

Land Etn (1925) Department.

This SERIES.

G.O. No. 1473

DATED 24-8-25

[Despatch Abstract.]

Establishment - Certain physical training instructors and
drawing masters - initial pay ~~fixed~~ 9 orders passed.

BACK PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.	G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.
Mis	67	LE	19.1.25	Proc	711	LE	11.7.21
"	562	" "	11.4.24				
"	681	" "	3.5.24				
Proc	1063	" "	2.8.23				
Mis	269	LE	21.2.24				
"	389	" "	12.3.23				
"	1177	" "	6.6.22				

FURTHER PAPERS.

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

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

Law (Education)

DEPARTMENT.



Received 11.7.25 192 Registered 192

Subject.

L. En 1958G
6/7/25

Proposals for the revision of the initial pay of certain Physical Training Instructors and Drawing Masters employed in Government Training Schools - Submitted.

ENCLOSURES.

No.

R.O.C. No. 553 C/25

Spare copies

Station Madras, Date the 29th June 1925 192

From (Name) R.G. Grieve Esq., M.A.,

(Designation) Ag. Director of Public Instruction

To The Secretary to the Government of Madras,

LAW (EDUCATION) Department.

Sir.

I have the honour to submit the cases of the following subordinates for favourable consideration and to request that permission be granted to refix their initial pay with reference to the principles applied to the individuals mentioned in para 2 of G.O.No. 67, Law (Education) dated 19th January 1925.

1. Muhammad Azam, Physical Training Instructor, Government Training School for Muhammadans, Arcot was entertained on Rs 30 plus 10 from 11th January 1921 and his initial pay was originally fixed at Rs 41 from 1st March 1922. But as the Accountant General objected to the above on the ground that the Instructor did not draw pay at the rate of

2
Rs 40 throughout the 3 months prior to 1st March 1921 his pay was refixed and the excess drawn up to 31st January 1924 was waived in G.O.No. Mis.681, Law (Education) dated 3rd May 1924. The Instructor has now petitioned that the concession given to certain others in G.O.No.67 Law (Education), dated 19th January 1925 might be extended to him also. His case is similar to those dealt with in para 2 of the above G.O. except that he was entertained in service sometime earlier. I therefore consider that his request is just and reasonable and recommend that he may be allowed to start on 6th October 1922 at the stage which his old pay forms in the revised scale of Rs 25-1-50. He would be then eligible for a pay of Rs 40 from 6th October 1922. He will be entitled to an amount of Rs 20x Rs.203-13-0 as arrears of pay for the period from 1st February 1924 to 1st June 1925.

40
30
T
M
2. M.C. Angappa Chetti. was entertained in service as drawing master on 20th September 1921 and was drawing Rs 20 plus 10. His officiating services were terminated on 17th December 1923 on account of the amalgamation of the Government Secondary and the Elementary Training Schools at Coimbatore. But while fixing his initial pay he was given a rate of Rs 25 from 1st March 1922 and Government waived the excess drawn by him up to 1st October 1922 in G.O.No. 562 Misc. Law (Education), dated 11th April 1924 and the excess drawn from 1st October 1922 to 31st July 1923 in G.O.No. 67, Law (Education), dated 19th January 1925 on the ground that he left service. However ~~that~~ excess drawn after 1st August 1923 was recovered from him -- through the Chairman, Municipal Council, Coimbatore under whom he was employed. As his case also comes under para 2 of G.O.No. 67, Law (Education) dated 19th January 1925, it is recommended that he may also be given the benefit of the concession. Although he was ^{ousted} ~~outside~~ from service, I consider it equitable that he should be given the

3-
3
treatment which is given to others. He will be entitled to a sum of Rs 14-15-5 as arrear pay.

3. A. Ramakrishna Ayyar. was entertained as drawing master, Government Training School, Dindigul, on Rs 40 from 14th July 1921 and confirmed on 5th January 1923. He was required by the Accountant General to draw pay at Rs 25 from the date of entertainment, ~~his~~ next increment falling due on 14th July 1922. As this was considered a hardship Government was approached with the request that his pay might be fixed at Rs 41 from 5th January 1923. But Government declined to do this and fixed his pay on 1st March 1922 at Rs 25 plus 15 Personal allowance in G.O.No. 269 Mis. Law (Education), dated 21st February 1924. His pay remains stationary ever since. His case also is similar to those dealt with in para 2 of G.O.No. 67, Law (Education) dated 19th January 1925, and I therefore recommend that the concession may be extended to him also. The arrears for which he would be eligible on 1st June 1925 if the concession is granted to him is Rs 24-11-0. The total amount of arrears that would be due to the 3 subordinates mentioned above comes Rs 243-8-0 and this can be met from the anticipated savings under 31 D(a) Education-Special-Government Special schools (i) Government Training School for Masters-Pay of establishment-Voted in the Civil Budget Estimate for 1925-26.

4. U. Venkatakrishna Rao and C. Gnanasagara Rao were entertained as Physical Training Instructors on Rs 30/- from 10th February 1921 and from 4th February 1921 -- respectively and their pay was fixed at Rs 31 on 1st March 1922 as was done originally in the case of Muhammad Azam (No.1). But when the initial pay of Muhammad Azam was refixed and the excess drawn by him was recommended along with other cases for waiver upto 31st January 1924 in my letter R.C.No. 717 C/23, dated 27th February 1924 disposed

of in G.O.No. 681, Law (Education), dated 3rd May 1924, the above two cases were left out ^{by} oversight and the ~~INSEEN~~ --
Instructors therefore continued to draw pay at the rate originally fixed for them. Ordinarily they would be eligible for a pay of Rs 25 from 1st March 1921~~1921~~ and if their pay is now revised they will have to refund a heavy sum. But their cases are similar to those dealt with ⁱⁿ the para 2 of G.O.No. 67, Law (Education), dated 19th January 1925 except that they were entertained in service. I therefore recommend that U.Venkatakrisna Rao and C. Gnanasagara Rao may be permitted to draw Rs 30 and Rs 31 respectively from 6th October 1922 with subsequent increments for approved service as the above rates were their pay in the old scale on 6th October 1922. Even if Government be pleased to approve the above proposals, these two Instructors will have to refund Rs 26-2-7 and Rs 8-2-7 respectively as excess drawn up to 31st January 1924. In view of their low pay I recommend that the excess drawn by them up to 31st January 1924 may also be waived as has been done in the case of those dealt with in G.O.No. 681, Law (Education), dated 3rd May 1924. The excess drawn by them after 1st February 1924 will be recovered from them.

I have the honour to be,

Sir,

Your most obedient servant,

A R a m a Rao
3/17

for Director of Public Instruction

P.R.K. 1/7

3/17



Law (Education) department.

Post copy of Telephonic message.

From the Assistant Secretary to Government, Law (Education) department,

To the Deputy Director of Public Instruction,

Dated, Fort St. George, the 17th August 1925.

Reference : - Director's letter R.O.C. No. 553-C/25, dd 29th June 1925 - Initial pay of certain physical training instructors and drawing masters.

Will you please say whether G. Gnanasagara Rao was drawing pay at Rs. 21 plus 10 a month on 6th October 1922 on the old scale.

(True copy)

G. A. Venkataswami
Superintendent. *4.7.25*

Jn.

of in G.O.No. 681, Law (Education), dated 3rd May 1924, the
above two cases were left out ^{by} oversight and the ~~in~~ --
Instructors therefore continued to draw pay at the rate
originally fixed for them. Ordinarily they would be eligible
for a pay of Rs 25 from 1st March 1921~~xxx~~ and if their pay
is now revised they will have to refund a heavy sum. But
their cases are similar to those dealt with ⁱⁿ the para 2 of
G.O.No. 67, Law (Education), dated 19th January 1925 except

C.P. 204-982 Bks. -6-10-12.

OFFICE OF THE

Dated 6 192

Hours Minutes.

TELEPHONIC MESSAGE.

From

The Dy. D.O.

To

The A.S. Land (Govt.)

Refr. your letter yesterday Ref.
the initial pay of C.
Kwasagura Rao.
The query is
answered in the affirmative

18/8/25

P.R.K. 1/7

2677

pp 1-4 c. b. C.No 1958/C, From the Director of Public Instruction,
R.O.C. 553-C/25, dated 29-6-25.

Subject:- Initial pay of certain physical training instructors and drawing masters

The Director submits ^{for order} the question of the initial pay of certain subordinates (drawing masters and physical training instructors). The time scale of pay (Rs 25-1-50) for these officers was announced in G.O. No. 1177 Law (Education), dated 6th October 1922. Prior to this, they were drawing ^{varying} ~~fixed~~ rates of pay - ~~Rs 20 plus 10 or Rs 30 plus 10 as the case may be~~. According to the instructions issued for the fixation of initial pay, these officers, should, strictly speaking, be allowed an initial pay of Rs 26 on the ^{1st} ~~first~~ March 1922. While the question of the waiver of the recovery of excess pay drawn by certain other subordinates, owing to wrong fixation of initial pay, was under consideration, the Hon'ble Mr. R. A. Graham observed as follows :-

"If their appointment was necessary and the pay given them on appointment was actually the pay of the posts to which they were appointed, I do not think it was intended they should lose in pay on the revision. I should be inclined to let them start on 6th October 1922 on the pay they were then getting."

2 In pursuance of the orders extracted above, certain drawing masters and physical training instructors were allowed to be brought on the time scale of Rs 25-1-50 and allowed to start on the 6th October 1922 on the pay they were then drawing -vide paragraph 2 of G.O. No. 67 (Edn.), dated 19th January 1925. The case of the five persons referred to in the Director's present letter is more or less similar to the cases disposed of in the G.O. quoted above and they may also be given the same treatment.

3 In paragraph 4 of his letter the Director asks ~~that the initial pay of undersigned may be fixed on~~

G.O. No. 7117
11-7-21

p 17 q G.O. No. M
67 Law (Edn.)
19-1-25

pp 1-4 c. b.

pp 3-4 c. b.

4. A draft order is submitted. It may be sent to the Finance Department for acceptance.

Finance (E.T.)

Under para 2 of G.O.67 Law (Edn.) dated 19-1-25, six physical training instructors who were appointed subsequent to 1-3-1921 but before the time scale was sanctioned in G.O.No.1177 Law (Edn.) dated 6-10-22 were allowed to start on 6-10-22 on the pay they were drawing on that date in the old scale. The D.P.I. now recommends that a similar concession be granted to other individuals who are on the same footing as the cases disposed of in the above G.O. These cases are examined below:-

	Date of appoint- ment.	Pay drawn in old scale.	Initial pay fixed on 1-3-22.	Initial Pay now proposed from 6-10-22.	Remarks.
(1)	(2)	(3) Rs.	(4) Rs.	(5) Rs.	(6)
1. Mr. Muhammad Azam.	11-1-21	30 + 10	26	40	Excess pay drawn up to 31-1-24 waived. <i>67/91-15</i>
2. M.C. Angappa Chetty	20-9-21	20 + 10	25	30	Excess pay drawn up to 31-7-23 waived. Left Govt service on 17-12-23. <i>58-14</i> <i>562 edu</i> <i>44-24</i>
3. A. Ramakrishna Ayyar	14-7-21	40	25 + 15	40	personal shown <i>67/91-15</i>
4. U. Venkatakrishna Rao.	10-2-21	30	31	30	In these two cases the pay originally fixed by the D.P.I. has been allowed to continue by oversight.
5. C. Gnanasegara Rao	4-2-21	30	31	31	

2. The D.P.I.'s proposal is to fix the initial pay of these five officers as shown in col. (5) above, i.e., to allow them to start on 6-10-22 in the revised scale of Rs25-1-50 on the pay they were then getting in the old scale. Finance may agree to this.

In the case of Nos. (1) and (2) the excess amounts drawn by them at the rate of Rs41 and Rs31 respectively are waived by Government in G.O. No. ~~and no~~ 562 Law of 11-4-24 respectively. 68/Law dated. 3-5-1924. These amounts should be set off against the arrears due to them under the present proposal and only the balance paid to them. The excess drawn by (4) and (5) after 1-2-24 is also proposed to be recovered.

3. The extra cost involved in the current year is proposed to be met from anticipated savings in the existing allotments. Subject to the remark at "A" above, the draft order may be accepted.

K.R.

8.8.25 use
10.8.25

The presumption that G. Ganasagara Rao was drawing R24/- + 10/- on 6.10.22 under the old scale should be verified. Memoes accepted signed to A. above

Am

Law (Edr)

காவு (உயிர்)

'K' above has been reprinted
the drafts amended with
reference to 'A'. The drafts
may now.

N. A. 2488c
15787/5-
 File no no 2605751-1
 15.8.25
 for incy 171d
 \$526
 c.t
 SECRETARY TO GOVT. OF INDIA
 15. AUG. 1925
 LAW DEPARTMENT

Taken by Fins. &
red: 24/8.

Date. Initials.

When despatched ..

Certain physical training instructors and drawing masters - Initial pay - Orders passed.

192

C. No. 1958C. From the _____, No. _____, dated _____ 192 .

” ” ” ” ” ” ” 192 .

” ” ” ” ” ” 192 .

No. 1473 dated 24-8-1925.

In the circumstances stated, the Govt. direct that the initial pay on 6th October 1922 of the subordinates mentioned in the Director's letter should be fixed as follows : ---

Name of the officer . Initial pay
on
6th Oct. 1922.

- | | Salary - | |
|----|---|--------|
| 1) | Muhammad Azam-Physical training instructor, Govt. Training School for Muhammadans, Arcot. | Rs. 40 |
| 2) | M.C. Angappa Chettia Drawing master, Govt. training school, Coimbatore (since left service) | 30 |
| 3) | A. Ramakrishna Ayyar, Drawing master, Govt. Training School for masters, Dindigul ... | 40 |
| 4) | U. Venkatakrishna Rao, Physical Training Instructor ... | 30 |
| 5) | G. Gnanasagara Rao, Physical Training Instructor ... | 31 |

2 The extra expenditure involved in the grant of arrears of pay to the subordinates will be met from the provision

11

under "31 D (a) Education - Special Government Special Schools - Govt. Training Schools for Masters - Pay of establishment - Voted". in the Civil Budget Estimate for 1925-26-

3. The Govt. are unable to approve of the proposal of the Director that the recovery of the excess pay drawn by Mr. C. Gnanasagara Rao and U. Venkatakrishna Rao in excess of that admissible to them with reference to the initial pay to be fixed in pursuance of paragraph 1 above should be waived.

The excess pay drawn by Muhammad Aslam Sahib and M. C. Arugappa Chetti ~~for~~ the recovery of which was waived in G.O. No. 681 Ed., dt/3rd May 1924 and No. 67 Ed., dt/19th May 1925 should be set off against the arrears of pay due to them in consequence of the revision of their initial pay.

CR
22/7
V.T.
23.7
*

To the Director of Public Instruction
(with refce to his letter R.O.C No. 553 C/25, dd. 28-6-25)
" Accountant General. through the Finance department.
" Finance department.

DESPATCHED
25 AUG 1925
H

When given for copying
When copied
When examined
When signed

192

READ AGAIN G.O. No. 192 DATED

CURRENT No.

ENCLOSURES TO C. No.

ORDER OF GOVERNMENT ... A A A A A A A

LETTER OF GOVERNMENT.

STATEMENT WITH DITTO.

PAPERS NOT FILED OF, 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.