[E.]

800—17-12-02.

Educational (1904) Department.

ORDINARY MS.

G.O., No. 289

DATED 13-5-04

13

[Despatch Abstract.]

Informing T.S. Subrahmanya Aiyar that his appeal against the order of dismissal passed by the D.P.I. is rejected.

BACK PAPERS.

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

FURTHER PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.	G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.
Ec 1443/04							

[E]
500—10-2-04.

H

EDUCATIONAL DEPARTMENT.

CURRENT FILE.

CONTENTS.

From	Number.	Date.	Pages.
T. S. Subramanyaaiyar, Tanjore		20-4-04	1-21

[P. T. O. FOR PUT UP PAPERS.

PAPERS PUT UP WITH CURRENT No. 737

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.
791R	1-12-02	original.		
70R	24-2-04	original		
105	10-3-03	S.C.		

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—23-12-01.

Educational (1904) Department.

CURRENT No. 737

From

[Name] T. S. Subrahmanya Aiyar

~~[Designation]~~ Tanjore

[Station]

No.

Dated 20th April 1904

Enclosures 8

Received 22-4-1904

Registered 23-4-1904

SUBJECT.

Praying that he may be restored to his former appointment or at least may not be debarred from being entertained in any other departm.

BACK PAPERS.

G.O. No. 791R d/02
70R/02
105/03

FURTHER PAPERS.

Ed 737

V

TO

HIS EXCELLENCY

THE GOVERNOR OF FORT SAINT GEORGE,

MADRAS.

The humble review petition of
T.S. SUBRAHMANYA AIYAR, residing
at 74 Raja Ram Matam Street,
Karuntattamkudi, Tanjore.

Most respectfully showeth:-

1. That your Excellency's petitioner was a clerk drawing Rupees 15/- per mensem, in the Office of the Sub-Assistant Inspector of School, Tuticorin Range, and was dismissed from service by the Director of Public Instruction on the 15th November 1901, Dis No: 6094.

2. That your Excellency's petitioner then applied to the Director of Public Instruction for a review of the order but without success.

3. That your Excellency's petitioner then appealed to your Excellency by a petition dated 20th November 1902, copy of which is enclosed herein and marked A.

4. That the said petition was summarily rejected by an order (Enclosure B) on the ground that it was liable to such rejection as a second appeal by a Government servant drawing less than Rupees 50/-

5
741R
1-12-02

P

5. That the said order has evidently been passed under some misapprenhension with regard to the nature of his petition as the said petition did not come within the limitation referred to in (Enclosure B) as it was a first appeal from the Director of Public Instruction.

6. That the existence of the said right of appeal

appeal has been made clear by Enclosure C, being the Proceedings of your Excellency's Government dated the 24th February 1904, R. No. 70, which rules, that an appeal lies to Government under the circumstances. ✓ R

7. That the petitioner therefore submits that the previous order on his petition has been passed under a misapprehension as to the nature of his petition and as to the existence of a right of appeal.

8. That the petitioner must state that previous to the Proceedings R. No. 70, dated 24th February 1904 enclosure C above referred to, the petitioner submitted a review petition which was summarily rejected on the ground that the petition was disposed off previously but ~~the~~ this question was not considered. ✓ R

9. That the petitioner prays that his petition of the 20th November 1902 which has not been legally disposed off till now, may be taken into consideration and justice done to your petitioner. P

10. That your Excellency's petitioner ventures to add that the dismissal of the petitioner from service, the justice of which act has not as yet been considered by your Excellency's Government, at the very commencement of his life has completely blasted his future career and he is a ruined man and requests your Excellency will be graciously pleased to re-consider his petition (enclosure A), call for and examine the papers and taking into consideration that one of his superior officers thought his conduct was not such as to deserve dismissal and recommended his reinstatement (Enclosure D), restore him to his former appointment, or at least order that the petitioner is not debarred from being entertained in any other department in future.

Your Excellency's Most Obedient and

Dutiful Servant,

T S Subrahmanian

Tanjore
April 20, 1904.

Enclosure A

To

HIS EXCELLENCY,
THE GOVERNOR OF
FORT SAINT GEORGE,
MADRAS.

The most respectful appeal of T. S. Subrahmanya Aiyar, late clerk to the Sub-Assistant Inspector of Schools, Tuticorin Range, now residing at 38, Sannathi Street, Karuntattamkudi, Tanjore.

MAY IT PLEASE YOUR EXCELLENCY,

I most humbly and respectfully beg to approach your Excellency with the following representations:—

1. I took up an acting appointment as clerk to the Sub-Assistant Inspector of schools, Tuticorin Range, under M. R. Ry. T. A. Swaminatha Aiyar Avergal, on the 30th March 1900, and I was confirmed therein on the recommendation of M. R. Ry. S. P. Rangaswami Aiyangar Avergal, his successor in office, in November 1900, and I had been continuing, to hold the same office without any stain. I had to retire from the office on the 22nd November 1901, as I was then removed from the service by the Director of Public Instruction.

2. It so happened that while I was continuing to work under M. R. Ry. S. P. Rangaswami Aiyangar Avergal above-said, we got into misunderstandings with each other owing to his dealing with me in such a manner as no clerk of whatsoever good disposition could brook it, for reasons best known to himself.

3. I was called upon in September 1901 to offer what explanation I had regarding the allegations contained in several bits of paper pasted together, against M. R. Ry. S. P. Rangaswami Aiyangar.

4. With all the frankness and truth that ought to find place in abundance in a rising young officer, I made certain admissions in my explanation, not omitting at the same time to make mention of what really had taken place on various occasions between myself and my immediate official superior above-named. (Eenclosure A.)

5. I here most humbly beg to submit that I understand that the Assistant Inspector of schools, Madura-Tinnevelly Division, had recommended for my suspension, but that because the Inspector of schools, Southern circle, recommended for my removal, the Director of Public Instruction has been pleased to dismiss me from the service accordingly. (Enclosure B.)

6. I then appealed to the Director of Public Instruction for restoration, through the Assistant Inspector of schools, Madura--Tinnevelly Division, on 29—11—1901. (Enclosure C.)

(P. T. O.)

T S Subrahmanian

7. The M-T Division Assistant Inpector of schools, M. R. Ry. N. Devasikamani Mudaliar avergal was pleased to recommend to the Director of Public Instruction through the Inspector of Schools, Southern circle, for my restoration. This paper does not at all appear to have been forwarded to the Director of Public Instruction by the Inspector of Schools. On my personal entreaties to M. R. Ry. N. Ragunathachariar Avergal, the Inspector of Schools, to forward the Assistant Inspector's letter to the Director of Public Instruction, he was pleased, after several months, to take a separate application from me and forward the same to the Director of Public Instruction. A copy of the application is herewith enclosed. (Enclosure D.) This was submitted to the Director of PublicInstruction on 4—4—1902, upon which he has ordered that I shall not be re-employed in the Department. (Enclosure E.) This was communicated to me by the Inspector of Schools, Southern circle, on 3—11—1902, with his No. 883 Ty.

8. I most humbly beg your Excellency to have all the papers called for concerning my dismissal from the service, as well as other papers concerned with the subsequent conduct of M. R. Ry. S. P. Rangaswami Aiyangar above-named, together with the Southern Circle Inspector's Nos. $\frac{372\ \text{Ty.}}{4-4-02}$, $\frac{392\ \text{Ty.}}{10-4-02}$, $\frac{447\ \text{Ty.}}{21-4-02}$ and $\frac{469\ \text{Ty.}}{26-4-02}$, and peruse the same together with the copies of papers I have been able to produce herewith. (Enclosures A to E.)

9. Having entered the department at a proper age and having understood the clerical work and having been trained therein, I have no other go in this world than to fall back upon your Excellency's clemency, and I most humbly pray that your Excellency may be graciously pleased to cancel both the orders of the Director of Public Instruction, Dis No. 6094 dated 15th November 1901, and Dis No. 3865 dated 22nd July 1902, (Enclosures B and E.), and cause me to be restored with punishment of any other kind than taking the bread off my mouth and protect a poor, humble and young officer, who always prays for your Excellency's long life and prosperity—or, if your Excellency be not pleased to get me restored, at least to grant me permission to seek employment in any other department under the Government, in consideration of the Assistant Inspector of schools, M-T Division, and the Inspector of schools, Southern Circle, having recommended me to the Director of Public Instruction for my restoration.

Most humbly begging to be apologised for my venture in approaching your Excellency with this appeal,

Tanjore }
28 Nov 02 }

I most humbly beg to remain,
Your Excellency's most obedient and dutiful servant,

(Sd) T. S. Subrahmaniam

(True copy)

T. S. Subrahmaniam
20th april 04

XXVII

Enclosure C.

Educational Department

Proceedings of the Madras Government

Read the following petition:

From T. S. Subrahmanya Aiyar, Triplicane, dt. 20th February 1904.

Order R. No. 70. dt 24th February 1904.

T. S. Subrahmanya Aiyar is informed that in the case of clerks on Rs 15 dismissed by the Director of Public Instruction in 1901, appeals against the order of dismissal lie to Government.

(True Extract)

(Signed) C. Galletti
for Secretary to Govt.

To T. S. Subrahmanya Aiyar

(True Copy.)

T. Subrahmaniam
20.4.04

Enclosure .D.

Mistake for revised.
Vide copy of the petn 29.11.01.
enclosed with the petn 20.11.02 to Govt.
T.S.

Endorsement of the Assistant Inspector of Schools Madura Tinnevelly division No. 93T/16.1.02. on T. S. Subramania Aiyar's appeal petition Dated 29th November ~~1902~~ 1901

No. 93T/16.1.02 Submitted to the Inspector of Schools Southern Circle

2. The point blank manner in which T. S. Subramania ~~Aiyer~~ aiyar readily Confessed his fault is a redeeming trait in him. But for his admission, there could have been no proof and no conviction. He is a fool and not a Knave. Mercy may be shown him.

(Signed) N. Devasikamanimudali
Assistant Inspector of Schools
Madura Tinnevelly Dn.

True copy)

Inspector of Schools
Southern Circle

Enclosure D2

Endorsement of the Inspector of Schools Southern Circle on T. S. Subramania Aiyar's letter dated 2.4.02 praying for modification of ~~his~~ the order of his dismissal.

No. 372 D/y
4.4.02.

Submitted to the D.P.I for favorable consideration – The petitioner repents for his folly very much and begs for mercy. The order of dismissal – vide Pro: No. Dis 6094
15.11.01 may be modified so as to make him eligible for reappointment when a vacancy should occur – His place in the Tuticorin Range has been filled up already.

(Signed) N. Raghunatha Chariar
Inspector of Schools
Ag. in the S. C.

(True copy)

Compared

Inspector of Schools
Southern circle

Ty/1668

No. 392 Ty
10·4·02

Enclosure E

(10)

From

The Inspector of Schools
ag in the S. C.

To

The Director of Public Instrn.
Madras.

Sir,

I have the honor to submit for your orders a letter from the Assistant Inspector of Schools Madura-Tinnevelly Division about the misappropriation of certain monies due to T. S. Subramania aiyar late clerk Office of the Sub Assistant Inspector of Schools Tuticorin range as pay and travelling allowance while he was in Office.

2. From a perusal of all the papers it is clear that M. R. Ry P. Rangasami aiyangar the Sub Assistant Inspector has been extremely careless to say the least.

3. The acting clerk I learn has been at the bottom of the

petition which caused the dismissal of the Permanent clerk T. S. Subramania aiyar. To his own advantage he attempted to prevent by means of an anonymous communication the young man who was appointed clerk to the Sub Assistant of Tuticorin from joining his appointment. I have therefore no opinion of T. A. Subramania Pillai

I would suggest that the Sub Assistant be authorized, at his own cost to take proceedings against Subramania Pillai either in a Civil or Criminal Court as he may be advised

XIII

Orders on the conduct of the Sub Assistant may be deferred pending the result of these Proceedings.

T. A. Subramania Pillai is the person referred to in your Pro: No. D1787/26.3.02. He was at first temporary clerk and then acting clerk after the dismissal of T. S. Subramania aiyar.

Sd/ N. Raghunathachari
Ins pro of schools agin 8C

(True copy)

Inspector of Schools S.C.

Enclosure F

Endorsement No. 2498 I/1-10-01 of the Assistant Inspector of Schools Madura - Tinnevelly Division on the Tuticorin Sub Assistant's reports

Submitted to the Inspector of Schools Southern Circle

2. These papers relate to a pseudonymous petition written by the Tuticorin Sub Assistant Inspector's clerk against his own Superior the Sub Assistant Inspector in August last

3. Some of the torn pieces of the draft herewith submitted, pasted up on a paper show that the clerk has been intriguing against the Sub Assistant Inspector.

4. The clerk T. S. Subramania aiyar admitted to me in the presence of the Supervisors of North and South Srivaikuntam that he prepared the draft and that he sent up the petition to the Director in feigned hand-writing.

5. In his written explanation herewith submitted, the clerk admits his having prepared the draft but alleges that the Temporary clerk Subramania Pillai copied it in affected handwriting and submitted it to the Director

6. So, the ~~clerks~~ clerk pleads guilty
1-10-01
but tries to implicate the Temporary clerk as an accomplice. This would in no way mitigate or extenuate the offence he has committed.

7. Recommended that T. S. Subramania aiyar may be suspended for 6 months for his nefarious conduct. My moral conviction is that the Temporary clerk put him on the wrong track and betrayed him at the nick of time. Subramania aiyar is an efficient clerk.

VI

Sd/ N. Devasikhamani Mudr.
Asst Inspector of Schools
Madura-Tinnevelly Dn

/True Copy/

Chappell
Inspector of Schools
Southern Circle

List of papers submitted herewith for favor of perusal

A. Copy of petition of T. S. Subrahmanya Aiyar to Government, dated 20-11-02
B. Copy of G. O. dated 1-12-02. R No. 291. (Educational)
C. - - do dated 24.2-04. R No. 70. - - do
D₁ Authenticated copy of the M. T. Dn Assistant Inspector of Schools, No. 93-T dated 16-1-02
D₂ - do the S. Circle Inspector of Schools, No. 372-Ty dated 4-4-02
E. - do do do No. 392. Ty dated 10-4-02. (Para 3. is noticeable)
F do of the M-T. Dn Assistant Inspector of Schools, No 2498 T. dated 1-10-01. (Para 7. deserves the notice of the Government).

T. S. Subrahmaniam
20 April 04

Or, the senior clerk pleads guilty
... to implicate the temporary
clerk as an accomplice. This would in no
way mitigate or extenuate the offence
he has committed.

Recommended that T. S. Subramania
... suspended for 4 months for

True Copy

[E./2]
1,000—5-12-02.

EDUCATIONAL DEPARTMENT.

C. No. 737 From ~~the~~ T. S. Subramanya aiyar No. .... dated 20 - 4 - 1904.

SUBJECT.

Appeal against dismissal by the Director

T. S. Subramanya aiyar who was a clerk in the Office of the Sub assistant Inspector of schools, Tuticorin range, was dismissed by the Director of Public Instruction in (November) 1901 for writing pseudonymous complaints against the head of his own office — Vide Director's dismissal order (copy) at flag P in G.O. no. 791 Educational, dated 1st December 1902. He then applied to the Director for a review of this order to which the Director replied that he would not be reemployed by the Educational department — Vide Director's order at flag O in the same G.O. Afterwards he appealed to Government when he was informed that there was no second appeal in his case — Vide G.O. no. 791 Educational, dated 1st December 1902. He then applied for sanction to be reemployed in any department of Government, but this sanction was refused in G.O. no. 105 Educational, dated 10th March 1903.

P.

P.

E.

2. As the original order of dismissal was passed by the Director himself there was in reality an appeal to Government against that order and on Subramanya Aiyar explaining the facts he was so informed in G.O. no. 70 Educational, dated 21st February 1904. He therefore now submits this appeal

R.

Under

Under ordinary circumstances the preliminary disposal on the appeal would be an endorsement in terms of para. X of the C petition rules, namely, that he V.
should submit the appeal through the head of the office or department to which he belonged. The object of this rule is to enable Government to have along with the appeal the remarks on it of the head of the office or department so that a separate reference to that head may be avoided. In Subramanya aiyar's case, however, we have already obtained the Director's views - Vide cur. 350 of 1903 at [redacted] flag E. in G.O. No. 105 Educational, dated 10th March 1903. It E.
is submitted therefore that neither an endorsement in terms of para. X of the C petition rules V.
nor a fresh reference to the Director is now necessary.

With reference to the notes and orders in G.O. No. 105 Educational, dated 10th March 1903 Subramanya E.
aiyar may be at once informed that His Excellency the Governor in Council sees no reason to interfere on his behalf.

£. D.

Please see Mr Thomson's order in G.O. 105 / 1903.

11/5/4

The appeal may be dismissed. There have already been passed on the merits of the case.

9.5.4

H.M.

10.5.04

Sec 4

Yes

10/5

These have already

11/5

The draft placed below may issue.

11/5/4

12-5-4

H.D.T.

12/5/4

[E. / 12]
1,200—7-10.03.

15

EDUCATIONAL DEPARTMENT.

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

READ ALSO:—

C. No. 737, From ~~the~~ T. S. Subramanya Aiyar, No. , dated 20 – 4 – 1904.
" " " " , " , " 190.
" " " " , " , " 190.

ORDER No. 289, dated 13 – 5 – 1904.

Desp
12/5/4

T. S. Subramanya Aiyar is informed ~~that~~ his appeal against the order of dismissal passed by the late Director of Public Instruction is rejected.

11/5/4

12.5.4

12.5.03

To T. S. Subramanya Aiyar

Despd
16/5/4

en given for copying ———
When copied ———
When examined ———
When signed ——— } 190 .

READ AGAIN G.O., No. , DATED
190 .

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.