

E + P. H. (1946) Department

MS.

SERIES.

G.O. No.

1437 Ede.

Dated

15-9-1945

[Despatch Abstract.]

College - Engineering, ~~Eng~~ Guindy - "Failed" students of the first year L.C.E. Class - Re-admission into the same class - Petitions rejected.

Back Papers.

No.	No.	Department.	Date.	G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.
	1003	Em	2.7.44				

Further Papers.

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

To

The Secretary to the Government of Madras,
Health Department, Madras.

Through The Director of Public Instruction.

Sir,

Sub:- Engineering College - Licenciante in C.E. Class -
(Preparatory Course) - Failed Pupils - Principal
"QUIT COLLEGE" Order, Revision prayed for.

The course of instruction for Licenciante C.E. Pupils was fixed at first ~~as~~ as four years. It is now cut down to 3 years, imparting an intensive course of instruction.

2 In the last Sessional Examination held in March 1945 Pupils of L₃ Class (preparatory Course) under old and new rules less than 7³ plus 15 or 22 pupils were declared as failed and eligible for promotion to the next higher course. i.e. NL₂ Class.

The Principal has served on these unsuccessful pupils may be called "QUIT COLLEGE" Order to keep obviously the NL₃ Class (Preparatory First Year's Course) clear for new entrants. select him in July '45, while stating that the question of permitting unsuccessful pupils privately at the Sessional Examination i.e. to be held in the following year:- (1946), is under consideration.

These young pupils after having finished their school fixed up according to their aptitude a particular course in this Sessional College of Engineering and the Principal selected them to follow it up. Failures in a written examination are common, mostly to various causes beyond the pupils' control.

3. The Principal, instead of advancing one and all the pupils in the preparatory Class NL₃ to the next higher course automatically subjecting such of those pupils as were found backward in particular subjects to a subsequent monthly or quarterly special examination conducted for them, till they score ~~the~~ the required ~~as~~ prescribed in the syllabus, is, by such drastic order, driving the unfortunate pupils to wilderness to lead a life of gloom and despair. Not only would the experience and the practical knowledge acquired at a heavy cost in the College in the past year vanish with lapse of time, but their future also be ruined considerably.

4. Had the parents and guardians been made aware of the risk attending on the pupils seeking a professional career in this College in that way unlike the case elsewhere, they would have ventured on the dangerous pursuit of admitting their boys in this College.

5. In the interest and well being of the unfortunate pupils in question it behoves the authorities to interfere and set the matter right in the manner suggested above.

We remain,

Sir,

Yours Faithfully,

S. Supra Swami
No. 41, Bazaar Road

N. Krishna Rao

B.T.

Urgent

To

The Secretary to Government, Education and
Fort St George.

From The Director of Public Instruction, Madras

Sir,

C.685A/45

Engineering college Guindy - Pupils of Licentiate
classes thrown out of the college at Principal's drastic ^{To be}

It is a tragedy that in the annals of the college
Engineering Guindy, a number of pupils of licentiate
classes who had completed the course for one two years
struck off the Roll from July 45 merely because
to secure the prescribed minimum of 50% of marks
last Sessional examination held in March 45. These
fortunate pupils are driven to waste a year outside in
and unhappy life. Quite a miserable plight!

2. When as many qualified men ^{are required} of technical
knowledge in various spheres as possible, to meet the
needs, the Principal rather than throwing the trainee
partially unsuccessful pupils out, ought to have
new ways and means to permit them to continue the
course in higher classes unimpaired and uninterrupted
and thereby fulfil the purpose for which the college exists.

3. The Sessional examination held at the end
each year is apparently a formal test to judge the degree
of progress made by pupils with reference to the marks
obtained in each subject. In cases where pupils
have not got the prescribed minimum in a sessional
examination, there could be no difficulty at all
the way of the Principal conducting supplementary
or special examination - pertaining to the respective
courses for L3 or L2 classes at short intervals
the following year, enabling the pupils in question
exert and obtain the required minimum without
detriment to their prosecuting the course in higher classes.

4. This step will save time, energy and cost in respect
their career. It is therefore fervently hoped that the Government
the D.P.I. will be pleased to come to the pupils rescue, who suffer
from shipwreck in their professional career of study, relax
rules if necessary.

S. Chandrasekhar
Director

31330

Madras, dated 10-7-'45.

To

The Secretary to the Government of Madras, Education and Public Health Department, Madras.

Through The Director of Public Instruction.

Sir,

Sub:- Engineering College - Licenciante in C.E. Class - L₃
(Preparatory Course) - Failed Pupils - Principals
"QUIT COLLEGE" Order, Revision prayed for.

The course of instruction for Licenciante C.E. Pupils fixed at first as four years. It is now cut down to 3 years imparting an intensive course of instruction.

2 In the last Sessional Examination held in March 1945 for Pupils of L₃ Class (preparatory Course) under old and new rules, less than 75 plus 15 or 22 pupils were declared as failed and eligible for promotion to the next higher course. i.e. NL₂ Class.

The Principal has served on these unsuccessful pupils may be called "QUIT COLLEGE" Order to keep obviously the NL₃ Class (Preparatory First Year's Course) clear for new entrants selected him in July '45, while stating that the question of permitting the unsuccessful pupils privately at the Sessional Examination i.e. to be held in the following year:- (1946), is under consideration.

These young pupils after having finished their school fixed up according to their aptitude, a particular course in this Sessional College of Engineering and the Principal selected them to follow it up. Failures in a written examination are common, due mostly to various causes beyond the pupils' control.

3 The Principal instead of advancing one and all the pupils in the preparatory Class (NL₃) to the next higher course automatically, subjecting such of those pupils as were found backward in particular subjects to a subsequent monthly or quarterly special examination conducted for them till they score over the required marks prescribed in syllabus, is, by such drastic order, driving the unfortunate pupils to wilderness to lead a life of gloom and despair. Not only would the experience and the practical knowledge acquired at a heavy cost in the College in the past year vanish with lapse of time but their future also be ruined considerably.

4 Had the parents and guardians been made aware of the risk attending on the pupils seeking a professional career in this College in that way, unlike the case elsewhere, they would have ventured on dangerous pursuit of admitting their boys in this College.

5 In the interest and well being of the unfortunate pupils in question it behoves the authorities to interfere and set the matter right in the manner suggested above.

We remain,

Sir,

Yours Faithfully,

N. Krishnakumar

This is only an advance copy
of the original sent through the
D.P.I.

May be lodged. This should be looked
up ask D.P.I. when it is sent to the
3

11.2.45
11/7/45

Draft memo sent on next page

11/7/45

30
1917



The D. P. S. is requested
to state when the original of the
petition ^{cited above} ~~is not~~ ^{can be}
forwarded to Govt. with his remarks

To Mr J.P.S. ✓
Dated
1/11/45
19-7-45

Memo

Eng. College, Guindy - L. C. E.
Course - Preparatory course -
Failed candidates - Principals
order to leave the college -
petition from N. Krishna Rao

The D. P. 9 is requested
to send his reply to Govt-
office no: 31330 C/45-1 & 19.7.45-
on the subject mentioned above,
at a very early date.

W 3.5 sailing w/ all
no. 31330 plus 2 Sn
12.00

To the D. P. S.

11/8/65-

R.C.No.609 A/45

Office of the Director of Public
Instruction, Madras, dated 11-8-1945.

From

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

To

The Secretary to Government,
Education & Public Health Department, Madras.

Sir,

Sub: College of Engineering, Guindy - L.C.E. Class -
Failed students - Appeals - Remarks - submitted.
Ref: Govt. Memo. No. 31330 C-45-1, Education and Public
Health, dated 19-7-45. *page 6 ante*

In connection with the petitions on behalf of the students who failed in the L.C.E. Class I have the honour to submit a copy of letter R.C.No.23-6 B/45, dated 18-7-45 from the Principal, College of Engineering, Guindy, which contains detailed remarks on the question. I agree with the remarks of the Principal. I may also state that by admitting the failed candidates, the interests of new students will suffer having regard to the fact that such re-admissions will be detrimental to the claims of the more deserving young men who have been admitted fresh into the L.C.E. Class especially in view of the restricted strength and limited accommodation; whereas by keeping the failed students out of the college no harm will be done to them for they will sit for the sessional examination as private candidates and join the next higher class in the college after passing it.

2. The petitions are resubmitted herewith.

I have the honour to be,

Sir

Your most obedient servant.

Mr Hammond

for Director of Public Instruction. / 5.8.45-

TRB.13/8

52
13/845

Copy of R.O.No.23-6 B/45, dated 18-7-45 from the Principal
College of Engineering, Guindy.

"Ref: Your Proceedings N.R.O.No.609-A/45, dated 12-7-45.
@@@

The course of studies for L.O.E.Class was reduced from four to three years in 1944, and the first batch of students under the three year course took their sessional examination in April, 1945. Fifteen candidates failed to get the qualifying marks for promotion to the next higher class.


According to rules of the College (vide Rule 25 and Rule 15) a student who fails has either to leave this College or to join the same class at the discretion of the Principal. Owing to the great demand for L.O.E's, the strength of the class has been raised to the permissible maximum limit of 90. The strength of the new Licentiates Class is 90 and as accommodation in the class room and drawing office for more than ninety is not available, it is impossible to admit the fifteen failed students in the new class. The only way of admitting the failed students in the First year class would be to reduce the number of admission in the Licentiates Class. This would be extremely unfair to deserving young men seeking admission in the Licentiates Class and would put a premium on negligence in study as exhibited by the failed candidates.

I am of opinion that attendance in the College of these failed students is not essential. The subjects of study, such as Mathematics, Applied Mechanics, Construction, Building Materials etc. are such that they can study at home. As regards practical work drawing can be done at home and it is not necessary for them to repeat the practical work in Surveying and Workshops practice, except in the case of those who are very backward. The best solution is to permit students to appear privately for the written papers in the Sessional Examination next year. The marks of the practical examination already obtained by them should be carried over as is done by the University in the case of failed candidates. Candidates who are backward in practical work may be permitted to do practical work in the college in the last term.

The suggestion made in para.3 of the petition of promoting the students and holding examinations at intervals in subjects in which they are deficient, is highly undesirable and is not practicable. Moreover the rules do not permit this."

Raghothama Rao.

...



Villupuram,
20th August 1945.

Dear Sir,

Further to my letter of the 9th instant, I wish to bring to the notice of Government that while disposing of my petition in regard to the students supposed to have failed in the I year L.C.E. class of the College of Engineering, Guindy, the following facts, which I have come to know of subsequently, may also be taken into consideration and favourable orders passed.

1. The Principal (Dr. Rudra) ordered that the marks of students in the new I Year Class who secured 600 and below 650, be raised to 650 so as to give them the benefit of promotion. Had not this been done, the failures in the I Year Class this year would have been more than 15. If the Principal considered it necessary to show some concession (nay - favouritism) to only a few candidates, why should it not be extended to all?

2. If the failed II Year students of the old L.C.E. Class, who should, according to the so-called rules, be admitted only into the new I Year L.C.E. Class, can be admitted or promoted to the II new L.C.E. Course, with the D.P.I's permission, why not the I Year students (new) who have also successfully undergone the necessary course for one full year be given the same treatment accorded to their fellow students?

3. When in the medical college and in the School of Indian Medicine - professional colleges - the students are allowed to go to the next higher class and permitted to pass only the subjects in which they failed, why a different procedure in the Engineering College alone?

4. The L.C.E. Examination is not a University Examination as the Principal thinks it to be. It is only a College Examination and the failed students may be asked to make up the deficiency in the total number of marks in subsequent years. If, at the

2.

end of the III Year course, the students fail, they may be asked to appear privately for the examination so as to enable them to earn the Diploma of the College. On the other hand, even at the beginning of the year to shut these people out of college is rather uncharitable.

I may also be permitted to state that while orders of Government are issued allowing all these students to go to the higher class and asking them to make up the deficiency in the total number of marks or to appear and pass the subject in which they have failed, it is necessary to instruct the Principal to condone the deficiency, if any, in the number of term days to be put in by these candidates, as the fault lies on the Principal and not on them.


I earnestly request that very early orders may be passed since the college re-opened on the 4th July and we are now on the 20th August. Further, the orders of Government may kindly be communicated to the Principal simultaneously so as to avoid any further delay. (Delay in being communicated from the D.P.I.'s office to the Engineering College).

I remain, Sir,

Yours faithfully,

Raghothama Rao

To
The Secretary to Government,
Education and Public Health Department,
Fort St. George, Madras.



Respected Sir,

Kindly excuse the liberty I am taking in writing this personal letter to you. This is in regard to the "Quit the College" order issued by Dr. Rudra, lately Principal of the Engineering College, Guindy.

The college is to close on Monday after the close of the first term and we, poor students, have not yet received the orders of Government deciding our fate. Most of the students have joined the Arts colleges while only a very few are still eagerly awaiting favourable orders from Government so as to enable them to join the College. The fate of the failed I year new L.C.E. students have already been explained to Government by many parents and the papers in front of Government should clearly indicate how unjust it has been on the part of the Principal of the College (Dr. Rudra) to have thrown them out of the college without any consideration to humanity.

May I request you, Sir, therefore kindly to look into the matter and pass early orders.

Thanking you very much in anticipation of favourable orders.

A student still waiting
in Madras.

To
M.V. Subramanian, Esq., I.C.S.,
Secretary to the Govt. of Madras,
Education and public health department,
Madras.

24 159 C.T.

Edn. & P.H. Department (1)

College - Engineering, Guindy - "Failed" students of the first year L.C.E. Class - Re-admitted into the same class - Petitions rejected

pp1-5 ms 11-13 CF
p7 CF.

Read:- Petitions from Sri S. Kuppaswami Ayyar and others dated 10-7-1945. From the D.P.I. letter No. RC.609A/45 dated 11-8-1945.

ORDER 1437 Edn. dated 15-9-45.
Ms.

The petitions are rejected.

2. The D.P.I. is requested to apprise the students affected of the facilities for instruction available in the College, without the being re-admitted into the same class, in terms of the penultimate paragraph of the Principal's letter No. RC.23-6 B/45 dated 18-7-1945.

14.9.45

20.9.45
17-9-45
p9 CF.

The D.P.I.

Principal of the Engineering College, Guindy.
This personal letter to you is in regard to the "Failed" students of the first year L.C.E. Class - Re-admitted into the same class - Petitions rejected

The college is to close on Monday after the close of the first term and we, poor students, have not yet received the orders of Government regarding our fate. Most of the students have joined the Arts colleges while only a very few are still eagerly awaiting favourable orders from Government as to the fate of the college. The late of the enable them to join the college. I have already explained to Government about the late of the Principal of Government Engineering College, Guindy, in front of Government and the Principal of the college (Dr. R. S. Srinivasan) have shown them out of the college without any consideration to the students.

My I request you, Sir, therefore kindly to look into the matter and pass early orders. Thanking you very much in anticipation of favourable orders.

A student still waiting in Guindy.

To the Secretary to the Government, Madras.
From the Government Engineering College, Guindy.

C.No. 31330 C/45 From N. Krishna Rao and others, petitions dated 10-7-45 and 20-8-45.

C.No. 36570 C/45 From the D.P.I., R.C.No. 609 A/45 dated 11-8-45.

College of Engineering, Guindy - L.C.E. course -
Failed students.

The c.f. contains 3 petitions protesting against the order of the Principal, Engineering College, Guindy, asking the students who ~~had~~ ^{first year} failed in the L.C.E. Examination held in 1945 to leave the College. The position is not exactly represented by the petitioners. From the Principal's letter copy at page 9 c.f. - it will be observed that the students question will not be put to any real hardship by leaving the College now, as they can appear for the next examination ^{study} privately and if they secure a pass in that examination will be promoted to the next higher class. On the other hand the procedure adopted by the Principal will enable more students to get trained. The Principal also says that the suggestion made in para 3 of the petition ^(p.1 c.f. for) promoting the students now and holding examinations at intervals ^(next year) in subjects in which they are deficient, is highly undesirable and is not practicable.

The D.P.I. agrees with the Principal. For orders whether the petitioners may be informed that the Government see no reason to interfere. ^{the view point of the students is at c. 7.} ^{the Deptt's anxiety to make as many} ^{new admissions to the L.C.E. class,} possible, is understandable, having regard to the demand for trained personnel. At the same time, the college owes a duty to the 'failed' students too, having once taken them in. We ^{may} probably agree with the principal in what he says at S-c. 7.9, ~~regarding~~ of whatever the pr.

PL: See
below

22/8

last para, p.9 cf

17 cf

21/8/45

A

Government of Madras.
Education and P.H. Department.
Memorandum dated 16th April 1945.

Technical education - Scheme for sending students for training overseas - Forms of application.

A form of application (in duplicate) together with a copy each of the 'advertisement' and the "terms and conditions of award of Government stipends" are furnished.

E.A. Venkateswara Ayyar,
Assistant Secretary.

To the Applicant.

Forwarded/By Order. *Provide mem*
Superintendent.

Government of Madras.
Education and P.H. Department.
Memorandum dated 16th April 1945.

Technical education - Scheme for sending students for training overseas - Forms of application.

A form of application (in duplicate) together with a copy of the 'advertisement' and the "terms and conditions of award of Government stipends" are furnished.

E.A. Venkateswara Ayyar,
Assistant Secretary.

To the Applicant.

Forwarded/By Order.

Provide mem
Superintendent.

Government of Madras.
Education and P.H. Department.
Memorandum dated the 16th April 1945.

Technical education - Scheme for sending students for training overseas - Forms of applications.

A form of application (in duplicate) together with a copy of the 'advertisement' and the "terms and conditions of award of Government stipends" are furnished.

E.A. Venkateswara Ayyar,
Assistant Secretary.

To the Applicant.

Forwarded/By Order.

Provide mem
Superintendent.

Government of Madras.
Education and P.H. Department.
Memorandum dated the 16th April 1945.

Technical education - Scheme for sending students for training overseas - Forms of application.

A form of application (in duplicate) together with a copy each of the 'advertisement' and the "terms and conditions of award of Government stipends" are furnished.

E.A. Venkateswara Ayyar,
Assistant Secretary.

To the Applicant.

Forwarded/By Order.

Provide mem
Superintendent.

(=)
in the school of Indian Medicine or the colleges. B there is only one side of the question. It does not take into account the needs and wishes of students who consider that they will be worse off for being denied the benefit of college instruction and in that respect the rule 29 clearly gives a "failed" student the option to leave the college or re-join for another year. It is not clear how we got the notion that it is in his interest to direct the student to leave the college or re-join the class. The first term of the year is very nearly over. The Principal may be that his interpretation of the rule is not correct and that he should now give the "failed" students individually the option either to re-join the first year class on the re-opening of the college for the second term or to appear for the next seasonal examination as per the college must provide whatever special instruction is necessary for such "failed" students as leave to join.

If appld, a draft will be prepared as at A & B above.

22.8.45 - 9/10 do. W.
Agree with the comment. W. R. above. 9
do. W. Provide the rule. Give an option to the student, either, clearly. Please compare the corresponding rule relating to the University of Madras at p. 23 of the Circular. That leaves the whole matter clear. No option at all: it will be by direction of the Principal; 'may rejoin' would

discretion of the Principal. 9
 Name Institution Number in
 place or Rule 29. in known of his
 Principal the D.P. on the basis
 accept. S. a. p. S. Y.
 No interference
 is taken for.



1 free - 05
 12/12/49
 H. S. students
 be - formed of R.
 P. G. C. M. 1/41

Please see p. 13 c. 7, since added, apparently
 from one of the students, affected.
 Draft for appl.

64.8.45 - S. M. / S. M.

The Secretary to Government, Education and P.
 Fort St. George
 3274 The Director of Public Instruction, Madras
 18.10.1945
 The Secretary to Government, Education and P.
 Fort St. George

Engineering college Cuddly - Pupils of Licentiate
 classes thrown out of the college at Principal's drastic order.

It is a tragedy that in the annals of the college of
 Engineering Cuddly a number of pupils of ^{the} Licentiate
 classes who had completed the course for one or two years
 struck off the roll from July 45 merely because they
 to secure the prescribed minimum of 50% of marks in
 last Sessional examination held in March 45. These
 -tunate pupils are driven to waste a year outside in
 and unhappy life. Quite a miserable plight!

2. When as many qualified men of technical
 knowledge in various ^{are required} spheres as possible meet the
 needs, the Principal rather than throwing the trained
 partially unsuccessful pupils out, ought to have
 new ways and means to permit them to continue the
 course in higher classes, unimpaired and uninterrupted
 and thereby fulfil the purpose for which the college exists.

3. The sessional examination held at the end
 each year is apparently a formal test to judge the
 progress made by pupils with reference to the marks
 obtained in each subject. In cases where pupils
 have not got the prescribed minimum in a sessional
 examination, there could be no difficulty at all
 the way of the Principal conducting a supplementary
 or special examination pertaining to the respective
 courses for N.L. 3 or L. 2 classes at short intervals
 the following year enabling the pupils in question
 exert and obtain the required minimum without
 detriment to their prosecuting the course in higher classes.


4. This step will save time, energy and cost in respect
 their career. It is therefore fervently hoped that the Govt.
 the D.P.G. will be pleased to come to the pupils' rescue, who suffer
 from shipwreck in their professional career of study, rather
 than most of the rules 4, necessary.

X. N. T. O. S. Chandrasekhar

While it has been the standing practice to promote even those pupils who had obtained a total of $\frac{1}{3}$ rd of the marks in the sessional examination on a warning given them to get the deficiency made up in subsequent years' course, the departure from this procedure in 1945 is untenable and iniquitous

Chothama Rao.

Villupuram,
9th August 1945.



Dear and Esteemed Sir,

Kindly excuse the liberty I am taking in addressing you. Had it not been for the sorrowful plight of the students, I would not have encroached on your precious time at all.

Some 15 students of the L.C.E. course (of the College of Engineering, Guindy) newly started from last year were declared to have failed in their I year Examination. They received intimation from the Principal of their failure, at the same time informed that the question of permitting to appear for the next sessional examination was under consideration. Naturally, the students thought that they would be allowed to attend the II Year course and asked to appear in the subjects in which they failed in the I Year. But it was a great surprise and disappointment to them all to know, when they came to the College for admission, that they were not entitled even for re-admission into the same class in the College but that they should study privately and appear at the end of a year for the sessional examination in all the subjects and pass the examination. The L.C.E. course was previously of 4-years duration. Only from last year it was intensified and made a 3-year course and naturally there was some difficulty in regard to the courses of study, etc. In the annals of the history of the Engineering College, this is the first time when 15 students have been detained. The minimum to secure a pass is, I understand, 50 per cent. In view of the large number of failures and also in view of the fact that the new course was introduced only last year with an intensified syllabus; it is but fair that the minimum should be fixed at 40% and such candidates as are eligible made to go to the II Year class. It is a well known fact that a large number of engineering students are required at the present days and that was the main reason why the No. of admissions to be made in a year was increased from 60 to 90.

Further, it is understood that in the School of Industrial Medicine the L.I.M. students who do not secure the minimum for a pass in the I year etc., are allowed to attend the next higher class and given an opportunity of writing the I year examination before answering the II Year paper. In the medical college also, it seems students are permitted to appear and pass the subject in which they have failed while at the same time they are given the opportunity of attending the higher class course. Previous history of the Engineering College also would reveal the fact that students who failed were promoted with a warning and in certain cases asked to appear and pass the subject in which they failed. In these days especially when more technical men are needed it is essential that the pupils should be shown at least the same concessions which the students enjoyed in pre-war days. Some of the students who failed in the II year course of the old L.C.E. course, who should be normally and according to rules, admitted into the new L.C.E. I year class, have been, with the sanction of the D.P.I. admitted into the new II Year L.C.E. class. This means the old course students who have failed have been given the benefit of promotion but not the students of the new I Year course. If the above promotion is deemed reasonable and permissible, then at least the minimum for a pass in the new I Year L.C.E. students reduced, say to 40%, and students who secure promotion according to this principle be promoted to the II Year class, as a special case this year. Or such of the students as are desirous of joining the College may be admitted into the II year and asked to appear at the end of 2 or 3 months and pass the subject in which they failed.

14 AUG 1945

MADRAS

All the 15 students may not seek re-admission as some of them have chosen other courses and some of them have been admitted into the B.E. course of the Annamalai University. Further, in these days for secondary grade training the S.S.B.C. failed candidates are given concession and are admitted for training by the D.P.I. So, I beg to submit that some special concession may be shown to these candidates as in the case of so many other students.

As already one month has elapsed early action may kindly be taken. It is understood further that the re-admission of all the 15 students into the I year class is objected to on the ground that the present maximum permissible strength of 90 students do not make it possible for any further admissions. But it may be argued this way - supposing, if by any chance, all the 90 I year students and the now failed 15 students - pass the sessional examination in 1946, then the strength in the II year class will come to 105 and to this probably we may have to add some more who may fail, God forbid any such failures, in the II Year. If, on the question of accommodation these students are not re-admitted into the I Year class, which practice was in vogue from time immemorial, then how can they provide for 105 students or more in the II year? This is only an argument.

In the circumstances explained above a sympathetic view of the fate of the failed students may be kindly taken and early orders passed.

I remain, Sir,
Yours faithfully,
Ragholthame Rao

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

Ed P. H. Dept.

An official reference was given to the

1. D. P. 2. as this matter - p. 2 note. This may
be forwarded to him w/o, in continuation. The
situation prima facie appears to require
urgent action.

11.8.45

S/D P. 2.
11/8/45

Ed P. H. 31330 (us. 28)
13.8.45

The attention of the Govt is invited
to this office letter RENO 609 A/45 of 11.8.45.

216 N. 609 A/45
15.8.45

11/8