

[E.]

600-30-8-06.

Educational (1906) Department.

ORDINARY MS.

G.O., No. 785

DATED 3.12.06

INDEXED.

[Despatch Abstract.]

Medical School. Rayaparam. Sanctioning the re-
admission ^{as paying students} into the — of five non-matriculantes
who failed at the final examination for the Hospital Assistant
and grade

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.]

1,000-4-11-06.

CURRENT FILE.

EDUCATIONAL DEPARTMENT.

CONTENTS.

From	Number.	Date.	Pages.
[1933]. S.P.I.	7999.	23. 11. 06.	1-2.

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, etc., 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.

70660
11/10/06
171-20904
375/03
379/05



Ed CURRENT NO 1933

EDUCATIONAL DEPARTMENT.

Received 26-11-1906, Registered 26-11-1906

Subject.

Requesting sanction of Government for the readmission, as private pupils into the Medical School, Rayapuram, of five pupils who are all non-matriculates and who failed at the Final Examination for the Hospital Assistant Grade conducted by the Board of Examiners, Medical College, Madras.

ENCLOSURES.

No.

Ref on Cur No 7 9 9 9 /06

Spare copies

Station Madras, Dated the 23 November 1906

From (Name) The Hon'ble Mr. T.T. Logan, B.A.,

(Designation) Ag: Director of Public Instruction

Madras.

To The Secretary to the Government of Madras,
Educational Department.

Sir,

With reference to G.O. No. 660 Educational, dated 11th October 1906, I have the honour to request you will be so good as to obtain the early sanction of Government for readmission as private pupils into the Rayapuram Medical School of five pupils who are all non-matriculates and who failed at the Final Examination for the Hospital Assistant grade conducted by the Board of Examiners, Medical College. The Superintendent of the school had at first admitted them under a misapprehension as reported in my letter read in the G.O. quoted above and he strongly recommends that the clause now added to para 6 of the "Rules for the Remand and Dismissal of Hospital Assistant students" may not have retrospective effect- at least so far as these five pupils are concerned. Having regard

R.R. 20/11/06

regard to the peculiar circumstances of the case, I have
approved of the Superintendent's recommendation pending the
sanction of Government.

I have the honour to be,

Sir,

Your most obedient servant,

Richard L. ...

For Director of Public Instruction.

*Ed
RS*

N.V.S.

NOTES.

C. No. 1933 From the S.P. 9 No. 7777, dated 23. 11. 1906.

SUBJECT.

Readmission of non-matriculantes who failed at the Final Examination for the Hospital Assistant-grade into the Medical School, Royapuram.

O. In their order dated so recently as the 11th October 1906, no. 660 Edl. the Government directed that "a stipendiary student dismissed for failure at any of the Board examinations may rejoin the school as a private (paying) student. provided he has passed the general education test prescribed for such students."

2. The S.P. now reports that the Superintendent of the Medical School, Royapuram, had admitted ~~at first~~, ~~is~~, before he could get the Government Order above referred to, 5 non-matriculantes who failed at the Final Examination for the Hospital Assistant-grade, into the Medical School as private (paying) students under a misapprehension that rule 6 of the "Rules for the removal & dismissal of Hospital Assistant students" as it then stood made no mention of the general education qualification for dismissed stipendiaries seeking re-admission as private (paying) students.

O. In September 1905, the Superintendent recommended that all military pupils who were declared unfit for military service might be permitted to continue their studies as private pupils - vide Director's letter printed with G.O. no. 660 Edl. of 11th October 1906. This recommendation met with the disapproval of both the Director & the Surgeon-General - vide the S.G.'s letter printed with ^{the} same G.O. The Superintendent made a similar proposal this year in respect of certain other classes of

Director's letter printed in
G.O. no. 660 Edl. of 11-10-06-D.

of dismissed stipendiaries ^{and held} the view that rule 6 made no mention of General education qualification. It was to remove this misapprehension on the part of the Superintendent and to make the intention of the rule clearer that the S.P.I referred the matter to Govt. Under such circumstances, the Superintendent should naturally have awaited the final order of Government ^{The Superintendent however} in the matter. He, on the other hand, admitted ^{the} students on his own responsibility and now requests that the clause now added to para 6 of the rules for the removal & dismissal of Hospital Assistant Students may not have retrospective effect "at least as far as these five pupils are concerned."

3. As the clause now added to rule 6 simply explains the rule which was already in force and ^{which was} meant to exclude the dismissed stipendiaries ^{without the general education qualification} from getting admission to the school as private (paying) students, it is for orders whether the admission of the 5 students now made by the Superintendent without sufficient authority may be sanctioned.

29.11.06
M. J. 23/11/06
Secy.

Rule 6 was altered so as to make the intention of the rule clearer. So that it is not a question of giving retrospective effect to it. As the 5 pupils referred to were readmitted as private pupils by the Superintendent under misapprehension of the purport of the rule as it stood then, I submit that Govt. should sanction their readmission. (There is the

80660 228 11.10.06.0.

(The school year begins in July).

Page 40 page 531 228 5. 9. 06. N.

pupils might reasonably complain that they had been misled into waste of time & money which it would be hard to make them incur.

Chm

30.11.06

The admission of the five pupils into the school should be considered as a special case and no responsibility and no requests that the rule be added to para 6 of the rules for the removal & dismissal of pupils.

11/12/06

Ph

Janie

Chm

3-12-06

The draft placed below is submitted for approval. As far as the five pupils are concerned. As the classes now added to rule 6 simply explain the rule which was already in force to exclude the dismissed pupils from being admitted to the school. It is for order whether the admission of the 5 students now made by the Superintendent, without authority, is to be considered as a special case. The draft is submitted as to the school master of the school. Rule 6 was altered so as to make the intention of the rule clear so that it is not a question of giving retrospective effect to it. As the 5 pupils referred to were readmitted as private pupils by the Superintendent under misapprehension of the purport of the rule and closed this, I submit that the school should be readmitted.

[illegible]

READ ALSO:—

C. No. 1933, From the OP. I., No. 7999, dated 23. 6. 1906.

” ” ” ” ” ” ” ” 190

[illegible]

ORDER.

No. 785, dated 3-12- 1906.

Mus

The admission of the fine pupils

referred to
will be sanctioned as a special Case.

182
1/12/16

Ch
3.1206

17/12/00

Lo

The D.P.I. (q to)

Serial 5712/k

When given for copying _____
 When copied _____ } 190 .
 When examined _____
 When signed _____

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.

*The admission of the four papers
 will be recorded as a special case*