Scott. H-29—27,004—25-11-25.

Law (802) (1926) Department.

Mes SERIES.

G.O. No. 661

DATED 20. 4. 26

15

[Despatch Abstract.]

Ramaswamy Aiyar D.C.
Assistant. Government Training
School. Drawing of pay - recovery of over
payment. Reconsideration of previous
order - refused.

# BACK PAPERS.

| G.O. | No. | Department. | Date. | G.O. | No. | Department. | Date. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Gu 1566 7-9-25 | | | | | | | |

# FURTHER PAPERS.

| G.O. | No. | Department. | Date. | G.O. | No. | Department. | Date. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | | | |

S F. 30—41,000—8-9-24.

Law(Education) **DEPARTMENT.**

(2)

GENERAL DEPARTMENT
20 MAR 1926
SECRETARIAT
MADRAS

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

h-Gu 996C 26/3/26.

*Subject.*

Revision petition of T. C. Ramaswami Ayyar, Secondary grade teacher, Government Training School, Trichinopoly- regarding the refund of the excess leave allowances drawn by him- to Government- with remarks- submitted-

ENCLOSURES.
No. .....
.....
Spare copies .....

R. C. No. 22 C/26

*Station* M a d r a s. , *Dated the* 22- 3- 26 192 .

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

(Designation) Director of Public Instruction,
M a d r a s.

To The Secretary to the Government of Madras,

Law(Education) Department.

Sir.

Mp 3-9 cistra

I have the honour to submit herewith the revision petition of T.C.Ramaswami Ayyar,Secondary grade teacher,Government Training School,Trichinopoly and to state that his case has been fully reported to Government in my letter R.C.No.1295-C/25 dated 11- 8- 25 disposed of in G.O.No.Mis.1566 Law(Education) dated 7- 9- 25. The present petition does not appear to contain any fresh facts for a reconsideration of his case.

Mp 1-3 g (D)

2. I wish to offer the following remarks on certain statements contained in the petition.

B

Para I i. G.O.No.389 Law(Education) dated 12-3-23

Mp 3-cistra

has been incorrectly quoted as authorising him to draw pay at Rs.50 per mensem from 1- 3- 22 to 5- 4- 22. But it is G.O.No.793 Finance dated 29- 7- 21 and Government Memo No.611 A-2 dated 28- 4- 22 that permitted Supervisors of Elementary Schools to draw pay at Rs.50/- in the scale of Rs.50- 5- 75 originally sanctioned for them in the revision but subsequently withdrawn in anticipation of the abolition of the Supervisors' cadre.

Para 3. It is stated in this para that he was permitted to draw pay at Rs.52 per mensem in my Proceedings Dis.No.3341/21 dated 31- 3- 21 and Dis.No. 5183/21 dated 17- 9- 21. In the first of the Proceedings, the petitioner was given a subprotem promotion to class II (Rs.52) of the Supervisors cadre from 1- 3- 21. But this promotion was finally disallowed by Government in G.O.No.1135 Law(Education) dated 25- 9- 22 and G.O.No.435 Law(Education) dated 19- 3- 23. The second proceedings quoted above is the one in which G.O.No.793 Finance dated 29- 7- 21 was communicated to subordinate officers and this permits him to draw pay only at the rate of Rs.50 the minimum in the scale of Rs.50- 5- 75 now withdrawn. Although the above Proceedings permitted him to draw pay at Rs.50/-, Government have waived the excess drawn in the new scale(over and above his substantive pay) in G.O.No.761 Law(Education) dated 26- 6- 22 . Hence his pay drawn at Rs.50 per mensem cannot be taken into consideration in calculating the leave allowances drawn from June 22. His contention that the question of refund and waiver did not rise in his case for the period preceding June 22 is untenable especially in view of the waiver sanctioned in G.O.No.761 Law(Education) dated 26- 6- 22.

I have the honour to be,
S i r,
Your most obedient servant,
A Rama Rao 24/3/26
for Director of Public Instruction.

Trichinopoly,
Dated 27.[illegible].1925

To

His Excellency The Right Honourable
The Viscount Goschen of Hawkhurst,
Governor of Fort St. George, M a d r a s

Through

THE DIRECTOR of Public Instruction,
M a d r a s

and

The Headmaster,
Government Training School, Trichinopoly

The humble Revision petition of T.C.Ramasami Iyer, Assistant Model Section, Government Training school, Trichinopoly, Most Respectfully showeth,--

1. That the petitioner was the permanent assistant, Model section, Government Training school, Trichinopoly, and the sub protem Supervisor of Elementary schools, Rasipuram. He was promoted to class II, Supervisor, Sub protem on Rs 40 plus 12 with effect from 1.3.21 in Director's Proceedings C.3341/21 dated 31.3.21. The minimum of Rs 50/- in the time scale of Supervisors viz., Rs 50/5/75 was ordered to be drawn by Supervisors with effect from 1.3.21 permitting Officers drawing more than Rs 50 to draw their then pay till the fixture of their initial salary, vide D.P.I's Proceedings Dis 5183/21 dated 17.9.21 (Enclosure I) and D.P.I's Pro. 919 C/22 dated 8.5.22 (Enclosure 2). Accordingly the petitioner was drawing Rs 52 till 25.6.22. From 26.6.22 to 25.1.23, he was permitted to go on leave on average pay on medical certificate on a monthly leave allowance of Rs 52 as per Fundamental Rule 9(2). From 26.1.23 to 5.1.24 the above leave was extended as one on half average salary on medical certificate. The Government

having in their order No.389 Law, Education, dated 12.3.23 pleased to waive the sub-protem allowances drawn up to 1.3.22 and to allow Supervisors in the inspection branch to draw Rs 50 up to 1.6.22 irrespective of their initial salary vide (Enclosure 5) and the Director of Public Instruction having in his R C No.325 C/23 dated 27.6.23 fixed the initial salary of the petitioner at Rs 42½ with effect from 1.3.22, the average leave allowance of Rs 52 originally sanctioned had to be referred at Rs.50/6/0 as per details given below:

| | |
|---|---|
| Pay drawn from 1.6.21 to 28.2.22 at Rs 52. as Supervisor. . . . . | Rs.468.0.0 |
| Pay drawn from 1.3.22 to 5.4.22 as Supervisor at Rs 50 as per G.O.No.389, Law -- Education dated 12.3.23. . . . . | 58.5.0 |
| Pay from 6.4.22 to 31.5.22 at Rs 42½ being the initial salary as Assistant of the Government Training school. ... .. | 77.15.0 |
| Total.....604.4.0 | |

or Rs. 50-6-0 average.

ii. The Accountant General Madras, called finally for a statement of excess pay drawn by the petitioner and in that statement it was detailed out that a sum of Rs. 38.11.0 being the pay and leave allowances drawn in excess should be recovered from him as per details given below.--

| Period..... | Amount drawn. Rate | Amount Pay. | Amount due. Rate | amount.. | Excess. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1.3.22 to 5.4.22... | 52 | 60.11 | 50 | 58.5. | 2 6 |
| 6.4.22 to 25.6.22 | 52 | 138 10 | 42½ | 113.6 | 25 4 |
| | | | | Total..... | 27 10 |
| **LEAVE ALLOWANCE.** | | | | | |
| 26.6.22 to 25.1.23 | 52 | 362.10 | 50.6 | 351.4.. | 11 6 |
| 26.1.23 to 30.6.23 | 25 As2 | 130..8 | 25.3 | 130.13 | — 0 5 |
| | | | | Total.. | 11 1 |
| Excess of total pay and leave allowance..... | | | | | 38 11 |

This amount was approved of by the Accountant General and in obedience to his order, the full amount was refunded in February 1924. The fact of the recovery of the amount was reported to the Accountant General and the question of refund in the petitioner's case was once for all settled as it can also be seen from the fact that a Supplemental bill claimed, later on, for Rs 20/5/0 being the half ~~xmax~~ average leave allowance for the first 25 days of July 1923, ~~and~~ at Rs 25.3.0 and sent to the Accountant General for pre-audit was duly passed for payment by him in his order No TR dated 18.2.24. But a similar supplemental bill for Rs 27.6.0 being the difference of half average leave allowance claimed at the same rate of Rs 25.3.0 for the period from 26.1.23 to 25.2.23 with reference to the order of the District Educational Officer, Trichinopoly, R C No.367 Tr of 1922 dated 12.7.24 copy enclosed (Encl.3) and forwarded to the Accountant General for pre-audit was returned unpassed with further orders that the leave allowance claimed at Rs 50/6/0 was in excess, that the leave allowance should have been claimed at Rs 42½ only and that the excess drawn over and above Rs 42½ should be recovered from the petitioner. Please vide Accountant General's Order No Tri 15.394 dated 25.9.24 copy enclosed (Encl. 4).

2. The objections raised in the above order give rise to the following issues:--

i. When the refund question in the petitioner's case was once for all settled, can it be raked up again a second time by the Accountant General against his own orders?

ii. Whether the amounts drawn by the petitioner as Supervisor at Rs 52 from 1.6.21 to 28.2.22 and at Rs 50 from 1.3.22 to 5.4.22 were in excess of ~~more~~ those admissible under the rules.

iii. Whether the amount ~~received~~ waived by Government has been taken into consideration with consideration in calculating the average leave allowance.

and iv. whether the claiming of leave allowance at Rs.50.6.0

was out of order and whether is it just to allow the petitioner a leave allowance of Rs 42½ only?

3. Regarding the 1st issue the petitioner begs to point out that the question of refund in his case was once for all settled by the fact that the recovery of excess pay and leave allowance amounting to Rs 38.11.0 was duly approved of by the D.P.I., and the Accountant General and the amount was refunded in full as per A.G's Express letter No Tr 2 dated 6.2.24 The claiming of leave allowance at Rs. 50.6.0 was approved of by the A.G., in his ~~communication of more than one~~ several communications. He was also pleased to pass a supplemental bill for Rs 20.5.0 being the half average ~~pay~~ leave allowance claimed at Rs.25.3.0 as already explained in 1(ii) supra. Such being the case - contrary to his own original orders, his ~~refund~~ fusal to pass a similar supplemental bill for Rs 27.6.0 and ordering the refund of the excess drawn over and above Rs 42½ from 26.6.22 do not stand for justice.

Regarding the second issue, the drawing of pay at Rs. 52 from 1.6.21 to 28.2.22 is permissible as per Pro.C. 3341/21, dated 31.3.21 and D is no.5183/21 dated 17.9.21 (Encl.I). All Supervisors in the inspection branch were allowed by government to draw the minimum of Rs 50 in the time scale of supervisors from 1.3.21 to 1.6.22. There was no WAIVING OF excess pay as even without the temporary promotion ~~xxxing~~ given by the Director and subsequently cancelled by Government, one could not have possibly drawn anything less than Rs 50 as a Supervisor in the Educational Department from 1.3.21 to 1.6.22 and therefore the drawing of pay at Rs 50 by the petitioner from 1.3.22 to 5.4.22 was in order.

Regarding the iii issue, the petitioner begs to point out that with reference to Director's Proceedings R C No. 2678 C/22 dated 28.3.23 copy enclosed (Encl.5) the Government have disallowed only the promotion of Supervisors and consequently ordered the refund of the sub-protem allowances drawn

by them. By the bye they were pleased to waive the sub-protem allowances drawn by them up to 1.3.22. As per this order all Supervisors should refund anything drawn in excess over and above their initial salary after 1.3.22. But such is not the case. The Government have been pleased to allow all supervisors in the inspection branch to draw Rs 50 up to 1.6.22 (i.e.) the drawing of Rs 50 was allowed for 3 months more even after the waived period. Further in the case of a third class Supervisor who was not given promotion, the question of refunding and waiving does not arise at all. These Officers were in receipt of Rs 50 from 1.3.21 being the minimum pay in the time scale of pay of Rs 50.5.75 sanctioned for supervisors as per Directors Pro. ~~Diva~~.5183/21 of 17.9.21 vide Encl.1. Thus the average pay of a third class Supervisor will be Rs 50 on 1.6.22 taking his pay drawn during the preceedings 12 months; because he is not required to refund anything and there is nothing to be waived in his case.

When a third class Supervisor has the advantage of getting his average salary of Rs 50 without the question of refunding or waiving, IT IS HIGHLY IMPROBABLE THAT A SUPERVISOR WITH MORE THAN 20 YEARS SERVICE AND WHO WAS GIVEN PROMOTION ON ACCOUNT OF LONG AND FAITHFUL service should be asked to have his average pay calculated at less than Rs 42½ on the plea that the waived amount has been taken into consideration in calculating the average leave allowance. This cannot be the view of the sympathetic Government. The drawing of pay by Supervisors in the inspection branch at Rs 50 from 1.3.21 to 1.6.22 being permissible as per G.O., communicated in D.P. I's Pro. R.C.No.2678 C/22 dated 28.3.23 (Encl. V,) the only objection that can be raised in the petitioner's case with reference to the A.G's order is the excess amount of Rs 2 over and above Rs 50 from 1.6.21 to 28.2.22 that has been taken into consideration in calculating the average leave allowance. Even in this case, if the excess amount is left out of account, the average comes to Rs 48.14.0 as detailed below:-

From 1-6-21 to 5-4-22 as supervisor in the inspection branch at Rs. 50 ..... Rs a p 508-5-0

6-4-22 to 31-5-22 at Rs. 42½ ..... 77-15-0
as assistant of the model Section.

586- 4-0

48-14-0 average.

Thus it will be seen that the A.G's ruling that the waived amount has been taken into consideration and that the average wouldbe less than Rs. 42½ at the timeof talking the leave is untenable and it is not based on any Government order.

Regarding the 4th and the last issue, the petitioner's leave period expired before 8-10-24 and the average leave allowance has to be calculated only with reference to the average pay for the past 12 months or the pay which he was drawing in an officiating or temporary capacity i.e. from 1-6-21 to 31-5-22 as per F.R. 9 (2) and not the substantive pay of 42½ at the time of taking the leave as per F.R. 87 note. (amended rule) Vide A.G.'s letter No. T M 24.21.3329, dated 11-12-24, copy enclosed, enclosure VI. Thus the A.G.'s ruling that the leave allowance should not be fixed at Rs. 50-6-0 and that the same should be Rs.42½ only is not based on any Government order and it is contrary to his own order quoted above.

4. Thus the petitioner's leave allowance drawn as per rules and under proper authority has been unnecessarily objected to by the A.G. and a supplimental bill for Rs.27-6-0 sent to him for pre-addit has been returned unpassed and the petitioner has been ordered to refund a sum of Rs. 76-9-0 drawn during the period from 26-6-22 to 5-1-24. This amount was recovered from the petitioner at 1/3 of his pay, under great hardship. In spite of representations, the Government were not pleased to pass favourable orders and they have in their order No. G.O.Mis.1566 Law, Education, dated 7-9-25, stated that they see no reason to waive the recovery of the excess pay drawn by the petitioner from 26-6-22 to 5-1-24. In fact, the excess pay drawn was already

already refunded and the present question is not with reference to the excess pay. The objections now raised by the A G. is for the leave allowance drawn during the period. The Government Order is therefore a death blow to the petitioner.

5. In the above circumstances, the petitioner hopes that this representation which is now submitted as the last hope of getting justice will convince His Excellency of the prayer stated above and by the grant of this request His Excellency will as a matter of course be conferring a great boon on the petitioner, a poor afflicted public servant, who has put in more than 21 years' service in the Department and who has already been starving to some extent on account of the low fixture of his initial salary and who has been burdened with a family of 8 members entirely depending on him.

27.12.25

THE PETITIONER.

Enclosure I.

Copy of Proceedings of the Director of Public Instruction, Dis.No. 5183 of 21 dated 17.9.21.--

---

In anticipation of sanction to the proposition statement for the revision of pay of non-gazetted officers in accordance with the scale separately laid down the Government are pleased to direct that the subordinates concerned may be permitted to draw with effect from 1.8.21 the minimum salary of the sereral revised scales which eventually be applied to them. In cases of doubt as to the scale of pay that will finally be adopted, the present rate of remuneration should continue.

---

Enclosure II.

Copy of D.P.I's Proceedings 919 C/22 dated 8.5.22. Summary 611 A-2 28-4-22

Inspectors of schools are informed that Government having deferred the revision of pay of the Supervisors until orders are passed in the scheme of reorganization of Inspecting agency, in the meanwhile, the Supervisors will continue to draw the pay allowed to them under G.O., 700 Financial dated 2.8.20 & G.O.793 ~~Fin.~~ Financial dated 29.7.21--

---

Enclosure III.

Copy of R.C.No. 367 Tr of 22 dated 12.7.24 of the District Educatio-nal Officer, Trichinopoly:--

Under Rule 81 (b) ii last para of the Fundamental Rules T C Ramasamier is eligible for leave on average pay for 8 months only.

He has been given leave on full average pay already for 7 months from 26.6.22.

He is now granted leave on average pay for the remaining one month from 26.1.23 and he may draw the difference between full average pay and half average pay in respect of this month.

---

Enclosure IV.

Copy of Accountant General's order No Tr 15.394 dated 25.9.24, to the Headmaster, G.T.S. Trichinopoly--

In returning herewith unpassed the Supplemental Bill for Rs 27.6.0 being the difference of leave allowance claimed for T C Ramasami Ayyar,

2nd Assistant, Model section, forwarded with your endorsement N.R.C. 127/22 dated 25.8.24, I have the honour to state that the Assistant is not entitled to leave salary of Rs 50.6.0 per mensem as claimed. As the amount drawn by him as Supervisor at Rs 52 per mensem from 1.6.21 to 28.2.22 and at Rs 50 per mensem from 1.3.22 to 5.4.22 were in excess of those admissible under the rules and as the recovery of the excess drawn has been waived by government, the pay that should be taken into account for calculating the average pay is what was admissible during the period but for the waiver and not what was actually drawn which is higher than that found admissible. As the average thus calculated will be less than his pay at the time of taking leave which was Rs 42½ from 1.3.22, he may be allowed leave salary at Rs 42½ under the note to F R 87. The amount of excess drawn from the commencement of his leave, viz.--26.6.22 should be recovered from him and the fact of recovery intimated to this Office.--

---

Enclosure V.--Copy of proceedings R C No. 2678 C/22 dated 28.3.23

Read G.O. 435 Law Education dated 19.3.23.

The undersigned officers are informed that the promotion granted to officers in the Supervisors cadre in Proceedings R C No. 3341/21 dated 31.3.21 have been finally disallowed by government and that therefore the sub protem allowances drawn by the officers in consequence of the promotion have to be refunded. As however Government have in their order G.O.No. 389 Law Education dated 12.3.23 communicated in Proceedings 16670/22, dated 13.3.23 waived any excess pay drawn till 1/3.22. The question of refund arises only in respect of the period from 1.3.22 only. The undermentioned Officers are therefore requested to be good enough to instruct the subordinates concerned to refund the amount of sub-protem allowances drawn in excess of the initial pay that will be fixed for them in the new scale from 1.3.22. But in the case of officers whose initial pay as now fixed is less than Rs 50, the amount to be refunded will be the excess drawn by them over and above Rs 50 for the period from 1.3.22 to 1.6.22 if they were men in the inspection branch and from 1.3.22 to 1.5.22 if in training schools.

2. Doubtful cases should be reported to the Director immediately and orders obtained thereon

Enclosure VI---

Copy of the letter No. I from the Accountant General to all Heads of Departments No T M 24.21_2329/ dated 11.12.24 communicated in Proceedings ~~xxxx~~ Dis No. 260/25 dated 19.1.25 re: grant of leave salary to Non-Gazetted Government servants.--

---

2. The effect of the amended rule is that when a Non-Gazetted Government servant takes leave and his pay is less than Rs 300/-- or the leave taken does not exceed one month, his average pay for the purpose of the above rule should be the pay which he would draw on the permanent post held by him substantively at the time of taking leave instead of the average pay for the past 12 months or the pay which he was drawing in an officiating or temporary capacity as hitherto.

3. The revised rule takes effect from 8.10.24 I would therefore request that all cases of leave may be re-examined and the leave salary regulated according to the permanent pay held by the absentee substantively with effect from 8.10.24.

---

27.12.25

GOVT. TRAINING SCHOOL
27DEC 1925
TRICHINOPOLY

Rc. 376/25.

Enclosure VI---

Copy of the letter No. I from the Accountant General Madras to the Headmaster, Government Training School, Trichinopoly.

---

Sir

I have the honour to inform you that I have sent to the Treasury officer as desired, duly passed for payment at the Huzur Treasury Trichinopoly for Rs 20-5-0 the Supplemental leave allowance bill of M.Rly T.C. Ramaswami ayyar forwarded for pre-audit with your letter No Rc 12/24 dated 6.2.1924. You may now apply to the Treasury officer for payment on the authority of this letter.

---

Copy of letter Rc No 12/24 dated 6.2.1924 from the Headmaster, Govt Training School Trichinopoly to the Accountant General, Madras.

In forwarding herewith the Supplemental pay bill for July 1923 on behalf of Mr. T.C. Ramaswami ayyar, 2nd assistant, model Section of this institution for favour of pass order, I have the honour to state that it was not known whether the incumbent would join duty at all or extend the leave. Further the leave was pending sanction with the Dt Educational officer Trichinopoly, and in the meantime there was correspondence regarding the incumbent's intention to rejoin duty as he was on medical leave. It was not sure whether the leave would be on 1/2 average Salary or 1/4 average Salary Since the leave allowance was purely left to the discretion of the controlling authority. However, it may be added that as an amount of Rs 38.11.0 had to be recovered from him (vide your office Tri 236 dated 21.11.23 to this office), the bill could not be prepared earlier till further leave applied for by him was sanctioned by the Dt Educational officer, Trichinopoly & hence the amount was not drawn in August last. Under the circumstances, it is requested that the bill may kindly be passed for payment in the Huzur Treasury Trichinopoly

---

Encl: Supplemental pay bill for July 1923.

Leave allowance on behalf of T.C. Ramaswami Ayyar after 25 days from 1-7-23 to 25.7.23 at Rs 25-3-0 per mensem:- Rs 20-5-0.

---

(True Copy)

Headmaster,
Government Training School,
Trichinopoly.

Law (Education) Department. (140)

p1-2c.f. (C. No. 996 C) From the Director of Public Instruction, R.C.No. 22C/26, dated 22nd March 1926.

*******

Subject : - Waiver of excess pay drawn by teacher T.C. Ramaswami Ayyar.

---

The facts about the petitioner are as below :-

pp.1-2 of G.O.1566 (D) 7-9-1925

In February 1921 the petitioner was permanent head clerk of the office of Assistant Inspector of Schools (Bellary), on Rs. 30 plus 10 -temporary additions to pay. With effect from 1st March 1921 the Director of Public Instruction gave him a sub-pro-tem promotion to class II of the old supervisors' cadre - pay Rs. 40 plus 12. He actually drew pay at this rate from 1st March 1921 to 25th June 1922 and proceeded on long leave for one year ( eight months on average pay and 4 months on half average pay) from 26th June 1922.

(E) (P) (B)

2. In view of the introduction of the time-scales of pay, promotions from grade to grade in the old cadre of supervisors were ordered to be stopped with effect from 1st March 1921 ( G.O. 1135 Education, dated 25th September 1922 and G.O. 435 Education, dated 19th March 1923) but it was ruled that the recovery of over-payments made up to 1st March 1922 in consequence of such promotions already made might be waived( G.O. No. 389 Education, dated 12th March 1923).

p.4 of G.O. 1566 (D) 7-9-1925.

3. The petitioner, whose initial pay in the time scale of Rs. 35-35- 1½ -50-1-60, was fixed according to the rules at Rs. 42 ½ with effect from 1st March 1922, drew leave salary while on leave at Rs. 52 in the beginning and at Rs. 50 later on. The Accountant General rightly ruled that the leave salary should have been restricted to the pay really admissible, namely Rs.42½ and that the circumstance of the petitioner having drawn a higher pay prior to going on leave could not entitle him to draw the higher salary while on leave

The petitioner's request that the recovery of the amount overdrawn might be waived has been once rejected - vide G.O. No. 1566 Education, dated 7th September 1925. He now submits a 'revision' petition. As observed by the Director of Public Instruction, no new facts have been brought out. The petition may be rejected. A draft order is submitted.

(D)

pp.3-13 c.f

p.i.c.f.

16-4-26

17.4.26

V.TK 17.4

M 2

18/4/26

CR 19/4

Sectt. II-5 (b)—6,004—25-11-25. (6)

| | Date. | Initials. |
|---|---|---|
| When received for Fair-copying. | | |
| When copied .. | | DR 20/4 |
| When examined .. | | |
| When signed .. | 20/4/26 | |
| When despatched .. | | |

Law ( Education) DEPARTMENT.

15

RAMASWAMI AYYAR T.C.,

Assistant, Government Training School, Trichinopoly - Recovery of overpayment - Reconsideration of previous orders-Refused.

READ AGAIN G.O. No. 1566 L.E., dated 7th September 1925. (D)

" " " " " " 192 .

READ ALSO:—

C. No. 996 C. From the D.P.I. R.C. No. 22 C/26, , dated 22-3- 1926 .

" " " " " " " 192 .

" " " " " " " 192 .

ORDER.

No. 661, dated 20.4. 1926.

Misc.

(D)

DESPATCHED 22-4-1926

The Government see no grounds to reconsider the orders contained in G.O. No. 1566 Law (Education), dated 7th September 1925.

16.4.26

CR 17.4

V.TK 17.4

To the Director of Public Instruction
( q and o)

*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, 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.