/25

R
8/14

2 5

(w/ Education) Depo

(C no. 1297 A) from the D.O., NRC no.

549-c/15 of 7.4.25

13

Subject: Memorial from M. M. M.
Anantapadmanabha Rao Avaral - Exemption
from prison at Rs. 500/- in the P.S. file

The paper referred to in the D.O. 9s
endorsement on the memorial are
put up in the case relating to a
similar Memorial from Mr. Abdul
Rahim. That file is in circulation.
Submitted that this current may lie
over till the paper referred to are
available.


~~In the meantime the memorial~~
~~has been circulated & may be perused~~
~~See may be in the meantime~~

File
18.4.25

1/11
18/4/25

18.4.25

YTK
20.4



The case of Mr. Ananta Padmanabha Rao is similar to that of Mr. Chakravarti and others dealt with in the linked file except in regard to the following circumstance.

2. While Mr. Chakravarti on promotion to the I.E.S. received only an increase of Rs. 50/- to his pay, Mr. Ananta Padmanabha Rao received an increase of Rs. 100/- to his pay on promotion to the I.E.S. Mr. Anantapadmanabha Rao however points out that, though he was appointed to a gazetted post in the Teachers' College in July 1911, he was not allowed to join it till October 1911 and in consequence, his initial pay in the I.E.S. ^{on 1-9-24} was fixed only at Rs. 550/- though Mr. Seshu Ayyar who was promoted to the M.E.S. simultaneously with him received an initial pay of Rs. 600/- per mensem.

3. In the circumstances explained in the memorial, the request of Mr. Anantapadmanabha Rao to be exempted from the pause at Rs. 600/- appears to be reasonable. He has already passed the stage of Rs. 600/- and ^{Following the order in the Chakravarti's case} is now in receipt of a pay of Rs. 700/- per mensem. ~~He~~ may be allowed to draw pay at Rs. 800/- per mensem, instead of Rs. 750/- per mensem, from 1st September 1925.

4. The file may be sent to Finance for remarks.

40. 160-61 (F)
1-1-24
40. 1686 (C)
1-12-23

Order No. 27
80.4206/3-7-11

(Z)

Fi 213-7 ET

1297 A-1
8.8.25



Finance U.O

6.6.

Finance (F.T.)

The case of Mr. Anantapadmanabha Rao is not exactly similar to that of the officers dealt with in the linked file. The former got an increase of Rs 100 to his pay on promotion from M.E.S. to I.E.S., while Messrs Rama Rao, Ramaswami Ayyangar, Abdul Rahim, and Chakravarti referred to in the linked file got very little or no increase on such promotion - vide Cols. 2 and 5 in the stat at page 11 of G.O. No 713 Law Edr. D. 8.5.24. In the ordinary course, Mr. Anantapadmanabha Rao will get Rs 950 on attaining his 55th year as against Rs 800 he would get if he had not been promoted to the I.E.S.

2. His case bears a closer analogy to that of Mr. Seshu Ayyar who got an increase of Rs 125 on promotion to I.E.S. In Mr. Seshu Ayyar's case, Govt considered that there was not sufficient reason for abolishing the pause at Rs 600. There does not therefore seem to be a strong case for exempting Mr. Ananta Padmanabha Rao from the pause at Rs 600 from the date of his next increment as proposed by law. For

9 Sept 1927

40. 215 in the stat
at F.T. (P)

G.O. No 394 L.F.
14.3.24 (A)

19. 02.02.1927

orders whether Law Edn may be requested to negative the request. ^{of the exemption is}

^{CA} 13.6.25 granted in this case, it will be difficult ^{one} to resist the claims of the other officers ^{13.6.25} in the list at (2) for a similar concession.

~~There are~~

The case for the removal of the prance at Rs 600 in respect of M.E.S. Officers promoted to the S.E.S. has been put forward on two grounds:-

1. That officers of a certain seniority promoted cannot reach the maximum pay in the ordinary scale - Rs 1250

2. That certain officers got little or no ^{if any} increase when their initial pay was fixed in the S.E.S.


The first ground, if accepted, would obviously entitle all officers of a certain seniority to the removal of the prance in their cases - and Govt have decided that they would only consider special cases.

As regards the 2nd ground Mr AP Rao obtained an increase of Rs 100 in promotion to the S.E.S. He, however, ^{claims} that his initial pay was fixed at Rs 500 lower than it would otherwise have been, because he was not allowed to join duty in a gazetted post until Oct. 1911 - although appointed in July. This hardship would seem better remedied by a revision of initial pay than by the removal of the prance at Rs 600 - as the latter ^{case} would open the way to claims from the officers in the list at (2).

Yours
Dy Secy.

Finance no 2134767-1
18.6.25

Law (Edn) Prance inculcate to C4.



Law (Education) Department

If, as suggested by the Dy. Secretary, Finance, Mr. Anantapadmanabha Rao is allowed to count service in the M.E.S. from 10th July 1911 instead of from October 1911, his initial pay in the I.E.S. on promotion to that service from 1st September 1920 should be fixed at Rs. 600 p.m., instead of at Rs. 550 p.m., as in G.O. No. 1586 Law (Edn) dated 1st December 1923.

2. If the initial pay on 1st September 1920 is fixed at Rs. 600 p.m., Mr. Anantapadmanabha Rao will become eligible for a pay of Rs. 800 p.m. on 1-9-25 as shown below:-

Date	Rate of pay
1-9--1920	600
1-9--1921	600
1-9--1922	650
1-9--1923	700
1-9--1924	750
1-9--1925	800

In addition, he may also claim arrears of pay with retrospective effect. Such arrears may amount to over Rs. 2400.

3. In para 3 of this department's note on p. 3 ante, ~~this department~~ suggested that Mr. Anantapadmanabha Rao ~~may~~ be allowed to draw pay at Rs. 800 p.m. from 1st September 1925 instead of at Rs. 750 p.m. --the pay admissible to him under existing orders.

4. It will be seen that the proposal of Finance will cost Govt. more than the suggestion made in this department. In view of this circumstance, Finance may be asked to reconsider its views.

Pay in the M.E.S. Rs 475
Ag. Allowance in the I.E.S. 100
575

As there is no stage of Rs 575 in the I.E.S. scale, the next stage of Rs. 600 should be adopted as the initial pay.

23559

12974-2


1000 Rs. 12.50

29.6.25

CA
15/6/25

V.R.
26.6

For u.O.



Finance (ET)

Subd with reference to the D.S.'s note on page 5 ante. For orders whether in the circumstances explained on page 6 ante, Finance may agree to Mr. Anantapadmanabha Rao being allowed to draw Rs. 800/- with effect from 1-9-25

Wus
29.6.25

I agree that revision of initial pay cannot be contemplated at this stage. We can exempt him from 'penal' with retrospective effect be allowed

2 Law Dept proposal is to allow him to draw Rs. 800/- from instead of Rs. 750/- from with effect from 1-9-25.

The argument advanced by petitioners is that when Leshu Lyes & Ramaswami Ayyangar, who were promoted to gazetted rank in the same month in 1911, but that for public reason, he was not

allowed to join duty along with them. I think, however, that he obtained an initial Rs. 550/- against Rs. 500/- allowed to Ramaswami Ayyangar & Rs. 600/- to Leshu Lyes.

He thus has secured an advantage of Rs. 100/- as compared with his contemporaries Ramaswami Ayyangar. Considering that he obtained an increase of Rs. 100/- on promotion to the I.E.S. I do not think it necessary to allow even the concession suggested by Law (Ed.)


3 It should be please

Law (Ed.)

Col 151 on p 119
Hes (P)

L. E. 2330A

4/7/25



Fin no 2355945-1
30.7.25

Law (Education) departt.

May be circulated to M-2, C-4 and H.E. for orders.


2. Mr. Anantapadmanabha Rao officiated in the I.E.S. even prior to 1st September 1920, the date of his promotion to that service, while Mr. Ramaswami Ayyangar, on that date, drew only the pay of an officer in the M.E.S. Hence the difference in the initial pay of the two officers, noted by Finance. This difference in pay cannot be treated as a concession to Mr. Anantapadmanabha Rao, but was allowed to prevent a reduction in the pay actually drawn at the time of promotion.

para 2-
p. 6 ante

3. As already pointed out, Mr. Anantapadmanabha Rao would, from 1st September 1920, have drawn Rs. 50 per mensem more than the pay allowed to him by Govt., ~~if he had~~ been permitted to join his appointment in the Teachers' College in July 1911. He has already lost in emoluments to the extent of Rs. 2,400/-. The proposal to raise his pay from Rs. 750/- to Rs. 800/- per mensem from 1st September 1925, if accepted, will serve to ~~remove the~~ the disability created in 1911.

6.7.25

V.T.
8.7.



M2

C4


H. E. the Govt

22.7.25

The paper of Law Secretary seems reasonable & I agree to raise the pay to Rs. 800/- from 1st Sept 1925 -

Receipt pay of Rs. 800/- from 1-9-25. L.M.


18/7/25



Mr. Littlehales states that this officer has done "exceptionally good work" (P) 10

V.T.
6.7

As regards the extra expenditure during 1925-26, the D.P.O. has stated in the case of a few other officers who are also exempted from the pause, that it can be met out of the anticipated savings in the respective heads of account in the C.P.E. for 1925-26 to which the pay of the officers concerned are debitable. Submitted that in the case of Mr Anantapadma. Natta Rao also such an arrangement seems possible. A draft order exempting him from the pause is sent for approval. ~~The draft may be sent to Finance for perusal before issue~~



File 23/7/25
25/7/25
24.7.25
V.T.
24.7.
Fin U.O.

Finance (ET)

The draft order is in accordance with the decision of Govt on page 8 ante. The case may be perused and returned

27.7.25
28/7/25
29/7
29/7/25
28/7/25

27 JUL 1925
Law Edms
24.7.25
26306 ET
27/7/25

2762A
29/7/25
Fin no 26306 ET-1
28/7.25

Date. Initials.
When received for Fair-copying
When copied
When examined
When signed
When despatched

Indian Educational Service

Mr M.C.S. Anantapadma. Natta Rao Avangal - exempted from the pause at Rs 600/- with effect from 1.9.25.

READ AGAIN G.O. No. , dated 192

READ ALSO:-

C. No. 1262A From the , No. , dated 192
1297A
2150A
2330A

ORDER.

Mis.

No. 1319, dated 30-7-1925.

The Government are pleased to exempt Mr M.C.S. Anantapadmanatha Rao Avangal from the pause at Rs 600 in the time-scale of pay sanctioned for officers of the Indian Educational Service. ~~But~~ No increase of pay will be allowed for the period from 1.9.22 to 31.8.1925. He will be permitted to draw pay at Rs 800 a month from 1.9.25 instead of at Rs 750 a month.

2. The extra expenditure
 during the current year
 will be met from savings
 anticipated under '31-A-
 'Education - University-
 'Government arts Colleges-
 'men -
 'Pay of officers - non-voted'

Dis
 28/7/25
 22/7/25

14/7/25

V.F.
 24.7

The D.P.I
 The A.G. through the Finance
 Dept
 The Finance Dept

DECEASED

31 JUL 1925

for copying
 ed
 med
 at

192

O. No. DATE

No.

O. No.

VERNMENT

VERNMENT

THE DITTO

FIELD OF, BRING MEANT FOR DISPATCH
 FINAL

Copy in full.
 Not to be copied.
 Copy abstract only.
 Copy heading only.

A A A A A A A

10