

Educational (1904) Department.

ORDINARY MS.

G.O., No. 267

DATED 30-4-04 ✓

9

[Despatch Abstract.]

Transferring to the D.P.I. for desposal petition
from V. Muttakrishna aiyar appealing against
the order of the Director refusing aid to
his school at Marur in the Tanjore taluk

BACK PAPERS.

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

FURTHER PAPERS.

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

[E]
500-10-2-04.

EDUCATIONAL DEPARTMENT.

CURRENT FILE.

CONTENTS.

From	Number.	Date.	Pages.
V. Muttukrishna Aiyar.		23- 2- 04	2
D.P.I.	1887	6- 4- 04	5

PAPERS PUT UP WITH CURRENT No. _____

Papers of the department to which the current belongs.

Number.	Date.	Original (=O) or spare copy (=S. C.).	Remarks. (In this column such of the papers as have been removed for copying, printing, &c, should be marked with a cross.)	Initials of Referencer with date in token of return to Reference department.

Papers of other departments.

Department.	Number.	Date.	Original (=O) or spare copy (=S. C.).	Despatcher to note the return of the papers to the departments concerned.

[E.]
[1]

1,000-5-12-02.

Educational (1904) Department.

CURRENT No. 335 }

From

[Name] V. Pruthukrishna Aiyar

[Designation] Manager, U. P. School,

[Station] Marur, Tanjore Taluk

No. _____

Dated 23 - 2 - 1904

Enclosures _____

Received 25 - 2 - 1904

Registered 20 190 .

SUBJECT.

Appealing against the order of the D. P. I
refusing results grants to his School.

BACK PAPERS.

Is

H.E. the Governor in Council

Madras.

The humble petition of V. Muthukrishna aiyar,
Manager, the Results Upper Primary School, Mannar,
Tanjore Taluk,

The results upper Primary school at Mannar of
which I am the manager was established in Feb'y 1902.
The Edl. Authorities recognised the school on the
22nd December 1902 (ie) after a lapse of full ten
months though the Sanitary certificate building
plan & other accounts preliminaries required for
recognition were sent by me in time. The late
recognition of the school in 22nd December 1902
is due only to the inattention on the part of the
Edl. Authorities & resulted in the protest of the
D.P.S. against my claim to the grant. Had my
school been registered during the time (ie) in the
month of November) of the submission of the
G. form noted on, I could have got the
grant due; but it was made known
to me only just now 18th Jan'y. 1904.

Further on the 17th April 1903 the Sub-
Asst. Inspector of schools examined the
Lower Primary classes, & I was given pass

N. S. Srinivas

informed that aid will not be granted which is quite unjust. Moreover I sent the application on 14th October 1903 to examine the pupils for the primary examination. But while I was with the students ready for the examination on 8th December 1903 the Chairman refused to examine them until their application fee was sent. On his order, trusting that aid will be granted, I sent their fees & had them examined. So it was quite unjust to refuse the aid for 1903. A Copy of the Proceedings of Dis. No 1095 of 20th Feb. is given below:

Prop of the D.P.I.

Dis No 1095.

The petitioner's request cannot be granted. His school not being recognized at the time of the submission of the G. forms it is not eligible for admission to the aided list during the current official year.

In fine the petitioner humbly prays that the E. in Council will be pleased to pass the grant of Rs 61-12-0 (Rs 24-12-0 by Local fund and Rs. 37 by Provincial fund) which he is unjustly deprived of.

23rd July 1904

C. No. 335, From the V. Muttukrishna Aiyar, Dated 23rd Feb. 1904.

Encl. No 89 of 2-3-4

Referred to the S.P.I. for report.

7A.
16-2-4 PH
26/2/4

RA n Depd
2/3/4

Educational (190⁴) Department.

CURRENT No.

655 6

From

[Name] The Hon'ble Mr. A.G. Bourne, D.Sc., F.R.S.,

[Designation] Director of Public Instruction,

[Station] Madras

Ref No. Cur No. 1887 of 04

Dated 6th April 1904

Enclosures one in original

Received 8 APR 1904 190

Registered 190

SUBJECT.

Resubmitting, with remarks, Government endorsement No. 89 d/
2nd March 1904 on petition from V. Muthukrishna Aiyar, Manager
Upper Primary School, Marur, Tanjore Taluk.

BACK PAPERS.

Memo 89/04 ✓

FURTHER PAPERS.

76/8409

To

The Secretary to Government,

Educational Department.

Sir,

With reference to Endorsement No. 89 dated 2nd March 1904 (herewith returned) on a petition from the Manager of the Results Upper Primary School, Marur, Tanjore Taluk, I have the honour to submit the following remarks.

2. Under Rule 13 of the Grant-in-Aid Code the appeal lies to the sanctioning authority. In this case the appeal has already been rejected by the Director of Public Instruction as sanctioning authority. I venture to suggest that this further appeal should be transferred to me for disposal.

3. The petitioner lodges complaints against the Educational authorities. These I have enquired into. The Manager's original application for recognition was made on the 23rd May 1902 and the school was recognized on the 3rd December 1902. This long period was partly due to the system under which papers have to pass through "the usual official channel". They were despatched in this case no less than 23 times from one officer to another. I shall endeavour to simplify the system. The delay was however chiefly due to the manager to whom the matter had to be referred back three times before the conditions of recognition were complied with. There do not appear to be any circumstances in the case which warrant a departure from the usual rules.

I have the honour to be,

Sir,

Your most obedient servant,

A. P. S. S. S.
Director of Public Instruction.

[E.]
1,500-7-10-01.

C. No. 335 From the V. Muttukrishna Aiyar No. , dated 23rd Feb 1904.

SUBJECT.

Rejection of Results grants to Marur Results School.

The petition of Muttukrishna Aiyar against the order of the D.P.I. refusing aid to his school may be referred to the Director for report.

A draft is placed below for approval.

7/11
26-2-04

27/2/04

14/11/04

[Encl. no. 89 dated 2-3-04]

From the D.P.I. no 1887 of 6-4-04.

The Petr. states that his school was established in Feb. 1902, that he applied for the recognition of his school in time, that the Educational authorities recognized the school only on the 3rd Dec 1902 i.e. after a lapse of full ten months; that his school was examined for grant on the 17th April 1903 and he was given a pass list but that on the 18th January 1904 he was informed that he would

get

get no grant. The Petr. thereupon appealed to the D.P.I. and he informed the petr. that as his school was not recognized at the time of the submission of the G. form it was not eligible for aid during the ^{then} current official year i.e. 1903-1904. The Petr. appeals against this order and prays that the grant of Rs 61-12-0 earned by his school may be paid to him.

2. The D.P.I. to whom the petition was referred for report states that the petr's original application for recognition was made on the 23rd May 1902; that the school was recognized on the 3rd Dec. 1902⁴ that this long delay was partly due to the system under which papers have to pass through the usual official channel ^{but} ~~and~~ chiefly to the manager to whom the matter had to be referred back three times. The Director also states that in this case an appeal has already been rejected by him and suggests that this further appeal ^{may} ~~should~~ be transposed to him for disposal.

3. It will be seen that in his reply the Director does not refer to

Gov^t may, if they please, admit the further appeal.
M₄

to the question of grant - ⁸ when the petr. submitted an application for aid in accordance with rule 72 of the Grant-in-aid Code - i.e. before the 1st of July 1902; and if so, why the school was not admitted for aid. The school was recognized on the 3rd Dec. 1902 and there was time till the 1st of April 1903 for the publication of the list of aided schools - vide rule 75 of the Grant-in-aid Code. If the school was not admitted for aid it should apparently have been included in the list of excluded schools referred to in rule 77 of the Code; and if it was so included explanation would be necessary why the school was examined for grant on the 17th April 1903 and why a pass list was given to the petr. stating that his school earned Rs 61-12-0.

The Director should have dwelt on these points in his reply; but has not done so. Orders are therefore solicited as to whether the Director should be called upon to furnish information on these points or whether the petition may simply be transposed to

Director as he suggests.

4. It may also be noted that the reason given by the Director for not admitting the school for aid, i.e. that it was not recognized at the time of submission of the G. form, does not appear to be sufficient. There is nothing to prevent application for aid being made in anticipation of recognition. In the present case recognition was granted before the list of schools admitted to aid was published.

7/4.
22.4.04. The appeal may be sent to the Director for disposal with a brief résumé of the above remarks, which appear to be correct? M₂₅.4.4

G. The case appears to be an existing further consideration. Please draft accordingly. 27.4.04. appealant by the Inspector L-5.10.9.

The draft placed below is submitted for approval.

Para: 1 alone will go to the petitioner.

PH 28/4/4
10/4 M₂₈ 8.4.4
10/4
28.4.04

[3]

1,000-5-13-02.

EDUCATIONAL DEPT.

READ AGAIN G.O., No. , dated 190
" " " " " " 190

READ ALSO:—

C. No. 335, From the M.R. Qy. V. Muthukrishna aiyar, No. , dated 2/3-2 1904.

" " 655, " the Director of Public Instruction, 1887, " 6-4 1904.

" " " " " " 190

ORDER

No. 267, dated 30-4-1907

Desp - see para 1 alone goes to petitioner - mis
29/4/4

M. R. Qy. V. Muthukrishna aiyar's petition will be transferred to the Director of Public Instruction for disposal.

2. In the Director's proceedings no. 1095, dated 20th February 1904 it is stated that Muthukrishna aiyar's school was not eligible for admission to the aided list during 1903-04 as it had not been recognized at the time of the submission of the G. form. It appears to Government however that there was ~~apparently~~ nothing to prevent an application for aid being

being submitted in anticipation of recognition. If therefore Muthukrishna Aiyar had applied for aid before the 1st of July 1902 as required by rule 72 of the Grant-in-aid code, the school should apparently have been admitted for such aid seeing that it was recognized on the 3rd of December 1902 and that under rule 75 there was time for its admission till the 1st of April 1903. If the school was not admitted for aid it should have been included in the list of excluded schools published under rule 77 and if it was so included it is not clear why it was examined for grant on the 17th April 1903 and why a pass list was given to Muthukrishna Aiyar stating that his school earned Rs. 61-12-0. It seems to Government therefore that the case is one requiring further consideration from the Director.

28/4/4
28.4.04

to Mr. V. Muthukrishna Aiyar
Para: 1 only.
with papers 2/5/04

When given for copying _____
When copied _____
When examined _____
When signed _____

190

READ AGAIN G.O., No. 190

, 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 UP, 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.