

Law (Education) (1926) Department.

Ms SERIES.

G.O. No. *470*

DATED *29-3-26*

[Despatch Abstract.]

Establishment - Sub-Assistant Inspectresses and School

Assistants (Women's Branch) - Excess pay - Waiver of recovery -

Orders passed.

BACK PAPERS.

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

FURTHER PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.	G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.
1680 3-7-26							

F. No. 18,658 8-10-23.

EDUCATIONAL

DEPARTMENT.

1. m
6340
4-1-24

Received



192

Registered

46066
560113
17/12/23
192

Subject.

Recovery of the amount drawn by certain members of the
Subordinate Members of the Subordinate Educational
Service - Waiving of - Recommended.



ENCLOSURES.

No.

R.C. No. 727-G/23.

Spare copies

Station Madras, Dated the 6th. December, 1923.

From (Name) P. Littlehales, Esq., M.A.,

(Designation) Director of Public Instruction.

To The Secretary to the Government of Madras,

LAW (EDUCATION) Department.

Sir,

In G.O.No.737 Law (Education) dated 29-5-23,
orders were passed sanctioning the revision of pay of
the members of the Subordinate Educational Service (Women's
Branch). This order, though dated 29-5-23, was received
in this office only on 8-7-23, and until its receipt,
appointments were being made on the old rates of pay
under G.O.No.1587 Law (Education) dated 18-12-22. On
receipt of G.O. No.737 dated 29-5-23, statements for
fixing initial pay were called for from the subordinate
officers and the pay of the existing incumbents were fixed
in October '23. From this it is observed that the pay of

(P.T.O)

General diary No.	GM. 4146
File or case.	
Disposal.	
Initials of the Supt. with date.	

-2-

officers without substantive appointment recruited after 1-3-21 has in some cases been considerably reduced with the result that they have to refund the excess pay drawn from 1-5-23 to 30-9-23. As the Director has no information until July last, that the revised scale would have retrospective effect, and as he had been authorized to make appointments on the old rates of pay, he could not prevent the drawing of excess pay in those cases until their initial pay was fixed, and immediate action was taken, by reference to Inspectresses of Schools, to fix their initial rates of pay. As it will be hard to oblige these officers to refund the excess drawn, I request that Government will be pleased to waive the recovery of the excess amount drawn upto 1st October 1923.

I have the honour to be,

Sir,

Your most obedient servant,

Rames 10.12.23
for Director of Public Instruction.

M.R.P. 7/12.

Law (Education) Dept

Encl. 4606 B-1 9/18.12.23

Referred to the Accountant-General for remarks.
(By order)

Ramamurthy
Under Secretary
to Government

8/5

The Accountant-General
(to be read with reply)

1-8-23.

Law (Education) DEPARTMENT.

CURRENT No.

Received

192

Registered

L. Edn 147B

192



ENCLOSURES.

No.

No. - T.M. 23-7219

FORT ST. GEORGE,

Dated the 9th January 1924.

From

THE ACCOUNTANT-GENERAL, MADRAS,

To

THE SECRETARY TO THE GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS.

Law Education Department,

SIR,

In returning herewith Government endorsement 4606-B-1- dated the 18th December 1923 referring to this office for remarks letter No.R.C. 727-G/23 dated the 6th December 1923 from the Director of Public Instruction regarding the waiving of the excess payments made to persons without substantive appointments in the subordinate educational service (women's) Branch, for the period 1-5-23 to 30-9-23, I have the honour to state that as the appointments in the subordinate services (Women's Branch) have with the exception of college assistants been revised on a time scale basis - in G.O.1459 Law Edn dated the 30th November 1922, it is not clear why officiating incumbents without substantive appointments entertained after 1-3-21 should have been permitted to draw after 1-12-22 more than the minimum pay of the posts. The Government order No. 1587 Law (Edn) dated the 18th December 1922 would appear to admit officiating -

grade promotions only to such of the posts in the Educational Department as have not been included in G.O.215-Financial dated the 4th March 1921 until their pay is reorganised on a time - scale basis.

2. There is however no audit objection to the proposal being sanctioned by Government. In the absence of a detailed statement showing the amount of overpayment made to the officers concerned it is not possible to indicate the extent of the amount involved in the recommendation made.

I have the honour to be,

Sir,


Your most obedient Servant,

Dy. Accountant-General

18,658-3-10-23.

LAW (EDUCATION) DEPARTMENT.

Received



Registered

192

Subject.

Recommending to be waived, the recovery of the excess amount drawn by certain women officers.

Referred to the Accountant-General for remarks (By order)

The Acct. General
(To be ret'd with reply)

Ramanujachari
Under Secretary
to Govt. Secy.

R.O.C. No. 727 G/23

Station Madras, Dated the 26th February 1924 192

From (Name) R. Littlehailes Esq., M.A.,

(Designation) DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC INSTRUCTION

To The Secretary to the Government of Madras,

LAW (EDUCATION) Department.

Sir,

In continuation of my letter R.C.No. 727 G/23

dated 6th December 1923 recommending that the recovery of the Excess amount drawn by certain members of the subordinate Educational Service be waived, I have the honour to state that from the statements received from the heads of institutions I find that some of the officers recruited prior to 1-3-1921 have also to refund excess pay drawn by them. Consequent on the introduction of the time scale.

2. Further as the initial pay of secondary grade teachers was fixed only in December 1923, they have drawn pay at the old rates for the months of from May to November 1923. In the case of these teachers there-

6
therefore the excess amount drawn has to be waived for 7 months while in the case of others (Graduate school Assistants and Sub Assistant Inspectresses) the excess amount drawn is only for 5 months from May to September 1923.

3. A consolidated statement showing the excess pay drawn by all women officers is enclosed. I recommend that the recovery of the excess amounting to about Rs 4744-5-0 be waived.

4. I fear that if the refunds are to be paid in full by the teachers several of the women officers will resign and be lost from educational work in the -- Presidency.

I have the honour to be,
Sir,

Your most obedient servant,

R. K. S.
for Director of Public Instruction.

P.R.K. 27/2

m/
29.2

P. 173-1,000-31-8-23.

Law (Education)

DEPARTMENT.

CURRENT No.

Received



192

Registered

L. C. 697C

192

28/3/24

Subject.

ENCLOSURES.

No.

Two Six Sheets

Spare copies

No. Edn.1-704

FORT ST. GEORGE,

Dated the 26th March 1924 192

From

THE ACCOUNTANT-GENERAL, MADRAS,

To

THE SECRETARY TO THE GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS.

Law (Education) Department.

SIR,

h. S. S.
With reference to Endorsement No.311 C-1, dated 6th March 1924 forwarding for remarks letter No.R.O.C.727 G.2 dated 26th February 1924 from the Director of Public Instruction, Madras, (herewith returned with its enclosures) I have the honour to state that as the initial pay of the Women School Assistants and Secondary Grade teachers fixed by the Director of Public Instruction has not been checked in all cases and approved by this office, it is not possible to certify as to the correctness of the amounts the recovery of which is recommended to be waived by Government.

2. If after check it be found that a greater amount has been overdrawn than that stated by the Director of Public Instruction he will be addressed to send a supplemental statement.

Name of Teacher	Initial pay Fixed	Rate at which pay has been drawn from 1-5-23 to 31-3-23	Amount of excess pay drawn		
Government Secondary & Training School for Mistresses, <u>Rajahmundry</u>					
1 Miss. G. M. Abraham	150 + 30 [✓] + 10	200	50		
2 " K. Venkataratnam	75 + 10 [✓]	100 + 25	163	14	
3 " B. Venkataratnam	75 + 10 [✓]	100 + 25	109	11	
Lady Anpithill Secondary School for Girls, <u>Masulipatnam</u>					
1 Mrs. M. Jesudason	150 + 10 [✓]	180	81	15	
2 Miss E. J. Abraham	75 + 10 [✓]	100 + 25	118	11	
Govt Training School for Mistresses, <u>Bellary</u>					
Miss M. Paranjothi	75 + 10 [✓]	106 1/4	82	14	
Govt Middle School for Girls, <u>Vellore</u>					
Sri Malli G. Sumanthi Annual	75 + 10	125 + 25	325		
Presidency Training School for Mistresses, <u>Egmore</u>					
Miss E. Chorley	75 + 10	100 + 25	4	3	
Lady Willingdon College for women					
Miss E. M. Cavanaugh	160 + 10	125 + 25	3	14	
" S. B. Israel	100 + 50 [✓] + 10	150 + 30	80		
Govt Hobart Secy Hg School for Mistresses, <u>Royapettah</u>					
Miss C. Jeevaratnam	150 + 12 [✓] + 10	180	32	12	
Govt Secondary & Training School for Mistresses, for women, <u>Cuddalore</u>					
Miss Mary Pakkiam	100 + 10 [✓] (75 + 10)	125 + 25	199	4	
Govt Secondary School for Girls, <u>Mayavaram</u>					
V. Chellammal	75 + 10 [✓]	100 + 25	118	11	
Govt Secondary School for Girls, <u>Salem</u>					
M. Parnalathi	75 + 10 [✓]	100 + 25	133	6	

Statement showing the excess pay drawn by the Secondary grade Teachers for 6 months from 1-5-23 to 30-11-23. (1)

Name of Teacher	Initial pay fixed	Amount at which pay has been drawn from 1-5-23 to 30-11-23.	Amount of Excess pay drawn	
Government Middle School for Girls, <u>Berhampore.</u>				
Mrs E. Peacock.	57	65	56	..
Queen Mary's High School, <u>Vizagapatam.</u>				
1. A. Mary.	45	57	48	5
2. Mrs. A. Bhushanamma	45	57-3-	84	9
3. S. Perumdevanamma	45	52	48	5
4. A. Ragalakshman.	45	52	33	1
Govt Training School for Mistresses, <u>Rajahmundry.</u>				
1. Mrs. L. Satyananda	69	78	36	-
2. Mrs. L. Melhusala	45	52	42	11
Lady Ampthill Secondary School, <u>Masulipatam.</u>				
1. Mrs. S. S. Kamalam	45	52	7	4
2. Mrs. Purnachandravati	48	52	7	-
Government Middle School <u>Kurnool.</u>				
Mrs. M. K. R. Naidu	27-8-	65	187	12
Mrs. K. Lancesh	54	78	124	13
Mrs. Mary Samuel	45	52	29	14
Mrs. G. Manikyan	45	52	42	10
Government Girls Secondary School, <u>Anantapur.</u>				
Mrs. K. Ratnamma	45	52	31	12
Miss P. Sumethamma	57	78	84	2
Govt Training for Women, <u>Nellore.</u>				
K. Rukmaniamma	54	83	162	12
Mrs. G. R. David	32	33 1/2	25	9

L. Rukhanna	27½	30	17	8
-------------	-----	----	----	---

Government Secondary school for girls, Vellore.

Mrs. C. S. Bedford	45	52	49	-
Miss Lily Peter	45	52	49	-
Lakshmi	54	78	120	

Presidency Training school for women, Egmore.

Miss K. Joseph	45	52	42	11
----------------	----	----	----	----

Lady Willingdon Training College for women.

Mr. Visalakshiammal	54	65	77	-
Miss J. Kadambam	54	78	87	-
Mrs. V. Sankaranyal	45	57-3	85	6
Mrs. S. Meenakshiammal	45	52	49	-

Govt Secondary & Training school for women, Royapetah.

Mrs. N. Swarnammal	72	75	14	4
--------------------	----	----	----	---

Govt Secondary & Training school for women, Cuddalore.

Miss D. Anleelayammal	29	40	69	8
Mrs. Anantamoni Ramayya	27-8	35	33	2

Govt Training school for women, Tanjore.

Mercy Christopher	54	65	67	1
B. Muthiam	45	52	43	6

Govt Mixed Training school for women, Trichinopoly.

Alice anbammal Samuel	59	57-3	1	5
Mrs. E. M. Thomas	54	65	64	3
Mahaboo Bi	27-8	30	15	4

Govt Middle school for girls, Mayavaram.

Miss A. Savariimuthu	45	52	42	11
" Grace Israel	45	52	42	11
" Ratnam David	45	52	42	11
" V. Meenakshi	22-8	35	26	3

Miss Edeth Rajammal	45	52	42	11
David.				
Miss Swamy Arujal	45	52	42	11

128
(a)

Government Middle School for Girls, Madurai.

K. Visalakshi	45	52	42	11
Miss A.D. Rajaraman	45	52	42	11
Miss E. Perianayakam	45	52	42	11

Govt. Secy School for Girls, Salem.

1 Mrs. N. Velayutham	54	78	148	-
2 " P.S. Peters.	45	52	34	2
3 " Manomanickam	45	52	7	11
4 Mrs. S.D. Kurujan	45	52	49	-
5 Miss K. Arumanaya-	45	52	42	11
6 " M. Sahadevi	45	52	42	11

Govt Secondary Training School for Mistresses, Coimbatore.

1 Mrs. B. D. Dasan	45	52	49	-
2 Miss L.B. Rice	45	45	49	-
3 Miss J. Rajammal	45	52	28	-
4 " G. Mantody	27½	30	5	3

Government Training School for women, Cannanore.

Miss M. Briko	45	52	42	11
" A. Perujan	45	52	15	6

Govt Training School for women, Tellicherry.

Miss C. Sharada	45	52	30	7
-----------------	----	----	----	---

Government Secondary & Training School for women, Mangalore.

Miss Karunakar	90 + 3¾ P.A.	106-4	88	-
Miss C. Karat	75	78	21	-
Miss A.D. Sanza	51	52	7	-
Sybella Paul	60	65	35	-

Amount of Excess pay drawn by Sub-assistant
in 13 9 10 7 13

Name	Initial pay fixed.	Rate at which pay has been drawn for 1-5-23 to 31-9-23.	Amount of excess.	
Miss Rosie Viwasam.	95+35	150	53	-
" M. S. Rozario	100+50 80+25	150	475	.
Total			4744	5

James
For Director of Public Instruction

m
29.2

10x

Law of Eng Dept.
(11)

Memo: 697c-1 7/14-4-24

Subordinate Ed. Service -

Women's Branch - Excess

pay - Waiver of recovery -

DD's letter No. 727 of 23, 7

26. 2. 24.

H56cf

697c.

The Director of
Public Instruction is requested
to furnish information as to
the overpayments made to
the Subordinates concerned
prior to the 1st May 1923 and
subsequent to the issue of
G.O. No. 1459, Law (Eng), 7
30-11-22 fixing the time
scales of pay for these
appointments.

2. The Director is also
requested to report the modifications
necessary in the statement
submitted by him with reference
to para 5 of the A.G.'s letter
No. 251-1-704, 7 26. 3. 24 - Copy
enclosed.

Despd
8/23/24.

14/11
11/28/24

One D.D.
(w/c copy of A.G.'s letter)
H7-8cf

5/4/24
11. 4. 24

11. 4. 24



L a w (Education)


DEPARTMENT.

Received 192 . Registered 192 .

Subject.

L. E. 1277C
26/5/24

Subordinate Educational Service Women's Branch -
 excess pay waiver of recovery



ENCLOSURES.

No.

Spare copies.....

R.O.C. No. 727 G/23

Station..... M a d r a s , Dated the 20th May 1924.

From (Name) R. Littlehales Esq., M.A.,(Designation) Director of Public Instruction

To The Secretary to the Government of Madras,

L a w (Education)

Department.

Sir,

With reference to Government Memo. No. 697 C-1
 Law (Education) dated 14-4-24 I have the honour to state
 that the subordinate officers have been requested to furnish
 particulars of the excess pay drawn from 30-11-22 to
 30-4-23 and a statement of overpayments will be submitted
 to Government on receipt of particulars from them.

2. In this connection I beg to invite your attention
 to the fact that the initial pay statements of all the
 schools in the Presidency have not yet been checked by the
 Accountant General and his remarks communicated to me. Until
 this is done it is not possible to submit a complete state-
 ment of excess pay drawn.

3. Further the time scale for the Subordinate Educational Service (Women's Branch) was sanctioned in G.O.No.1459 Law (Education) dated 30-11-22 and proposition statement in respect of the above time scale was sanctioned in G.O.No.737 Law (Education) dated 29th May 1923. Appointments were therefore being made in the old scale of pay until 29-5-23. The Accountant General holds that promotions and appointments should not have been made according to the old scale with reference to Government Memo.2241-022 dated 23-5-21. I beg to point out however that if the Accountant General's view had been accepted no appointments could have been made between 1st March 1921 and 30th November 1922, the date of G.O.No.1459 Law (Education) announcing the time scale in respect of the Subordinate Educational Service Women's Branch; and great inconvenience in the working of the Department would have been caused in consequence.

4. In another communication, the Accountant General has stated that the promotions and confirmations made after 30-11-22 are irregular. But as already pointed out in this office No.R.C.726/G/23 dated 19-3-24 there was no indication whatever in G.O.No.1459 Law (Education) dated 30-11-22 as regards the date from which the revised scales would be given effect to nor were any definite instructions issued therein prohibiting appointments and promotions under the old scale of pay until the receipt of G.O.No.737 Law (Education) dated 29-5-23. In the above circumstances I request you will be so good as to issue early orders on this office letter R.C.No.726 G/23 dated 19-3-24 regularising appointments and promotions made up to 29-5-23.

I have the honour to be,
Sir,
Your most obedient servant,

Francis
For Director of Public Instruction

T R 22/5

m
22-5

13/ Memo No: 386c-2/494.2-5. *Law (Edn) Def*
S. E. S. Women's branch -
excess pay - J. P. S. letters, R.C. No.
727-2, d/ 6.12.22, 26.2.24, 20.5.24
1586 C.F.
With reference to

① paragraph 4 of G.O.No.131
Law (Edn), d/ 28th January 1925
The Government observe that
all overpayments to members
of the Subordinate Ed: Service
Women's branch, from and
after the 30th Nov: 1922, the
date on which time scales
of pay for this branch
were announced, are liable to
be recovered. The J. P. S. are
requested to submit through
the A. G. a complete list
of overpayments commencing
from December 1922.

Remuneration
DESPATCHED
8 AUG 1925 B

with list.
DESPATCHED
7 FEB 1925
814

5/2. 5/2. 20/3
To the J. P. S. (with list sent)
copy to the A. G.
R. 6 weeks after issue.
3.2.25 *CR 4.2.25*


Remuneration
DESPATCHED
18 SEP 1925

Remuneration 16/4
1912
140

Law (Education)

DEPARTM NT.

14
18
14
h. du 16 20 c
29/5/25



Subject.

Enclosures :—

No. Edn. 1-200

FORT ST. GEORGE, MADRAS,
Dated the 27th May 1925 192 .

FROM

THE ACCOUNTANT-GENERAL,

Madras.

TO

THE SECRETARY TO THE GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS,
Law (Education) DEPARTMENT.

SIR,

I have the honour to state that a sum of Rs. 118-11-0 was drawn in excess by Mrs. V. Chellammal for the period from 2nd July 1923 to 30th September 1923 during which she acted as Headmistress of the Government Middle School for Girls, Mayavaram. This amount has been included in the statement of excess pay drawn by certain members of subordinate Education Service (Womens' Branch) forwarded to Government by the Director of Public Instruction with his

15019
letter No.R.O.C.727 G/23, dated 26th February 1924. The Director of Public Instruction who was addressed in the matter by this office reports that she is no longer in Government service and that the amount due from her will be included in the consolidated statement of excess pay drawn by teachers to be submitted to Government with reference to their Memo 386/c-2, Law (Education), dated 4th February 1925. As the amount has been long outstanding in the objection books of this office I would request that early orders may kindly be passed either waiving recovery of the overpayment or stating how the overpayment should be recovered.

I have the honour to be,

Sir,

Your obedient Servant,

[Signature]
Deputy Accountant General.

R. Ven.

20

(15)

Law (Ed.)

C.1620/c.

Memo.

1620c-1 of 17-6-25

Reference letter from the

A.G. No. Ed. 1-200, N/2) H

May 1925 - Overpayment to Mrs

V. Chellammal.

With reference to

paragraph 2 (4) of G.O. No.

647 Finance, N/6 H. Sep:

1924, the Government

sanctioned the waiver of the

recovery of a sum of

~~Rs 118-11-0~~ as per

Rs 118-11-0 overpayment to

Mrs. V. Chellammal which

she was acting as the

headmistress of the Govt.

Middle School for girls,

Mayavaram, in the year 1923.

DESPATCHED

18 JUN 1925

To the A.G. only

Copy to the D.P. M.

[Signature]
15/6/25

V.F.
16.6

Respected Sir,

I have the honour to state that after graduating from College in 1920, I worked for two years in private service and received a salary of Rs 120/-. I was promised Rs 130/- with an annual increase of Rs 5/- when I passed my B.T.

Just then, my father retired from service, and I being the eldest in the family found that the salary received by me was insufficient for the maintenance of my whole family. This, I also thought that better treatment could be expected in Government service. I was also sure that the Government would keep to their word.

So, in 1922 July I joined Government service at Rs 150/- per month. In April 1923 I was confirmed in my post and since then drew Rs 150 plus 35. When

In 1924 my father died and at a time I could not be helpful to my family, I was ordered to draw only Rs 120/- which is insufficient to maintain my own self. I was confirmed on Rs 150/- and was confirmed on Rs 150/-. For the last three years I have been drawing that salary and during that period

17
pleased my superior officers by satisfactory work, which fact
may be ascertained from them, necessary. It is not only
most disappointing but is also painful to be suddenly reduced
to Rs 75/- and as a consequence have been put to great pecu-
niary difficulty. If I had known that this would happen, I
would have continued in private service and would be getting Rs 150/-
now. But nothing of this sort was said then, and I will not --
be taken back into private service now.

As a consequence of the reduction my travelling allowance
has been affected. It has been reduced simultaneously and what
I now draw is quite insufficient for my expenses. So I am
put to great difficulty in every way.

So, in consideration of the facts stated above, that I was
appointed and confirmed on Rs 150/- and drew this salary for two
years, that I am the only earning member of the family and that
I cannot take up any other work now, I request your honour to
fix my salary at Rs 150/- per mensem.

I have the honour to be,

Most honoured Sir,

Your most obedient servant,

K. Popal Aiyar
Sub Assistant Inspectress of
Schools, Cantur Girls' Range.

Copy Submitted to C.E. Minister of Education Madras.

Memo No. 847 C/25-1 dated 4-6-25

Initial pay - Miss K. Gopala Ayyar -
Sub-Assistant Inspectress of Schools

--
The Government have received a
copy of the memorial submitted by Miss
K. Gopala Ayyar, Sub-Assistant Inspec-
tress of Schools, Guntur Girls' Range,
through the Inspectress of Schools,
Ceded Districts Circle and the D.P.I.
on the subject of her pay. The
Director is requested to say if he has
received the memorial and if so to
forward it to Government with his
remarks.

B.M.
13-3-25.

V
14-3-25

AK
15/3/25
VTR
2-6

*copy to
Sub.
P. 20/3/25
D.P.I.*
To


The D.P. I.

Reminder : 3 weeks after issue.

DESPATCHED
5 JUN 1925 14

LAW (EDUCATION) DEPARTMENT.

Received 1925 Registered 1925



1861 C
1796 C
18/6/25

Initial Pay - Miss. Gopala Aiyar, Sub Assistant Inspectress -

Memorial - submitted with remarks.

Law (Edn)

The final report provided in the enclosing portion of the Director's letter may be awaited.

ENCLOSURES.
No.
Spare copies

R.O.C.No. 726-G/23

Station Madras, Dated the 16th June, 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.



Sir.

With reference to Memorandum Law (Education) No.847-C/25-1 dated 4th June 1925, I have the honour to submit herewith the Memorial from Miss K.Gopala Ayyar referred to therein and to state as follows:-

Miss.Gopala Ayyar was confirmed as Headmistress, Government Middle School, Madura, on Rs.125 plus 25 in the old scale of pay on 9-4-23. But the Accountant-General objected to all promotions and confirmations made on the old scale of pay after 1-3-22, and the Government were accordingly addressed to regularise all promotions and confirmations

(P.T.O)

confirmations. In their order No.131 Law (Education), dated 28-1-25 however Government were pleased to declare that all promotions and confirmations made on the old scale of pay after 29th November 1922 were irregular and that the initial pay of all such officers should be revised. Miss.Gopala Ayyar is one of those who were confirmed on the old scale of pay after 29-11-22.

Government have further ordered that cases in which the restriction referred to above is likely to cause undue hardship should be submitted to Government with full particulars and that a statement of excess pay drawn by such officers should also be submitted through the Accountant-General.

The initial pay of all the officers has accordingly been revised and sent to the Accountant-General for approval. This is awaited.

On receipt of the Accountant-General's approval of the revised initial pay statements, I shall be in a position to know the exact number of cases in which the restriction is likely to cause hardship and to calculate the excess amount drawn by the several officers.

It is, therefore, proposed to submit the case of Miss.Gopala Ayyar to Government along with those of others similarly affected.

I have the honour to be,

Sir,

Your most obedient servant,

Thames
for Director of Public Instruction.

M.R.P.17/6.

17/6

LAW (EDUCATION)

DEPARTMENT.

Received



Registered

192 28/6/25

Subordinate Educational Service - Women's Branch

Excess pay drawn.

Law (201) sept

*The D. P. D. may be
reminded a month
hence.*

20/6/25

R.O.C. No. 726 G/23

Station Madras, Date the 25th 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. With reference to your reminder, dated 17th June 1925 to Memo No. 386 C-2, dated 4th February 1925, I have the honour to state that the initial pay of the members of the Subordinate Educational Service, Women's Branch has been revised with reference to G.O.No. 131, Law (Education), dated 28th January 1925 and ~~is~~ sent to the Accountant General for approval. I am awaiting the approval of the latter officer, on receipt of which, the initial pay as revised will be communicated to the officers concerned and excess pay statement called for. I have also sent a reminder to the Accountant General requesting him to expedite his approval.

It

It is not possible to state at present when exactly the excess pay statement will be ready for submission to Government as the details will have to be obtained from the subordinate officers on receipt of the Accountant General's approval. Every endeavour, however, will be made to submit them as soon as possible.

I have the honour to be,
Sir,
Your most obedient servant,

James
for Director of Public Instruction

P.R.K. 26/6

10/2/26

LAW (EDUCATION)

DEPARTMENT.

2/73

Received 192 Registered 192

Subject.

Submitting Statements showing the excess pay drawn by the officers in the cadre of Sub Assistant Inspectress and School Assistants.

ENCLOSURES.	
No.	
<i>Statements</i>	
Spare copies	

R.C. No. 190-C/25

Station Madras Dated the 21st. December, 1925

From (Name) R. LITTLEHAILES, Esq., M.A.,

(Designation) DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC INSTRUCTION.

To The Secretary to the Government of Madras

THRO' LAW (EDUCATION) Department.
THE ACCOUNTANT-GENERAL, MADRAS.

Sir,

With reference to memo No. 386 C-2/24 Law (Education) dated 4-2-1925, I have the honour to submit herewith two statements showing the excess pay drawn by the officers in the cadre of Sub Assistant Inspectresses and School Assistants.

10/31-32
intra

2. When Government announced in their order No. 215 Finance dated 4-3-21 the introduction of time scales of pay from 1-3-21 for all the subordinate services, there was no mention made of the Women's Branch of the Subordinate Educational Service which continued to be placed on the old

(P.T.O)

fixed

-2 29
fixed rates of pay. In Memo No.2241-C-2 dated 23-5-21, Government informed the heads of all departments that appointments and promotions in the old ^{rates} scale of pay should not be made in respect of services which were proposed to be placed on the time scale of pay from 1-3-21.

3. As the Women's Branch of the Subordinate Educational Service was not in the list forming an annexure to G.O.No.215 Finance, dated 4-3-21, the above prohibition was not considered by my office to apply to its case. Consequently appointments and promotions were made by the Director on the old scales of pay until the date when revised scales were actually sanctioned by Government.

4. In G.O.No.1459 Law (Education) dated 30-11-22, Government approved revised scales of pay for the Women's Branch of the Subordinate Educational Service and called for proposition statements. There was no indication in this order as regards the date from which the revised scale would take effect ^{my} ~~was~~ ^{was} any order similar to memo No.2241-C-2 Finance dated 23-5-21 issued prohibiting the Director from making the appointments and promotions on the old scale of pay.

5. G.O.No.737 Law (Education) dated 29-5-23 sanctioning the revised time scales of pay from 1-3-22 was received in this office on 8-7-23. It was held by this office that the appointments and promotions made up to 29-5-23 would hold good for fixing the ^{pay of officers in the revised} initial scales and the initial pay was accordingly fixed on receipt of initial pay statements from the subordinate officers. Until then the officers continued to draw the old scales of pay.

6. Objection was taken to this procedure by the Accountant-General and the whole case was explained to Government in letter R.C.

131 J No.726-G/23 dated 19-3-24. Government have in their order No.131 Law (Education) dated 28-1-25 however directed that only permanent promotions and appointments made up to 30-11-22 would be in order for purposes of initial pay. Revised initial pay statements were called for and the pay of the officers has accordingly been re-fixed.

In the above circumstances, I request that you will be so good as to obtain the sanction of Government for the waiver of the excess pay.

20
7. The excess pay statements for secondary grade teachers will be submitted separately.

I have the honour to be,

Sir,

Your most obedient servant,

E. M. Bowel

for Director of Public Instruction.

M.R.P.22/12.

No. Edn.1-954.

OFFICE OF THE ACCOUNTANT-GENERAL, MADRAS,

Fort St. George, 1st February 1926.

Enclosures.

Forwarded with reference to Government memo

386-C/24 Law (Education) dated 4th February 1925-

2. The excess pay drawn for Mrs.C.O.Jeevaratnam and
Mis.E.Chorley is Rs.339-5-0 and Rs.226-2-0 respectively
as shown below.

	Excess pay drawn.	Pay drawn less
Mrs.C.O.Jeevaratnam.	389 12 0	50 7 0

Net Excess. Rs.339-5-0

Miss.E.Chorley.	236 2 0	10 0 0
-----------------	---------	--------

Special pay not
drawn for Septem-
ber 1923.

Net Excess. Rs.226-2-0

The excess pay drawn for Mrs. Grace Nottle is
Rs.890-0-0 and not Rs.890/-

VSR.
To

Deputy Accountant General.

The Secretary to the Government of Madras,

Law (Education) Department.

31-32

(22)

Statement showing the excess pay drawn by Sub Assistant Inspectresses.

No. Name.	Initial pay originally fixed.	Initial pay as revised.	Excess pay drawn from 30-11-22	Remarks.
1. Mrs. F.D. Silva	150 plus 60 P.A.	150 plus 30 P.A.	374- 8-0	
2. Mrs. P.I. Bradley	150 plus 30 P.A.	150	405- 7-0	
3. Miss A. Pinto	150	130	202-11-0	
4. Miss D. Frank	110	75 on 1-3-22 93 1/2 on 27-3-22 100 on 27-3-23	342- 7-0	
5. Miss M.D. Rozario	150	110 on 17-9-23	1029-13-0	
6. Mrs. M. Briant	150 plus 30 P.A.	150	841- 0-0	

3195.140
S. H. Bonet
for Director of Public Instruction.

11540-3
3195-14-0
14736-1-0

Statement showing the excess pay drawn by school assistants.

No.	Name.	(3) Initial pay originally fixed.	(4) Initial pay as revised.	(5) Excess pay drawn from 30-11-22.	Remarks.
1.	Miss Cavanagh	160 (1-3-22)	150	7-12-0	Postponement of increment by the exclusion of the period of training for the calculation of increment.
2.	Miss Amitthammal	190 (1-3-22)	180 (1-3-22)	59-11-0	Drew pay at the old scale of Rs 150 plus 30 until the introduction of the time scale in October 1923.
3.	Miss A.G.Fernandez	160 (1-3-22)	150 (24-3-22)	215-3-0	Died on 1-11-25. Drew pay at the old scale of Rs.200 per mensem upto 30-11-23.
4.	Miss G M Abraham	150 plus 30 PA	150 plus 30 PA	120- 5-0	
5.	Miss C.O'Reilly	150 " 30 PA	150	220- 2-0	
6.	Mrs C.O.Jeevaratnam	150 " 12 PA	150	389-12-0	
7.	Miss C.Alexander	150 " 30 PA	150	215- 6-0	
8.	Mrs.Jesudasan	150	150	173- 0-0	Drew pay at the old scale 150 plus 30 until the introduction of the time scale.
9.	Miss Hart	150	100	361-13-0	
10.	Miss Hoogewerf	150	100	726-15-0	
11.	Miss V.Chinnammal	150	100	677- 6-0	
12.	Mrs.N.Stephen	150	100	483-14-0	
13.	Miss E.M.Britto	100 plus 50 PA	75	1042-10-0	
14.	Mrs Grace Nettle	100 " 50 "	75	890- 0-0	Left service on 10-1-24.
15.	Miss E.Hendrick	100 " 50 "	75	1035-13-0	
16.	Miss M Pereira	100 " 50 "	75	1011- 2-0	
17.	Miss K.Gopala Ayyar	100 " 50 "	75	1083- 7-0	
18.	Miss S.Kuruvilla	100 " 50 "	75	824-12-0	
19.	Miss P.Kanthimathi	100 " 50 "	75	774- 0-0	
20.	Mrs Gnanasambandam	75	75	383- 8-0	Drew pay at the old scale Rs 125 plus 25 until the introduction of the time scale.
21.	Miss E.Chorley	75	75	226- 2-0	Drew pay at the old scale Rs 100 plus 25.
22.	Miss Paranjothi	75	75	107-14-0	Drew pay at the old scale Rs 85 plus 21. Left service 4-7-24.
23.	Miss K.Venkataratnam	75	75	276- 0-0	Drew pay at the old scale Rs 100 plus 25. Left service on 16-3-24.
24.	Miss B.Venkataratnam	75	75	149-11-0	do
25.	Miss M.Packyam	100	100	6- 6-0	Drew pay at the old scale Rs.125 plus 25 but subsequently refunded the excess. She has yet to refund Rs. 6-6-0
26.	Miss E.J.Abraham	75	75	127- 9-0	Drew pay at the old scale Rs.100 plus 25.

for Director of Public Instruction.

R. H. B. mel.

11548-3

16/19/3

S. E. S. (Women's Branch) —

Excess payment — waiving of recovery

pp. 1-2 CF [C. 4606B] From the D. P. I., No. 7278/23 of 6.12.23

pp. 3-4 CF [C. 147B] A. G., No. T.M. 23/7219 of 9.1.24

u.s.

with reference to the

proposal of the D. P. I., regarding the

waiving of the excess payments made

(from 1-5-23 to 30-9-23)

to officiating incumbents without

substantive appointment entertained

after 1st March 1921 in the S. E. S.

(Women's Branch), from 23-6-23 to 30-9-23

the A. G. remarks that it is not clear

why these persons should have been

permitted to draw more than the

minimum pay of the post after

1-12-22, in view of the orders in

G.O. 1459 of 30.11.22. The reply to this

is given by the D. P. I. himself —

vide A on p. 2 CF. At the time of

the issue of the orders in G.O. 1459 of

30.11.22, the practice was to

sanction the revisions of pay

with effect from the date of

sanctioning proposition statements

and it was only later ~~that~~ that

that

34

Govt. decided to give them retrospective effect. It will be seen from para 1 of the office note on p. 43 of G.O. 1459, dated 30-11-22, that the original intention was to sanction the revision embodied in that G.O. only from the date of sanction of proposition statement and it was only in para 3 of G.O. 737

of 20-5-23, that definite orders regarding the "date of revision" was issued.

~~Before order~~ 2. Before orders are issued sanctioning the waiving of the excess payments, the D.P.I. may be requested to furnish a ~~statement~~ statement showing the amount of overpayment made to the officers concerned; ~~that~~

~~may be known~~ - para 2 of A.G.'s letter on p. 4 of.

CIV

11-1-24

86

13-1-24

U.O. Reply No. 23-C-24, 11-2-24

The required statement is attached.

Law (Educ)

A draft order sanctioning the waiving of the

Lambourn 777A1
21-2-24

Fin. 129 E.T. 7 22-2-24



13-FEB-1924

777A
h. du 698

13/2/24

Lambourn 4606B2
17-1-24G.O. 389 Law (Edu)
12-3-23

Recovery of the excess payments submitted for approval. It may be sent to Finance for acceptance.

Shir
18-2-24
M
18/2

CR
18-2-24

20/2/24

Tuncel

Finance Department. (E. T.)

The pay of the subordinate educational service (women's branch), with the exception of college assistants was revised on a time-scale basis in G.O. No. 1459 L. E. dated 30-11-22. When sanctioning proposition statements in G.O. No. 737 dated 29-5-23, the revised scales were slightly modified in some cases and the revision was given retrospective effect from 1-3-22. G.O. No. 1587 L.E. dated 18-12-22 authorising officiating appointments, did not apply to this service, as the pay of the teachers had already been revised on a time-scale basis in G.O. No. 1459 L.E. dated 30-11-22. The Director's statement at A on page 2 current file, that he had been authorised to make officiating appointments on the old ~~scale~~ of pay and that he could not prevent the drawing of excess pay, is not therefore correct. It was also clear that the revised scale sanctioned in G.O. 1459 dated 30-11-22 would be introduced at least with effect from 30-11-22, the date of that order. As a matter of fact, in March 1923 Government directed that the revision of pay of the establishment in the Education department previously sanctioned, should take effect from 1st March 1922, and the D.P.I. could have anticipated that the revision in the present case

case would also take effect from 1-3-22 as was subsequently ordered in para 3 of G.O. 737 L.E. dated 29-5-23. D.P.I. should ~~have~~ not have therefore allowed officiating incumbents without substantive appointments who were appointed subsequent to 1-3-21 to draw more than the minimum of the scales sanctioned in G.O. 1459 L.E. dated 30-11-22, after 1-12-22. His failure to comply with the orders has resulted in large over payments. This is not the only case in which over payments have been made in the Education department.

2. The over payments now in question relate to the period from 1-5-23 to 30-9-23 i.e., excess drawn in the beginning of June, July, August, September & October, subsequent to the issue of G.O. 737 L.E. dated 29-5-23. A

Though the aggregate amount is Rs 2,840 -1-0, excess payments in individual cases are not large considering their present pay, and there seems no reason why the amounts should not be recovered from the teachers in easy instalments if necessary. Law Deptt may accordingly be requested to issue orders for recovering the amount.

3. Law department may ^{also} be requested to ascertain whether there has been any over payments prior to 1-5-23 and if so, to obtain particulars for such over payments.

one
6.3.24.
Rud
7-3-24.

Law (govt) Deptt.

With reference to portion X of the Finance Deptt note on page 3 ante, it is submitted that though the revised scales of pay to be sanctioned for the several appointments were

A

rule A 98 remarks

(C)

Another case has since been received & is being subd separately

M 9-13-24

Law.

Fin. 129. S.T. 7

8.3.24

L. Govt 4044



were decided in G.O. No. 1459 of 30-11-22, the proposition statements giving effect to the revised scales were sanctioned only in G.O. 737, of 29.5.23. For orders whether the proposal of the Finance Deptt. to recover the excess from the subordinates concerned will be accepted.

Para 3 of Finance note on page 4 ante.

Apparently there should have been overpayments prior to 1-5-23 also, but the D.P.I. presumably considers that such overpayments would be taken as having been waived as a matter of course as it relates to the period before the issue of the G.O. sanctioning the proposition statements. It is for consideration whether particulars of such overpayments need be obtained as suggested by Finance. A draft u.o. note to the D.P.I. is submitted.

23.24. 19.3.24

28.3.24

Int issue the u.o. note.


I consider that ^{the same} all the overpayments should be waived. Put up when SDI replies

21/3/24

overpayments from 1.6.23 to be waived.

386-1 24/3

The intention of Finance is that the D.P.I. should not have submitted A on the old rates of pay after issue of G.O. 1459 of 30-11-22 in which Finance Deptt. was signified decided to, no part to take. Sanction to prop? Stat. issued later



38 Lawl. Dept.

U.O. Note.

386C

p2 nf.



Lawl. Dept. 386C

26.3.24

d. to 1046C
28/4/24

28
12.3.24
19.3.24

to 2/24

20.3.24
21/3/24

Office of the D.P.I.
U.O. Reply No. 411-C/23-4-24

The required particulars are attached hereto.

Added as 1049-13



Lawl. Dept.

The file deals with the question of the recovery or ~~recovery~~ ^{waiver} of the excess pay drawn by certain women teachers employed in the Govt. Secondary Schools for girls and Training Schools for mistresses. The excesses of pay came to be drawn in this way:—

The general revision of pay to most

of the subordinate establishments was given effect to from 1st March 1921 with reference to the revised ^{time-}scales of pay as recommended by the Reforms Commissioner and embodied in G.O. No. 215, Finance, 24.3.21. (I)

In the case of women teachers in the Govt. Secondary Schools for girls and the training schools for mistresses was not dealt with by the Reforms Commissioner and this was separately considered in consultation with the D.P. and in G.O. No. 1459, Law (Dy), 30.11.22, the scales of pay to be sanctioned for these appointments were finally fixed and the Director was asked to submit proposition statements to give effect to ~~this~~ this revision of pay. At the same time in G.O. No. 1587, 18.12.22, (L) it was declared that officiating promotions in the old fixed scales of pay should be admissible to these and similar appointments until such time as their pay was reorganised on the time scale basis.

The proposition statements for the revision of pay of these appointments were sanctioned in G.O. No. 737, 2 (A)

29.5-23.

The Director says that ~~these scales were fixed in 1922~~ the ~~existing~~ initial pay ~~of~~ the existing incumbents of the appointments ^{however} was fixed only in October 1923 in the case of L.T. teachers and in December 1923 in the case of the secondary grade teachers. Vide his letter 26.12.23. on pages 1-2 cf. and letter 26.2.24. on page 5 cf. in the linked file. Till that time the Director had been allowing acting promotions in the old scales of pay to teachers already in service and ~~appointments~~ appointing new entrants also on the old scales of pay, with reference to the orders in G.O. No. 1587, 18.12.22. This was done on the assumption that the revision of pay would be given effect to only from the date of sanction of proposition statements. The revision was, however, ^{retrospective} given effect to from 1st March 1922 - vide para 3 of G.O. No. 737, Law (Dy), 29.5-23. Hence there have been overpayments in many cases, as the minimum pay of the several time scales of pay is less than the pay under the old graded scales. (A)

2. The D.P.D. ~~has~~ says that as the G.O. sanctioning the proposition statements was issued only in May 1923, the overpayments up to 1-5-23 should be ~~be~~ considered to have been waived, as a matter of course and those after 1-5-23 should be waived ~~and~~ now. The Finance Dept. contend that as the revised scales of pay were fixed in G.O. No. 1459, of 30-11-22, the orders in G.O. No. 1587, of 18-12-22, would not apply to these appointments and that the Director should not have allowed these overpayments. They that Dept. therefore suggest that the ~~ex~~ excess pay drawn by the subordinates after 1-5-23 as well as prior to 1-5-23, should be recovered. It may, however, be mentioned that the original intention of Govt. was to sanction the revision only from the date of ~~the revision~~ sanction of proposition statements - vide para 1 of office note on page 123 of G.O. No. 1459, of 30-11-22. It was only in G.O. No. 737, of 20-5-23 that definite orders regarding the date of revision in respect of these appointments were issued. The Director could not have foreseen that

that the revision would be given retrospective effect from 1.3.22. As a matter of fact revision in several cases was ^{first} given effect from the date of sanction to proposition statements though the revised scales of pay were fixed in 1921, and only in G.O. No. 389, of 12-3-23, the question was reconsidered and ~~the~~ the date of revision in those cases was revised and fixed at 1.3.22.

In the present case the Director could have stopped the overpayments at least as soon as G.O. No. 737, of 20-5-23, was issued and this he failed to do and had allowed the overpayments till October and December 1923. The Finance Dept.

apparently suggest that the overpayments from 1.3.22 should be recovered. Vide that Dept. note on pages 3-4 ante.

3. The permanent Secretary has noted that the recovery of all the overpayments should be waived. That recovery will entail considerable hardship in certain cases is plain from a perusal of the lists at pages 12-13 of eg. Mrs. M.K.R. Nayudu, a teacher whose ~~pay~~ initial

initial pay ~~at~~ 1.3.22. has been fixed at Rs. 27½ has been overpaid to the extent of Rs. 112-12-0 plus Rs. 525-0-0 ~~pages 5+7g~~ or Rs. 637-12-0 in all. Though not so considerable as in this instance, the overpayments have been large in other cases as well, as shown below:-

	Rs.	
S. Perundewanma	126-5-0	4903f
Miss Abraham	118-11-0	} step
Miss K. Venkataratnam	168-14-0	
Miss B. Venkataratnam	109-11-0	
Miss Grace Israel	120-11-0	4611cf
Miss M. Parvati	139-6-0	pycf
Miss K. Rukmani	173-0-0	4610cf

4. The D.P.O. has brought to notice another batch of overpayments in the linked file and it is observed that there is some overlapping of the names that occur in the list at pages 7 to 12cf and those in the linked file. The D.P.O.'s office which was consulted admits the overlapping but says that some more particulars have been called for from subordinate officers and that on receipt thereof a consolidated statement will be submitted. Vide Mu. at (XXIII).

5. The question now for consideration is whether (1) the recovery of all overpayments ~~from~~ should be waived or (2) whether if ~~the~~ recovery should be made (a) whether the excess payments from 1-5-23 alone should be recovered or (b) whether the excess payments from 30-11-22 (the date of G.O. 1459, of 30-11-22) should be recovered. If the recovery should be made it would seem reasonable to order recovery of overpayments only after 1-5-23.

6. In the linked file ~~above~~ ^{above}, the Director has raised the question of the method of fixing the initial pay in the case of the S.E.S. (Women's Branch). If the Director's proposal in that file is approved the question of recovery of overpayments will not arise at all. The disposal of that file may be awaited.

GR 6.6.24 VTK 7.6

2AB
5.6.24



(J)

Please see the draft put in the top file. The effect of that draft, if approved, will ^{apparently} be to render all overpayments caused by the grant of promotions, ~~or~~ whether officially

operating or permanent, from and after the 30th November 1922 on which the revised time scales of pay were announced ~~and~~ linked to be recovered from the officers concerned. The ^{number of} officers in whose case overpayments have occurred and the extent of overpayment in each case ^{can} be fully ascertained only after initial pay is fixed by the Director. The Director himself has not full particulars of these.

2. After the orders in the linked file issue, the Director may be requested to send up a complete list of overpayments through the A. G. and the Govt. may then consider the question of waiving their recovery.

4: (PP 11.12.24 in bottom file)
Issues as G.O. No. 31 L.E.
28.1.25

16.1.25

CR
16.1.25
V.T.K.
17.1



A.S.

With reference to paragraph 2 above a draft memo to the D.P.I. is submitted.

20
2.2.25

CR
2.2.25

[Memo No: 386/c-2, d/4.2.25]

c. 1620/c, from the A. G., No. 211-1-200, d/2.2.25
A list of overpayments to

members of the Subordinate Edn. Service, Women's Branch, ~~not~~ from the D.P.I. p. 17 C.F. with reference to Memo No: 386/c-2, d/4th February 1925. It has been terminated twice and a third termination marked "urgent" is subd. separately.

The single case of overpayment p. 18-19, c-f on which the A. G. asks for early orders may be treated with reference to paragraph 2 (4) of G.O. No. 647 Finance, d/6th Sep. 1924. A draft Memo is subd.

Memo for issue
will be

12.6.25

CR
15.6.25

V.T.K.
16.6.



17.6.25
c.f.

p. 33 c.f.

C. No. 311 C - From the D. P. I., R.C. No. 190 C/25 dated the 21st December 1925.

From the Accountant General Edn. No. 1-954 dated the 1st February 1926.

10/31.32
c.f.

The D. P. I. has now submitted the statements showing the excess pay recoverable from Sub-Assistant Inspectresses and School Assistants. It is observed that there are 32 cases ^{involving an} amount of ~~Rs. 14,776-1-0~~ ⁷³⁶ Rs. 14,776-1-0, as altered by the

15
47
Accountant General. In 5 cases the individuals ~~the~~ have died or retired. ~~including~~ ^{Excluding} them, the amount to be recovered from ^{the remaining} 27 individuals comes to Rs.13,191-10-0.

In ~~the~~ cases of ~~6~~ individuals the amount to be recovered represents more than 10 times the initial pay shown in column 4 of the statement submitted by the Director. In 5 cases ~~the~~ amount represents 5 - 10 months salary and in 4 cases between 3 and 5 months. It will ~~be~~ thus be noticed that in the majority of cases ~~the~~ recovery ^{of the excess drawn} will be a hardship to the individuals concerned.

Further as the excess pay was ~~drawn~~ ^{drawn} by the D. P. I. ~~under~~ ^{in the circumstances explained in his letter of 24.12.25.} under a misapprehension it may not be advisable to insist ^{its} on ~~the~~ recovery ~~of the excess payments~~. The Finance Department may be consulted.

It may be mentioned that Mr. Satyamurthi has sent in a question ^{on} the above subject.

CR
10/2/26
V.T.R.
10-2
Fin U.O.



4847

(Previous note of Finance on pages 3-4 ante)

The case relates to the question of waiver of recovery of the over-payment made to Sub Asst. Inspectresses and School Assistants in the Women's branch of the Subordinate Educational Service. The overpayment arose in this way. In G.O., No. 1459, Law (Edn), dated 30-11-22 the pay of this branch was revised and proposition statements were called for. Though time-scales of pay had been sanctioned in November 1922 the D.P.I. was allowing officiating promotions in the old rates and also appointing new entrants on the old scale subsequent to that date. In G.O., No. 131, Law (Edn), dated 28-1-25, it was pointed out that appointments and promotions on the old scale of pay after the announcement of the time-scale of pay on 30-11-1922 were wholly irregular and that the initial pay in such cases should be fixed in strict accordance with the orders in para 3 of G.O., No. 737, Law (Edn), dated 29-5-23. Over-payments resulted, as initial pay admissible was lower than the pay actually drawn. The D.P.I. now proposes that the recovery of the excess payment amounting to Rs. 14,736-1-0 may be waived. Of the 32 individuals to whom over-payments have been made, 5 have died or been discharged. Under para 2 (4) of G.O., No. 647, Finance, dated 6-9-24 excess pay drawn by these 5, amounting to Rs. 1,544-7-0 may be written off. The balance of Rs. 13,191-10-0 is recoverable under the general orders in G.O., No. 647, Finance, dated 6-9-24. The Law department state that the excess pay was allowed by the D.P.I. under a misapprehension of the Government orders and that in the majority of cases the recovery will cause hardship. That Department consider it inadvisable to insist on the

para 3, p 29 CF.

J

A

Handwritten notes and stamps on the left margin of page 16, including a circular stamp dated 12 FEB 1926 and various initials and dates.

recovery of the amount. Attention is, in this connection, invited to M-2's note on page 52 of G.O., No. 131, Law (Edn), dated 28-1-25. For orders whether the recovery will be waived.

Due 8.3.26. Recovery should be effected.

Law (Edn) 11.3.26

Finance no 4847 ET-1 11.3.26 VDC

Law (Edn) Dept

A.E. 876C 14/3/26

For orders whether the suggestion of Finance that recovery should be effected should be accepted.

13/3

16.3.


M2

C4

The woman's branch of Service is already hard hit, especially the Subordinate Service in comparison with the men's Service.

The error is caused by the D.P.D's office. It is not the fault of the officers - if at all D.P.D's office should be dealt with just the same.

There are cases where the poor woman teacher will have to find all the salary for a year to refund the account down the method of fixing initial pay for misadventure by the D.P.D's office



Instructions were issued to the Men to draw salaries at a particular initial pay and it was drawn for one or two years according to any question. The mistake was accumulated & it is really the head upon the woman teachers to refund - not their fault in any case.

Strict finance may justify refusal but administrative expediency will appeal to the help the women - I have no doubt that the circumstances in all these cases fully justify waiver.

D. J. 20

I will not insist on women; I need not put to the test of my malpractice in every case & they have been numerous where the order of Govt regarding the revision of salaries initial pay etc have been misinterpreted misapplied or ignored it has always been

24/3/26

~~V.TK~~
~~25/3~~

Issue
✓-TK
20/3

M² Draft again.
D.P. & must make thorough
investigation. Substantiated or not - It is
the ^{clerk's} Superintendent's fault that must
be held responsible not the poor
clerk. I will not jump the case
before facts are ascertained fully.
D.P.

John W. G. 11337 E.J.-1
4-4-26.

X. Gessenon
30/3/26

h. du $\frac{1116c}{874/26}$

8-15-1966
SECRETARY OF DEFENSE
INTELLIGENCE LAW DEPARTMENT

France 10

Furane (ET)

[notes from p 16 et seq. supra may be read]

May be perused and returned to Law (Edn)

was
1.4.26

3.4. 26

Law

1850 e
V-TK
8/4

Initialed.

When despatched

Waiver of recovery - Orders passed.

” ” ” ” ” 192 .

” ” ” ” ” ” 192

No. 470, dated 29. 3. 1926.

The Government sanction, as a special case, the waiver of the recovery of the excess pay drawn by Sub-Assistant Inspectresses and School Assistants in the Women's Branch of the Subordinate Educational Service as shown in

He is requested to submit a full report
as to who dealt with the case in his

office and who was responsible for the
assumptions made in allowing higher pay to
the officers concerned and the failure to
refer to Government the question now orders
issued affected the Educational Department
to ask what order would apply.

la
25/3

CR
25/3

VJK
26-3

DESPATCHED
30 MAR 1926

To

The D. P. I. (Q & Q I)
and
copy of A.G.'s Endt.
" A. G. ~~copy~~ of
statement.
thru' the Finance Deptt. (with Q & Q I
Para 1 only. statement)
" Finance Deptt. ✓
(with copy of statement
statement and ~~XXXXXX~~ in
A.G.'s Endt.)

Call Ndis

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

LETTER OF GOVERNMENT

STATEMENT WITH DITTO.

PAPERS NOT FILED OF, BEING MEANT FOR DESPATCH
IN ORIGINAL.

N.B.—

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

A A A A A A A