[E.]
500—27-13-03.

Educational (1904) Department.

ORDINARY MS.

G.O., No. [illegible]

DATED [illegible] 1. 04

(8)

INDEXED.

G

[Despatch Abstract.]

[illegible]

[illegible]

1900 — 1901.

BACK PAPERS

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

FURTHER PAPERS

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

செப்பனிடுபவர் பெயர் அ. பாண்டி

செப்பனிடுவதற்காக எடுத்துக் கொள்ளப்பட்ட நாள் மார்ச் 97

செப்பனிட்டு முடித்த நாள் மே 97

சரிபார்க்கும் மு. பா. எ. கையொப்பம்

ஆராய்ச்சி உதவியாளர் கையொப்பம்

[L. & M. / 1]
1,500—2-11-03.

~~Local & Munl~~ Edn (190 4) Department.

CURRENT No. ~~386 L~~ 262

From

[Name] S. P. Sivaramakrishna Ayyar

[Designation] Manager Upper Primary School, Sathanur,

[~~Station~~] Kumbakonam Taluq

115/2

No.

Dated 4 - 2 - 1904

Enclosures 10

Received } 190 .

Registered } 6 - 2 - 1904

SUBJECT

Submits the papers called for in G.O. No. 753 L.R. d/ 26-10-03 — with reference to his claims for results grants from Provincial funds.

BACK PAPERS.

G.O. 753 Edn 26/10/03

FURTHER PAPERS.

8/2/04
5-20 pm

24/11/74

Expln. [illegible]

CHIEF SECRETARY
6 FEB 1904
GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS

4. 2. 1904
Upper Primary school
Satkanur
Kumbakonam Taluq
(via) Narasingenpet.

115/3

To.

His Excellency
The Governor
in council
Madras.

SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT.
6 - FEB 1904
LOCAL & MUNICIPAL DEPARTMENT.

With reference to G. O, No 755 L. R. Dt/26.10.02 the humble petitioner, S. P. Siwaramakrishnyar, manager Upper Primary school, satkanur, begs to submit herewith, the papers called for in the said order.

2. The petitioner applied on (5.11.03) to the educational authorities for the return of the papers in question and they were received on (15.1.04) and submitted herewith for favour of perusal and return, when no longer required as their return is asked for by the educational authorities.

3. The petitioner humbly begs to solicit favourable orders in regard to the C memo, under reference.

He begs to remain
Most highly Respected Sir,
Your most obedient & humble
Servant,

S. P. Siwaramakrishnyar
manager
Upper Primary S.
Satkanur

5.10 pm

[L. & M. / 47]
2,000—9-01.

LOCAL AND MUNICIPA DEPARTMENT.

C No 386 L, from S. P. Srirarama krishna Aiyar, Manager, u
primary school, Sathanur, Kumbako

SUBJECT.

Claim for result grants from Provincia
Funds earned in 1900-01.

11S
4

NOTE FOR THE Asst Secretary

It is submitted that this current may be transferred w.o to the Educational department for the issue of the necessary orders as the result grant claimed is payable from Provincial funds.

Idn w o

K.V V.R
9-2-04 9/2/04

AG 11.2.04

L. & M. U.O. No. 140D
Dated 10-2-1904

Edl U.O. No 33 R
11-2-4.

Educational Dept

This is a petition from one Sivarama-Krishna aiyar, manager of a results school at Sathanur in the Kumbakonam Taluq. The petr's school earned the sum of Rs 8-0-0 as results grants for the year 1900-1901. A certifying memo for this a prepared in the office of the Sub- Inspector of schools, Kumbakonam Range on the 11th March 1901 and was counter-signed

p 5 of the cur. file

gned by the Asstt. Inspector, Tanjore-
Trichinopoly Division, on the 22nd March
1901. The date on which the certifying memo.
was despatched to the manager is not
known and the manager says that it
reached him in April 1901 and that when
he presented it at the sub-treasury in
Kumbakonam, payment was refused
on the ground that it was not presented
before the 31st March 1901 - vide rule
92 of the Grant in aid Code for 1903-04. page 29

2. Afterwards the manager it appears
had to write to the Inspecting Officers to obtain
the sanction of the Inspector of Schools, Southern
Circle, to the payment of the grant. This
was accorded in the Inspector's memo. No
709 T dated 23rd May 1902, fourteen months p. 13 of the annual
after the issue of the certifying memo.
This sanction was ~~communicated~~ intimated to the
manager on the 5th June 1902 but no copy of the Inspector's order was given to him. and on or p. 10
before the 9th idem he presented the bill
at the Kumbakonam Sub-treasury. The
Sub-treasury Officer submitted the claim on
ne '02 for the orders of the Treasury p. 10
O at Tanjore, as it was more than a year
old, and the T.O. returned the bill in his
no 2290 dated 11th June 1902. p. 11

3.

3. The manager then applied for a c
of the Inspector's sanction and receiv
on the 23rd September 1902. But as his pp 14 & 21
wife was then dangerously ill and as she
was robbed of her jewels worth Rs 300
the manager took no steps to present the pp 21-22
bill immediately at the treasury. He
presented it on the 5th Dec. 1902 and p. 15.
the T.O. refused payment on the ground
that the certifying memo was not presented
within six months of its becoming due.
vide Article 5, ch. I of the Civil Account Code. p. 17

4. The manager then moved the
Inspecting Officers and after obtaining
an explanation from the manager for his
not presenting the bill at the treasury in
September or October 1902 the Assistant
Inspector submitted the case to the
Accountant-General and recommended
payment of the bill in his no. 1266 J
dated 26th March 1903. The A-G. then p. 23
pointed out that the certifying memo was
countersigned by the Asstt. Inspector on
the 22nd March 1901 and that p. 27
investigation of the claim by his
sought on the 26th March 1903 —
two years after the bill became due — he
could not investigate the claim without

th

the special orders of Govt. - vide article 5,
ch. I of the Civil Account Code - vide
A.G.'s no $\frac{T/Tny}{181}$ dated 4th April 1903. p. 27
The Asst Inspector then ~~communicated~~
forwarded the A.G.'s letter to the manager's
information and return and took no
action to move the Govt. in the matter. p. 28

5. The manager then addressed Govt.
on the 12th October 1903 and his petition
was rejected under para. II of C. Petition rules, W
as a copy of his correspondence with the
local authorities was not annexed to the
petition. G.O. no. 755 L. Dt 26th Oct. 1903. V
The manager then applied for a copy of
the correspondence on the 5th Nov. 1903
and received them in original on
the 15th January 1904. He now p 29
submits it and requests that orders
may be passed for the payment of the
certifying memo.

6. The manager has not addressed
the Dir. of Public Instruction in the matter
and his petition is liable to be rejected
para II of C Petition rules. But as W
three years have nearly elapsed
the bill became due it does not
seem expedient to reject the petition and
ask the manager to address the Director
which

which means further delay. The petition m
therefore be referred to the D.P.I. for r

7. If the certifying memo had reached
the manager in time in March 1901, he could
have cashed it before the 31st March. Some
Clerk seems to be responsible for not sending
the Certifying memo. in March 1901 and he has
been warned in the Inspector's memo. no.
p 13 709 T dated 23rd May 1902.

There was also some delay in addressing
the A.G. to investigate the Claim under article
5, ch I of the C.A.C. vide para 4 of this note
above. The T.O. refused payment on the
p 17 23rd Dec. 1902 but the date on which the
manager addressed the Supervisor of Primary
Schools is not ascertainable. The Supervisor
p. 17 Submitted the papers to the Sub. Asstt. on
the 23rd Feb. 1903; the Sub. Asstt. after making
p. 19 a reference to the manager on the 2nd March, 0
p. 24 addressed the Asstt. Inspector on the 25th id
and the Asstt. Inspector forwarded the pape
p. 23 to the A.G. on the 26th idem. The delay in
this case may be on the part of the manager.

T.R.
12-2-07

Between the first presentation
sub treasury in April 1901 and the Inspect
in May 1902 there was a delay of about 11 months for
which ~~[illegible]~~ there is no clear explanation in the papers
Page 13 of Ct file but from the Inspector's warning in his no 709 T dt

6

the delay seems to have been in the Assistant or
sistant Inspector's Office.

2. Between the Treasury Officer's call for a copy of the Inspector's sanction on the 11th June 1902 and the Submission of this sanction on the 5th December 1902 there was a delay of nearly six months which was almost equally divided between the Inspecting officers and the manager. No ~~information~~ explanation is forthcoming for the delay with the Inspecting Officers but that with the manager was due to his wife's illness.

3. Between the Treasury officer's refusal to pay of the 23rd December 1902 and the date ~~which the Sub~~ of the assistant Inspector's Communication to the Accountant General of the 26th March 1903 there was a delay of three months. This was caused chiefly by some intermediate correspondence. The delay after this was mainly with the manager, but the Sub Assistant was also responsible for a portion of it — vide page 28 of the current file.

4. On the whole it is submitted that the Sub Assistant Inspector ~~has~~ is much to blame. The Accountant General may now be authorized to investigate the Claim — this is the usual phraseology — and the papers may at the same time be forwarded to the Director with the request that suitable notice may be taken of the subordinate at fault.

K 13.2.4

3/2/04

Yes

AGJ 16.2.04.

A

Page 11 of ct file

Page 15

7

115/7

A draft is placed below for approval.

TK
17.2.04

PB
17/2/4

K 18.2.4

AGJ 18.2.04

[E./4]
1,500—8-11-00.

EDUCATIONAL DEPARTMENT.

115/8

READ AGAIN G.O., No. 755 L, dated 26th Oct. 1903. A

" " " " , " 190 .

READ ALSO:—

C. No. 262, From the Manager, Results School, Sathanur, No. , dated 4th Feb. 1904

" " , " " , " , " 190

" " , " " , " , " 190

ORDER No. 115, dated 19. 2. 1904

mis

desp 18/2/4

The A. G. is authorized to investigate the claim of S. P. Sivaramakrishna Aiyar, manager of the Results School at Sathanur in the Kumbakonam Taluq, to the sum of Rs 8-2-0 which his school earned as results grants (from Provl. Funds) during the year 1900-1901.

2. From the correspondence submitted by the manager it appears that the certifying memo. for the grant ~~earned by his school in 1900-1901 which was payable~~ which had to be presented for payment at the Treasury before

2

before the 31st March 1901 did not ~~sent to~~ reach him ~~before the expiry of~~ until after that date; that the sanction of the Inspector of Schools for ~~the~~ payment ~~of the certifying memo~~ after the due date ~~(the 31st March 1901)~~ was not accorded till the 23rd May 1902; that even then ~~the manager was not furnished with~~ a copy of the Inspector's sanction was not furnished to the manager for presentation at the treasury; that the A.G. was not moved to investigate the claim ~~of the manager~~ till two years had elapsed after the certifying memo. became due and that for these delays and ~~the~~ omission the Inspecting officers and their subordinates ~~was~~ were mainly responsible. The correspondence will therefore be forwarded to the D.P.I. with the request that suitable notice may be taken of the conduct of the officer or officers at fault.

AG 18.2.4

7.B.
17.2.04.

17/2/4

AG 18 2 04

G.P. 755 L.A (740)
Cu no 262 P
TO
L.P. 755 L.A
Cu no 262 A

To
The A.G. as para 1 only of order with Cu memo: in duplicate & copy of Inspector's ~~ado~~ no 709 23.5.02
-- D.P.I. as to with enclosures in original except Cu memo.

Despd
23/2/4