

Edn and P.H.

(194 5) Department.

MS. SERIES.

G.O. No.

1133 Ewa

Dated

25.7.45

16
order on
10.19.46

[Despatch Abstract.]

Memorial to H.E. the Governor - Sri T.L. Chinnaswamy, ex. attender, Office of the Sub-Assistant Inspectress, North Coimbatore Girls Range - termination of probation as clerk - 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.
1262	27897-A						

Governor's Secretariat.

U.O. Note No. 428/45-1 dated the 14th March 1945. ✓

Sub:- Petition to H.E. - Sri T.L. Chinmaswamy- Clerk,
Education department - Appeal against the orders
of the Inspectress of Girls' Schools, V Circle,
Coimbatore terminating the petitioner's probation -

Education and Public Health department may be
requested to say whether a petition dated 5-2-45 from
the petitioner, addressed to His Excellency and
submitted through Chief Secretary has been received in
that department and if so, when it will be sent to this
Secretariat.

To,
E.&P.H. Dept.

E.C. ALLARDICE.
Asst. Private Secretary to
H.E. the Governor.

True copy/Forwarded.

Superintendent.

Edn. & P.H. Deptt. (C).

The petition referred to on the previous page was received in this department. It was returned to the petitioner with reference to rule (2) of the Instructions for the submission of petitions to H.E. the Governor as it was not submitted through the Head of the Deptt. (i.e., D.P.I.) The petitioner sent the petition again to Govt. direct and therefore no action was taken, *paper was lodged*.

2. For a brief history of the petitioner's case please see the D.P.I.'s letter on p.1 of G.O.No.120 Legal, dated 13-12-43. The petitioner *has been in the habit of writing to Govt. very often about the same matter. If necessary the pet. will*

again be asked to send the pet. through the proper channel. As personal file will also be called for



*Edn. & P.H. V.O.
10702 C/45-1
5.4.45
4.5.45
428/45-2*

10/4/45 Some 3 4.4.45

The Pet. may be sent to send his representation through the proper channel. informed that no action will be taken in any representation not so submitted

ETH

APPENDIX.

Notification.

In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of section 118 of the 1939 (Madras Act III of 1939), His Excellency the Governor of Madras is hereby during the period commencing ending after,

vehicles (other than motor vehicles) and animals entering the

District which has been declared as a fair and festival centre in Public Health No. published at pages of Part I-A of the For

at the rates and subject to the exemptions and conditions specified

SCHEDULE.

Tolls shall be levied at the following rates :—
On every

No tolls shall be levied on any animal not mentioned in this clause.

2 (i) The payment of a toll in respect of any vehicle covers the animals engaged during any one period of 24 hours counted from midnight to midnight.

(b) The person collecting tolls shall give a receipt to the individual making form as may be determined by the District Board Municipality (hereinafter referred to as the local authority)

3. No tolls shall be levied on any vehicle or animal—

(i) belonging to the Central or Provincial Government or the local authority by the Central or Provincial Government or the local authority or by any officer Central or Provincial Government or the local authority for a public purpose ;

(ii) carrying any officer or servant of the Central or Provincial Government on duty or his personal effects ;

(iii) carrying any person or property in the custody of a Police Officer ;

(iv) licensed or registered by the local authority during the period for which has been so licensed or registered ;

(v) exempted by or under the Indian Tolls (Army) Act, 1901 ; or

(vi) carrying any Military Stores belonging to the Central or Provincial

-3- Edn. P. H. (C)

40/4/207(E)
12-4-1945

Memo 10702 C/45-2 Edn., dated 12-4-45

~~Petition to H.E. dated 21-2-45.~~
Petition from,
Sri T.L. Chinnaswamy ex-attender, Office of
the Sub Asst. Inspector, North Coimbatore
Girls' Range to the Chief Secy D. 21.2.45

Sri T.L. Chinnaswamy is informed that
his ^{representation} petition to H.E. the Governor should be submitted
through the proper channel. No action will be taken
on any representation not so submitted.

Perpd K.M. 14-4-45
To Sri T.L. Chinnaswamy,
Swarashtra Street,
Namakkal (Salem Dt.)
Copy to the D.P.S.

10/4/45
10/4/45
11.4.45

10/11/1945

N.M. 10

work finished

3. 2. 15. 8. 1945

with the manager

Respected Sir. ^{Public, 15.3.45. V}
^{Edm. & P.H. during}
^{17.3.1945}
Ood. 336A/5 ^{17.3.1945} My petition dated 5.2.45 submitted
to H.E. Governor through the Chief Secretary, praying
for mercy against the Irregular order of the Inspector
of Schools. Circle. Coimbatore mentioned therein.
I request you to kindly inform me
whether my above petition has been submitted to the
Governor with your kind recommendations. As this
matter is urgent and as it is pending for the past
2 1/2 years with legal disposal, I want to remind the
H.E. Governor thereon. Kindly expedite reply --
by 20th of this month, without allowing me to expend postal
expenditure.

From T. L. Chinnaswamy
Sowrashtia Street
Namakkal
(Salem Dt.)

To His Excellency the Governor of Madras
Government of Madras.
Madras.

Through

- 1) The Sub. Asst. Inspectress of Schools, North Salem Sub-Range Salem
- 2) The Inspectress of Girls Schools, Fifth Circle, Coimbatore
- 3) The Director of Public Instruction Madras
- 4) The Secretary Education and Public Health Department Madras
- 5) and The Chief Secretary to Government of Madras.

May it please His Excellency,

As directed in Govt Memo No. 10702 C-45-2 dated 12.4.45 of the Secretary, Education Department, I most humbly beg to represent the following:—

The Inspectress of Girls Schools, V Circle Coimbatore and the Director have failed to adhere to the Statutory Rule in passing Order R.C. No. 154/94/42 dated 14.10.1942 and Proceedings Dis No. 493/43 dated 2.2.43 respectively. These authorities have no power to pass orders at their will and pleasure.

In All India Reporter 1937, Privy Council page 31, it is held that servants of the Crown hold office during pleasure of Crown, that unless in special cases where it is otherwise provided, servants of the Crown hold their offices during the pleasure of the Crown not by virtue of any special prerogative of the Crown but because such are the terms of their engagement as it is well understood throughout the public service that Section contains a statutory and solemn assurance that the tenure of office though at pleasure will not be subject to capricious or arbitrary action but will be regulated by rule and ^{that} serious and complete failure to adhere to important and fundamental rules should be brought to the notice of authorities for justice and serious punishment in the matter forwards the ^{law-breakers}.

My services as clerk are definitely governed by the Public Services Rules as contained in the Revised Madras Services Manual - Volume I - 1942 which manual is framed under the Government of India Act 1935. There are rules framed pertaining to probationers with regard to probationers. There is every rule available either for appointing for ousting and for terminating the probationers. If any authority has violated any of the Rules or have failed to adhere to the Rules of the manual, the probationer has got every right to demand proper application of rulings and he has every right to his legal claims on the basis of rulings.

1942.11.9.143
(2)

Received

Fairs and Festivals

District Board/Panchayat

Notification under section

EDUCATION

G.O. Ms. No.

-8- -2-
The Education Department knows that I have acted as
probationary clerk in the 4 offices (1) Govt Training School for women
Erode (2) Chittoor Girls Range (3) South Coimbatore Girls Range (4) North
Salem Girls Range. I have served under 5 officers (1) Mrs. S. Balambal,
Head Mistress, Govt Training School for women, Erode (2) Mrs P. Paripatham
Naidu, Chittoor Girls Range (3) Mrs C. Rukmanamma, Chittoor
Girls Range (4) Miss S.E. Marsh, South Coimbatore Girls Range (5)
Mrs. E. T. Amirtharaj, North Salem Girls Range.

I have acted as clerk for a total period of 25 months
viz 2 years plus 23 days. I have completed my probationary
period of 2 years in September 1942. I started my probation as clerk in
May 1940 and completed my probation in September 1942. I continued
as clerk till October 1942. The last office I served, was the North
Salem Girls Range.

Rule 8 (a) Probation. No person shall be eligible for
appointment as a full member of a service in any category
until he has been on probation in such a category or in a higher
category of the same service or class for a total period of two years
or duty within a continuous period of three years. This is the ruling
of the Manual. I have fulfilled the terms of the conditions laid in
the Rules. As per this rule I have become eligible for clerk's service.
The Director has also admitted in his written statement dated 23-12-43
that I have completed my probation as clerk. And that I have put
in more than 2 years' service as clerk. The Director is well aware of
these rulings.

I have crossed the period of probation. My probation
was already over in September 1942. I am above the probation.
The Director and the Inspectors are breaking their heads with
my belated probation. They are fighting themselves with my
time-barred probation and with my completed probation.

The Inspectress, I Circle, has in her order R.C. 1207.
154/9442 dated 14.10.42 terminated my probation as clerk. 1307 (4)
By this order, I was deprived of the clerk's post. This termination
of probation order sounds as though I have not completed
my probation and as though I have put in less than 2 years
service as clerk. Whereas as per Rules, I have completed
my probationary period of 2 years in September. In
this order, the Inspectress has suppressed Rules and
my actual period of service as clerk. Whether an European
or an Indian, Rules have serious importance.
My efforts to abide by the Statutory Rules. If the Rules
are not followed, the Director can escape the present danger.

-3- 4-9-
In Courts before suits are admitted, two questions are at
first discussed viz (1) the maintainability of the suit viz
whether the suit is liable to be admitted in conformity with
the Rules. Only after the rules for the admission of such suits
has been established, then only such suits are admitted (2)
Merits of the suit are the second question. This procedure
holds good in the official orders also.

The Inspectress did not think out whether the termination
of probation order is in conformity with the rules or not. At
the misguidance of her office, she simply signed and approved
the termination of probation order.

Can the office of the Inspectress think that the termination
of my probation as clerk would have been approved by the
Inspectress if the rule and my total period of my service
as clerk have been brought to her notice, by her office?
Surely not. She would have simply destroyed and thrown
such office notes in their face.

The termination of probation order quoted above is not
in conformity with the prescribed Statutory Rules. This order
violates and contravenes Statutory Rules. The Inspectress has
suppressed the facts and the rules. I want to protest in
accordance to rules and rules alone. Rule is a Rule. Our British
Government is carried on under the spur of Rules -
irrespective of persons or authorities. Recently, the Director
of Air Defence, Madras was ~~imprisoned~~ because he has
attempted to confiscate the ~~Car~~ Car. His authority as
an officer and as an European was not taken into consideration
but because he had violated the rules, he was ~~imprisoned~~.

When I received this wrongful order, I appealed to
the Director in my appeal dated 17.10.42. The Director did
not scrutinise and investigate whether this order is ~~passed~~
in accordance with the rules or whether the public service
Rules have been maintained. The Director delayed my
appeal for a period of 5 months from October 1942 to February
1943. Very calmly, after a lapse of 5 months, the Director
simply rejected my appeal in his proceedings D.O. 493/4
dated 2.2.43. The Inspectress did not tell the Director
the rules under which my probation has been terminated
nor did the Director ask the Inspectress about the rules under
which my probation has been terminated after 2 years. Even
today both the Director and the Inspectress are re.

position to quote the rule for this wrongful order. If the rule is quoted, this matter will automatically end and I wonder what stands in their way of quoting the rules.

With a view to shield the Inspectress, the Director has simply rejected my appeal. Now ~~do~~ he does not give up his prestidigit and now the Director is blinking what rule to be quoted against these wrongful orders.

I wrote dozens of letters to the Inspectress and I asked her to quote the rules that guided her to pass the harmful and wrongful termination of probation order. She is on the wrong side. She has kept quiet. As a defence, she has manipulated and manufactured certain records against me. The Inspectress is in search of a head that would suit her hat. $\frac{1}{2}$ She has violated the Central rule. She goes on collecting some adverse things against me. She has ~~manufactured~~ ^{manufactured} many records adverse to me without bringing them to my notice. Will it be possible for her to manufacture rule to suit the present order?

I wrote dozens of letters to the Director asking him the rule under which my probation has been terminated. The Director has simply forwarded them to the Inspectress. The Director could not ^{quote} the ruling even to day.

Rule 22(ii). (page 195 of the Manual. Vol. I. 1942.)

For this Rule 3 important features should be noted and observed. Viz (1) Termination of probation:-

Probation can be terminated when the probationer has not put in a total period of 2 years' service within 3 years. I have completed my probation. I have put in more than 2 years' service as clerk. The termination of my probation does not arise at this stage after 2 years' service. If a man puts a service of 2 years ^{plus} one day, I can guarantee that such probation cannot be terminated.

This is not possible under the existing Rules, even ^{by} His Majesty the King (2) The appointing authority can terminate the probation before 2 years. This can be done at the discretion of the officers before 2 years. So it is evident and clear that probation cannot be terminated after the expiry of such period and much more so, this is not possible to ~~be~~ done ^{any thing} at the discretion of the officers after the expiry of 2 years. (3) The phrases "before the expiry of the probation and at its discretion" are worthy to be noted ~~in~~ ⁱⁿ the Manual

In my case, my probation has been terminated after the expiry of the prescribed period of probation. This action has been done at his discretion. Here the Director and the Inspectress have been autocratic and have ~~not~~ exercised their arbitrary power in the whole of the said Manual. Rule 22(ii) is only found, which authorizes how to terminate probation and when to terminate probation. This Rule does not say that probation can be terminated after 2 years. Thus the termination of probation order passed by the Inspectress, I.C. and the order rejecting my appeal by the Director are Ultra Vires of Rule 22(ii) and these orders are not in conformity with the Statutory Rules. I take both these orders as childish and deceitful. These are not the orders worthy to be passed by the Director and the Inspectress.

I consulted the appointing authorities of the other Departments whether the probation of a probationer can be terminated after the expiry of the prescribed probation. They spoke low of these orders and said that the order is in violation of the Statutory Rules. I even consulted many probationers who told me that probation cannot be terminated after 2 years. No authority is able to cite an instance of termination of probation after 2 years. In other departments, there is not even a single instance when probation was terminated after 2 years' service on duty because there are clear rules concerning the probationers in the Madras Services Manual.

Every officer is expected to protect their subordinates with the aid of Rules even when they go wrong. They have passed these orders as if I do not know the Rules and as if I will not press for the correct procedure and correct application of rulings. The Director and the Inspectress know that they have gone wrong in passing this wrongful order. But under their prerogative of their power, they want to remain stubborn from the wrong point. I can hardly say that termination of probation after 2 years' service is the correct order that should be passed after 2 years' service.

There is also another instance of this type in this Education Department. Mr. Jacob was probationer ~~Head~~ of the D.C. Educational Officer's office Vellore. In the same office and under me and the same officer, Mr. Ramanathan then D.E.O. Vellore during 1942, Mr. Jacob has put ⁱⁿ ~~one~~

more than 2 years service on probation as Head clerk. Under the plea that his work and conduct was not satisfactory, the Director terminated Mr. Jacob's probation as Head clerk in Proceedings R.C. 2164/C/42 dated 10.8.42. He appealed to the Director in his letter dated 18.8.42 in which letter Mr. Jacob has definitely pointed out to the Director that the probation can be terminated only before the expiry of the said probation and as per Rule 22 aii (page 195 of the Revised Madras Services Manual - Volume I - 1942) the termination of probation order passed after 2 years service on duty is irregular and illegal and that illegal orders are not binding upon him. The Director felt ashamed that a poor clerk had to correct him. Immediately the Director had to ignore the remark against his work and conduct because that order was, in the face of the Rules, the order was not in conformity with the Rules. The Director has, in his Proceedings R.C. No. 2164/C/42 dated 11.11.42, set aside and cancelled his previous proceedings. Thus the Director had to stand upon the Rules and had to act according to the Rules. Had it not been for the Rules, the Director would not have

This is a precedent in this Department of Director. Both my case and Mr. Jacob's are identical and similar. Both these cases are cases of termination of probation after 2 years and after completion of probation. The alleged conditions and circumstances for the wrongful termination are also similar in both the cases. I have perused the records of Mr. Jacob in Original, Mr. Ramani Menon, then D.E.O. Vellore without looking into the Rules and without proper scrutiny of Mr. Jacob's service as Head clerk recommended to the Director for the termination of Mr. Jacob's probation. Without originality and without the observance of Rules, the Director terminated Mr. Jacob's probation as Head clerk in Proceedings R.C. 2164/C/42 dated 10.8.42. On receipt of Mr. Jacob's appeal, dated 18.8.42, the Director has realised his fault of having violated the Rules. If the Rules the question of Rules has not arisen. If not, the Director would have cancelled his wrongful order in his Proceedings R.C. 2164/C/42 dated 11.11.42.

From October 1942 to July 1943, I have repeatedly been requesting the Director to quote the rule under which my probation has been terminated. The Director did not address the Inspectors in the matter nor did he open his mouth to enlighten me in this matter. I was vexed with the scandalous way in which my petitions were treated. I showed the bundle

of files to certain lawyers. They advised me to launch a suit against the Director. The Director has deceived the lawyer and the Court and he did not tell the Court ^{rule} under which my probation as clerk was terminated. His silence in this particular and other point gives me assurance that the Director and the Inspectors have committed serious mistakes in not observing Rules.

On 17.3.1943 I gave a Lawyer's letter to the Director wherein my Vakil has asked the Director to furnish to him the specific rule under which my probation was terminated. The Director has replied to my Vakil in his letter R.C. 571/C/43 dated 22.3.45. and against the title head and subject. The Director has noted as "T.L. Chenniaswamy Ex-attender. Rule under which his probation has been terminated - Information - Requesting." The Director did not answer to my letter and he does not answer his own subject ^{head} and title head. I have adopted all sorts of measures to get correct reply from the Director but the Director gives only evasive, misleading and misguided reply. I cannot be deceived by the Director.

I know perfectly well that I am in the right and the Director and the Inspectors are in the wrong. I have spent a lot of money on stamps for addressing them. The Inspectors's office does not reply but the Director gives me replies of very careless nature. The Director thinks that I would be carried away by such replies. On that I will be convinced with these replies. These disposals do not satisfy me.

In the eyes of the heavily paid and powerful officers, I may be an insignificant man, just as an ant is an insignificant creature before an Elephant. There are rules. The Director thinks that the rules are framed to ^{convenience} the big people and that they need not be applied in cases of low salaried officers. I am confident that rules are to be applied in all cases however ^{mean} the posts may be. The whole machinery of Govt runs solely and mainly on the Rules. If there are rigid rules, certain officers may be prepared to pay less than 30%. I have experience of such type in my career as clerk.

The Director and the Inspectors have caused me serious difficulties. With these irregular orders, I have kept without employment for the past 3 years as clerk. If the orders confirm to any of the rulings, I have no grounds to offer protest-vehement against these orders. These orders are wrongful and irregular.

22.4.45 -14- 8.

Cur 91
27 APR 1945
SALUN

The Director treats the rules in one way in a particular case and the same rules ^{are} treated differently in another case. My case and Mrs. Jacob's may kindly be compared so far as the rules are concerned. If the subordinates' officers of the Director have reverential fear towards the Director, there is no scope for such shirking of duties and non-observance of rules.

I have also some suspicion that the Director may deviate His Excellency from the matter in question. ^{Whether} the orders are in conformity with the rules.

I know perfectly well that the termination of protection order is not in ^{accord} with the rules and nor ~~then~~ have these authorities ^{power} to pass such meaningless orders. So either these orders quoted above or any other orders passed upon these orders ~~and~~ or passed subsequent to these orders are not binding upon me and such orders cannot be coerced upon me. If the wrongful termination of protection order is set aside, the whole subsequent question is easily solved.

I belong to the Sorrowstra Backward Community. I have given up my family profession of weaving. Now I feel that I have become educated. Because of these hardships and because ~~our~~ community has ^{no} influence, and for simple reasons or for no reason, such subordinates of the backward communities are troubled.

I am a big family man. I am entirely depending upon the Govt. for my service and livelihood. Since the Director deceived me without bringing the rule to my notice, I did not want to accept any illegal orders. And I have full confidence that His Excellency the Governor would judge the case mercifully and ~~unjustly~~. Any order that is not in conformity with the Rules will not be accepted and will be contested and vehemently protested. Under the circumstances, I most humbly beg to request His Excellency to Cancell the Memo R.C. No. 154/94/42 dated 14.10.42 of the Inspectors of Girls' Schools, V Circle, Coimbatore and Proceedings Dis No. 493/43 dated 2.2.43 of the Director of Public Instruction Madras, as these orders are not in conformity with the Statutory Rule 22 of the Revised Services Manual (Page 195)

19.4.45

I beg to remain,
Your most obedient servant.

Copy submitted to His Excellency the Governor of Madras
Direct to save delay.

OFFICE OF THE DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC INSTRUCTION, M A D R A S.
A.C. No. 571-C/43, dated 11-6-1943.

Sub: Petition to His Excellency the Governor of Madras
Sri T.L. Chinnaswamy, ex-attender.
REF: From Sri T.L. Chinnaswamy, ex-attender dated 19-4-45.

Submitted to Government.

4

2. I invite the attention of Government to their Memo. No. 55254-C/44-1, Edn., dated 8-1-'45. Sri T.L. Chinnaswamy's petition may be rejected.

M. Chinnaswamy
11.6.45
for Director of Public Instruction.

To
The Secretary to Government,
Education and Public Health Department.

R.R. 11/6/45.

13 JUN 1945

sol
11/6

26580
SR

Register Number 20155

PUBLIC EXAMINATION, 194

Secondary School-Reading Certificates

GOVERNMENT EXAMINATIONS

S.S.C. 6.

Handwritten signature

273/4

Ednot P.H. Dept
(C)

T.M. by post dated 26-6-45.

From the Assistant Secretary to Govt.

Ednot P.H. Dept

Despd
Km
26-6-45

To The D.P.G.

Sub:- Memorial to H.E. dated 19-4-45

from Sri T.L. Chinnaswamy, ^{clerk} Ex-attender
Office of the ~~Sd. Insp.~~ ^{of school} Inspectress, ~~North~~
T. circle
Coimbatore ~~girls' Range~~

Ref:- From the D.P.G., R.C.No. 571C/43 dated
11-6-45.

Please send urgently the personal
file of Sri T.L. Chinnaswamy, ~~ex-attender~~
for ~~reference~~ ^{personal} ~~reference~~.
26-6-45
Note:- please see the addition to clause (

-17-

Instruction 109 of the Sectt. Instructions,
introduced by G.O. 2969 Public (Elections)
dated 9-10-44. The draft T.M. ~~is~~ is for approval.

5/6/45
26/6/45-

(P)

R.C.NO.571-C/43,

OFFICE OF THE DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC
INSTRUCTION, MADRAS, DATED 3-7-45

From

Dr. B.B.Dey, D.Sc.(Lond.), F.R.I.C.
Offg. Director of Public Instruction, Madras.

To

The Assistant Secretary to Government,
Education and Public Health Department.

Sir,

Sub:- Memorial to His Excellency from Sri T.L.Chinnaswamy -
Ex-clerk.

Ref:- Your post copy of the Telephone Message dated 25-6-45.

30906

The personal file of Sri T.L.Chinnaswamy is enclosed.

kp.4-7.

sd/
4/7

for Director of Public Instruction.

Introduced by G.O. 2467 Public Examinations

You should enter only your register number on this page and not on any other page.
If you enter your S.S.L. Certificate number or your name or both, your answer-book will not be valued.
Write your answers on both sides of the paper.
All rough work must be shown on the lower half of the page. No marks will be given where the working by which the answer has been arrived at is not shown.
Do not write in the margin.
No loose sheets of paper will be allowed in the examination room, and no paper must be detached from the answer-books.
In case additional books are used, fasten all the books together.
The answers of candidates must be legibly written.

52/12

15 of

Dept. with personal file
26.7.45

To the D.P.I. (with personal file).

(X)

Edn. & P.H. Deptt. (C).

Memorial to H.E. the Governor - Sri T.L. Chinnaswamy, ex-attender, Office of the Sub Asst. Inspectress, North Coimbatore Girls' Range - Termination of probation as clerk - Rejected.

From the D.P.I., Rc.No.571 C/43 dated 11-6-45.

ORDER 1133
Ms.

Edn., dated 25-7-45

The D.P.I. is requested to inform the memorialist that His Excellency the Governor declines to interfere on his behalf in the matter.

21/7/45

24-7-45

C.No.26580, From the D.P.I., Rc.No.571-C/43 dated 11-6-45.

Memorial to H.E. the Governor - Sri T.L.Chinnaswamy,
ex-attender, Office of the Sub Asst. Inspectress,
~~North~~ North Coimbatore Girls' Range.

The memorial on pp.7-14 c.f. is from Sri T.L.Chinnaswamy, who was attender in the office of the Sub Asst. Inspectress of Girls' Schools, North Coimbatore Girls' Range and who acted as clerk for two years and odd in the offices of certain Sub Asst. Inspectresses. The memorialist's probation as clerk was terminated by the Inspectress of Schools, V circle and he was eventually dismissed from the post of attender on 15-10-42. The memorialist appealed to the D.P.I. against the orders of the Inspectress terminating his probation and he rejected it. For a history of the case please see pages 1-2 c.f. of G.O.120 Legal dated 13-12-43 and also pp.1-2 of Memorandum No.55254C/44-1 Edn., dated 8-1-45. After dismissal ^{memorialist} he filed a suit against the D.P.I. The suit was dismissed. ^{on 29.6.44} The memorialist then put in a petition to Govt. ^{on the order of the termination of his probation} and this was also rejected in Government Memorandum No.55254C/44-1 Edn., dated 8-1-45. He has now put in a memorial to H.E. ^{on the same case}.

The following note is submitted with reference to the instructions in Appendix-III at pages 87-88 of the Business Rules and Secretariat Instructions:-

(1) The memorial has been submitted through the head of the department viz., the D.P.I.

(2) The memorialist has availed himself of the remedies provided by the rules or orders applicable to his case.

(3) The memorial has been submitted within the prescribed period.

Introduced by G.O. 2969 Public (Electors)

(4) No previous petition from the memorialist has been disposed of by H.E. the Governor.

The file may be sent to the P.S.G. with reference to Sectt. Instruction 109. The personal file of Sri T.L.Chinnaswamy is placed below.

1/8/45
20/7/45

S
11.7.45
12

18/7/45 P.S.G.

E & P.H.U.O.
190250/45-36
13.7.45



20 JUL 1945

A.P.S.G. A.E. declines to interfere.

20.7.45

E & P.H. Deptt (C)

A draft order is submitted below for approval.

2/7/45
21/7/45

24.7.45 S 18/7/45