Close
1/11

Scott II-27—58,001—4-11-46.

E. & P. H. (194) Department.

Mis. SERIES.

G.O. NO. Ms. 1004 Edn. &

Dated the 13 . 5 . 1947.

[Despatch Abstract.]

APPEAL - Mahadeva Sastri, Sri S.V. - Ex-headmaster - Board High School, Tirupattur - District Board, Ramnad - Against reduction as L.T. Assistant - 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.

12399A/1946

From

S.V.Mahadeva Sastri, B.A.,L.T.,
North Car Street, Tiruppattur, Ramnad District.

To

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

Through

The President, Ramnad District Board.

Sir,

Subject: --- Appeal against the orders of the President, Ramnad District Board, reverting me as an Assistant from the Headmastership of a High School in his R.O.C. A-9/26237 of 45 dated 1--9--46.

I beg leave to appeal against the orders of the President, Ramnad District Board, reverting me as an Assistant master from the Headmastership of a District Board High School, in his R.O.C. A-9/26237/45 dated 1--9--46. (cppy enclosed, Enc. I) pp 175-184 of (a) pp 9-13 infra

2. I am a B.A.,L.T., of the Madras University and entered service under the Ramnad District Board as the Mathematics Assistant of the Board High School, Rajapalayam, in July 1924. I was appointed as the Headmaster of the N.M.Board High School, Tiruppattur in June 1940 and was asked to open IV Form there. When the VI Form was opened in June 1942, the District Educational Officer, Ramnad, included my name in the panel and Sri P.S.Kumaraswami Raja, the then President of the District Board, appointed me as the Headmaster on Rs110 + 6 in the scale of 110--10/2--170. In June 1944, I got the first increment and in June 1946, the second increment and my present salary is Rs 130 (from 8-6-46). I was confirmed as Head master from 8-6-44 as per R.O.C. A-9/13453/44 dated 25-8-44 of the President and continued to be at Tiruppattur till I was recently transferred as Headmaster, R.S.Board High School, Paramakudi, " on public grounds " and I joined duty there on 7-8-46.

not-recd

3. At the outset, I beg to submit that apart from the fact that the penalty is based on suspicion and not on charges proved, there are vital defects in the procedure adopted for the conduct of enquiry:--

(a) When communicating the proceedings containing the charges framed against me, copies of all statements and records (on which the charges are based) were not furnished

(a) 101-104

(M)

p121 % (2)

furnished to me.

(b) The enquiry was held during the Summer Vacation and the notice of enquiry to be held on 15-5-46 was received by me by telegram, only on the previous day, viz., 14-5-46. Two important witnesses, peon Arokkiasami (who is connected with charges 6 & 7) and teacher K.R.Ramaswami Ayyar, (who is connected with charge 4) were not present at the time of enquiry. These two witnesses do not appear to have received in time the summons for appearance at the enquiry and their evidences were not recorded and I was not in a position to cross-examine them. I understand the teacher received the summons, long after the enquiry was over.

Srikamal's yuvisal. pp129-131 % (2)

(c) The evidence of the witnesses at the preliminary enquiry has been relied upon mostly in arriving at the findings. Since all the witnesses excepting the waterwoman were examined at the preliminary enquiry in my absence, it would have been reasonable to examine them at the regular enquiry in my presence afresh and record their evidence. This was not done. The findings based on such statements taken 'in camera' should be discarded.

(d) I was not given sufficient time to put in a further written statement of my defence, after the regular enquiry was over. The enquiring authority was in a hurry to go back.. He came to the school at 6 p.m. and left the premises in half an hour. I only wrote a sentence or two, on the spot about the vouchers in respect of charges 1 & 2.

(e) I was neither supplied with a copy of the report of the enquiring officer nor was called upon to show cause against the particular penalty proposed to be inflicted. The oral enquiry was held on 15-5-46 while I was the Headmaster of the Board High School, Tiruppattur, and I was transferred on " public grounds " as Headmaster, Board High School, Paramakud in R.O.C. A-9/26237/46 dated 14-6-46 of the President. (copy enclosed Enc II.) I was also sanctioned my increment in July 1946 when these proceedings were pending disposal. Then all on

(2)/139

(V)

on a sudden, the proceedings inflicting the present punishment were received by me on 11--9--1946 only.

4. In the findings on the charges against me, remarks like " The ~~statement~~ conduct of the Headmaster is not free from doubt." " The statement of the Headmaster..... is highly suspicious and and the charge is proved." " So I suspect the genuineness of his (Headmaster's) statement." are found which only go to show that the various charges have not been examined plainly and in full, at the regular enquiry and cannot be considered to have been conclusively proved.

5. Coming to the charges themselves:--

(2)/102-103 Charges 1,2,&3. relate to the appointment of menials and payment of wages to them. I desire to state that the President has not issued any specific orders or instructions to be followed by the Headmasters. The procedure followed by me in the matter of appointments of menials (sweeper and waterman) paid from contingencies is the same as that followed by my brother Headmasters of the Board High Schools at Paramakudi and Kamuthi. In the Kamuthi High School, at one time, 2 or 3 persons were given the work of sweeping and all were paid, though the voucher for the whole amount was got from only one person. In all these three High Schools, only the Headmasters made these appointments of menials without obtaining the approval of the President, District Board. Also in the contigent bills, the names of the sweeper and waterman were not written. The bills were claimed in the following manner:--

(1)	Wages of sweeper	s 8
(2)	Wages of waterman	s 8

For nearly 19 years in the two High Schools at Paramakudi and Kamuthi and for 6 years in the High School at Tiruppattur the bills have been passed. Never was any question asked about the appointment of these menials. I mention this only to show that the President, District Board, allowed the Headmasters to make these appointments and since the President had not issued any orders on the subject all these years, I cannot be considered to be guilty of transgressing any orders of the President.

(5)

Regarding the vouchers, since only one individual was made responsible for the whole amount, acquittance was got from only one. She paid the amount due to the others. There has been no misappropriation by me as conceived by the President. None, other than Swarnambammal, has complained of nonpayment. This woman refused to receive her share after she had been dismissed. It is the dismissal that made her complain at all against me. She too received payment later and has accepted the payment. So the charge of misappropriation cannot be considered to be proved.

(2)/103 6. Charge 4. The auctioned backbenches were those condemned by the Assistant Engineer. If they were serviceable, they would not have been auctioned. The remnants of three unserviceable benches were auctioned. One teacher has corroborated my statement as per the findings of the Enquiring Officer himself. The other teacher who wrote the whole auction records was not present at the time of enquiry, not having been summoned in time. If enquired, he would have said that he made the correction at the ~~the~~ time of auctioning itself, since the whole lot of three was auctioned instead of only one bench. One Subbiah Pillai is said to have deposed that the watchman carried two benches to my house. I do not know who this Subbiah Pillai is. He was not present at the time of enquiry, nor was his evidence taken in my presence. I should think that the evidence of the teachers is entitled to more weight than that of the watchman or of an unknown stranger who was never produced. Thus the charge cannot be considered to be proved.

(2)/87

(2)/103 7. Charge 5. The Vice President says that the clerk admits the clerical error. Yet he says that when Rao Sahib A.Ramachandra Pillai verified the stock, he found one bucket missing. This verification took place in my absence, after I had taken leave. I should think that the loss, if any, must be accounted for by the peon and the watchman who have furnished cash securities for the safety of the tools and plant of the school. Thus the charge cannot be said to have been proved.

~~8. Charge 6. Peon Arokkiasamy was not produced, though he is tak~~

8. Charge 6. Peon Arokkiasamy was not produced, though he is taken as a prosecution witness, for giving evidence and being cross-examined. He has said in his first statement that I offered to give the amount to him during Christmas, if I found him allright by that time. A word about this peon's conduct has to be said in this connection. To put briefly, as enough is being said under the next charge, he is an unreliable person and his evidence cannot be relied upon. The payment was not made as his work and conduct were under watch. Since he was under suspension on 25-12-45, the amount was handed over to the Scoutmaster for the use of the pupil scouts. It may be remembered that the amount in question is one collected from the pupils by the monitors. The Vice President's remark, "He has kept the amount till 25-12-45 which tends to the idea of misappropriating the amount if it is not found out and questioned" is quite unjust. There was no misappropriation at all, and this charge cannot therefore be considered proved.

9. Charge 7 relates to my having placed the peon under suspension. This peon came to the school already with a bad reputation. While he was in the Women and Children's Hospital at Kanadukathan, his conduct was not satisfactory. On the initiative of the Doctor there, he was transferred. I found his work unsatisfactory and he did not behave also properly. So, I represented to the Secretary and Superintendent of the District Board Office both in person and in my letter (D.O.), copy enclosed, Enc-III to transfer him from the school. There was no effect. Then I wrote a formal complaint. Still there was no response. At that time the peon misbehaved and when a memo was issued to him asking ~~him~~ for an explanation, he refused to receive the same. It was at ~~time~~ that time that I framed charges against him, placed him under suspension and immediately wrote to the President requesting approval of my action. Even after this, no action was taken by the District Board Office for a long time. Now I am accused of not knowing the rules and regulations and of impudent behaviour. Only at the last stage when I found it impossible to exact any

any work from him, to maintain discipline, I suspended him and immediately wrote for approval. By a telegram or by the very next post the District Board Office might have rescinded my order and might have put me aright. After a lapse of three months this peon was transferred elsewhere and for the period of suspension he was given quarter pay. This tantamounts to the President approving my action. It is not understood how a charge against me can be considered tenable in the face of the punishment given to the peon. I cannot be therefore held guilty of this charge.

10. Charge 8. In my explanation, I have said that the Issue Register maintained in the school will prove this charge to be false. This Register does not appear to have been looked into by the Vice President. But he simply says that the watchman is justified in his complaint and my dealings with him were not proper. Even properly-maintained school records have no value in the eyes of the Enquiry Officer. The menial's statement is accepted as gospel truth and I am accused. It is clear that the Enquiring Officer has not attached any weight to my statement of maintenance of register nor did he call for it. The charge cannot be considered to be proved.

11. As per further instructions in G.O. N.O.3625 dated 14-12-43 "The Officer holding the enquiry should record his findings on each charge separately after carefully considering the evidence adduced in support of it as well as that for the defence. Where the Officer holding the enquiry is not competent to award a penalty, his duty ends with the recording of his findings on the charges and it is no part of his function to make any suggestion regarding the penalty to be awarded or the further disposal of the case."
In this case the enquiring Officer has clearly shown his biassed mind, not only in recording his findings on unproved charges, but also in suggesting the penalty, contrary to the G.O.

12. The prejudice can also be seen by the vacancy caused by my reduction having been substantively filled up to the prejudice of my interests on the very next day following the proceedings reducing

reducing me, contrary to Rule No. 35 of the Madras Provincial and Subordinate Services.

(9)

Extract from the Memo of the President.

"Consequent on the reversion of Sri S.V.Mahadeva Sastri, Head master, R.S.Board High School, Paramakudi, as Assistant, the following transfers are ordered on public grounds:

1. Sri M. Arumugam Pillai, M.A.,L.T., Assistant, Board High School, Kamuthi, to be Headmaster, M.M.Board High School, Tirup~~p~~pattur. To draw Rs 110 + 16.

13. The school pupils' Literary Association Anniversaries were presided over by Sri Rao Sahib A.Ramachandran Pillai, Sri P.S. Kumaraswami Raja, Diwan Bahadur CV.CT.V.Venkatachalam Chettiar, and Rao Bahadur R.V.Ramasundaram Pillai in the years 1941,42, 43 and 44 respectively and each at the time of his presidential speech had nothing but praise for my work in the school. I may also mention the following to show my good work in the school:--

(1) The school strength which was less than 200 in June 1940 is about 600 now;

(2) An additional shed to accommodate 2 or 3 classes was put up from donations got from the public, solely on my initiative, and handed over to the District Board only last year;

(3) I have the cooperation of the whole staff in the school;

(4) The school has presented candidates for the S.S.L.C. Public Examination only for 4 years till now, beginning from 1943, and the results in these 4 years are 33%, 86%, 94% and 79% respectively.

14. The following extracts from the Tabular Inspection Reports, pertaining to the school, of the District Educational Officer, Ramnad, will speak for themselves:--

1943-44. "The organising and supervising work of the Head master is satisfactory. Girls' activities are well-organised."

1944-45. "The organising and supervising work of the Head master is satisfactory. He has carefully planned the work of the school."

"Teaching is on efficient lines and the Headmaster has secured the willing cooperation of his assistants."

Review of the Divisional Inspector of schools on the same:--

"It is pleasing to note that the instructional side of the school is receiving satisfactory attention."

1945-46. "Organising and supervising work of the Headmaster is satisfactory."

"The results in the S.S.L.C. Examination are good. The school average is higher than the Presidency average in all subjects and this is commendable."

(8)

Review of the Divisional Inspector of schools on the same:--

"It is satidfactory to note that the results at the S.S.L.C. Examination have been commendable."

15. In view of the foregoing defects in the conduct of the enquiry, of the fact that the evidences have not been properly enquired into and recorded and all findings were based ~~on~~ merely on unfounded suspicions and half-truths, I humbly request that the Government may kindly be pleased to allow the appeal and restore me to my original status in the District Board service.

I beg to remain,

Sir,

Tiruppattur
20.9.46

your most obedient servant,
S.V. Mahadevadas
20.9.46

Copy sent direct to the Government.

Received for
24 MAR 1947
Copying

Enclosure I. 9/(10)

Proceedings of the Vice President, Ramnad District Board at Madura.

Present:--Sri Rao Bahadur R.V.Ramasundaram Pillai,Vice-President, in-charge.

Read the following:- 1. Petition dated 14-11-45 from Sornathammal Ex-waterwoman, N.M.Board High School, Tiruppattur. 2. Report R.O.C. 591-45dated 12-12-45 from the Headmaster N.M.Board High School, Tiruppattur. 3. Complaint dated 30-12-45 from R.Arokkiasami,peon N.M.Board High School, Tiruppattur. 4. Records of enquiry held on 30-1-46 of Rao Sahib A.RamachandaranPillai, Member, Ramnad District Board, Tiruppattur. 5. Mahazar from the public of Tiruppattur dated 25-12-45. 6. Proceedings dated,18-2-46 framing charges against Sri S.V.Mahadeva Sastri, Headmaster, N.M.Board High School, Tiruppattur 8. Records of enquiry dated 15-5-46 conducted by the VicePresident at Tiruppattur.

Roc A 9/26237-45 Dated 1--9--46.

Order:- Sornathammal, waterwoman of the N.M.Board High School, Tiruppattur preferred a complaint on 14-11-45 that Sri S.V.Mahadeva Sastri B.A.L.T. Headmaster N.M.Board High School Tiruppattur obtained from her acquittance for Rs 8 for her wages and paid a lesser sum and also reported that her services were terminated by the Headmaster without proper reasons. Another petition was received from R.Arokkiasami peom of the above High School that the Headmaster did not pay him Rs 10 being the collections made from the pupils as "present" to the school peons for Deepavali. A mahazar from the public of Tiruppattur dated 25-12-45 stating that (1) The Headmaster is not properly disbursing the wages to the menials of the school (2) that he is using the school furniture for private purposes in his house (3) that he is utilising the services of the school peon more for his private purpose than for the school use and (4) that he is not popular.

These complaints were forwarded to Sri Rao Sahib A.Ramachandrm Pillai, B.A.B.L., Member Ramnad District Board Tiruppattur for conducting an enquiry on the above allegations and send his final report on the matter. Accordingly he made an enquiry and obtained written statements from the persons concerned and forwarded them to me with his following remarks:-

"The allegations that he has not been paying the waterwoman properly, that he has utilised one bucket, that he has removed two benches, that he has not paid rupees ten due to peon R.Arokkiasami have all some substance in them and thorough investigation appears to be necessary. I am satisfied that he is unfit to be a Head of any institution."

After perusing the detailed remarks of the above District Board Member, charges were framed against Sri S.V.Mahadeva Sastri Headmaster, N.M.Board High School, Tiruppattur. The charges framed against him, his explanation and the findings thereon are detailed below:-

Charge No. 1. That he paid Rs 3-2-6 to waterwoman Swarnathammal for supplying water for the month of October 1945 and got her thumb impession for Rs 8 and that he paid the balance to some other water woman without obtaining her signature or thumb impression.

Explanation. That he is not guilty of appropriating any amount to himself. When the waterwomnn suddenly stopped the supply of water another had to be engaged for the rest of the month. For purposes of audit, an acquittance from a single individual was obtained and the amount was paid to both in proportion th the work done.

Findings:- The explanation of the Headmaster is not accaptable. The proper proceedure is that he should have got the acquittance from each individual for the amounts due to them and disbursements made to them accordingly. The statement of the Headmaster that he paid the balance amount of Rs 4-13-6 (8-0-0--3-2-6) to another woman in the absence of proper acquittance is highly suspicious and the charge is proved.

Charge N. 2. That he has obtained acquittance from Irulayee for Rs 8 for supplying water in November 1945 while he paid the wages as follows:--

Bramin waterwoman	1-0-0
Irulayee	1-12-0
Muthathal alias Thappakattai	0-4-0
Sornathammal	2-1-6 (to be paid)
	5-1-6.

The pay due to Sornathammal has neither been paid to her till now nor it has been remitted in the Treasury. Deducting this, the amount actually paid comes to Rs 3-0-0 while he obtained acquittance for Rs 8-0-0 for November 1945.

Explanation: That here also the same proceedure as in charge No.1 was followed Three or four women supplied water during that month and the amount was divided among them, though acquittance was obtained from only one. The whole trouble started because of the unsatisfactoty nature of the work done by Sornathammal. In the previous month she suddenly stopped the supply and he had to engage another. Since she begged, he appointed her again but again her work was not satisfactory and hence she had to be completely stopped. At this stage she began to scandalise him and th threaten him also. She refused to receive the same even at the time of enquiry by Sri Rao Sahib A.Ramachandran Pillai, though she admitted at the cross-examination that it was the only amount due to her. He can only say that the whole amount has been paid to the different women that did the work and no pie has been taken by him.

Findings:- The Headmaster has not given detailed particulars about the disbursement he had made to the several individuals whom he mentioned in the statement. From the observations made only the vagaries of the Headmaster are disclosed. The wages for the services rendered (water supplier to the school) are claimed only at the end of the month. Therefore it will be proper for the menials for the amount actually due. The Head master has not observed the rules properly but claimed a lump sum (the whole sanctioned amount for the purpose at his will) and disbursed the amount at random and utilised the balance for his purpose. This clearly shows the Headmaster's indifference in observing the rules and also his ingenious way of obtaining claiming hi her sum from the Board than for the amount which is actually due for the services rendered. Regarding the misappropriation since the Headmaster has not given any details for the amount and since he has not obtained separate acquittances for the wages paid, it is clear that the charge is proved against him that he did not keep regular acquittance for the amounts drawn for the payment of wages. He has no business in keeping the undisbursed amount for more than two months due to Sornathammal (paid on 28-1-46) Furtner he has appointed menials at his will and pleasure without obtaining proper approval of this office. This shows his nefarious behaviour towards the handling of the public money entrusted to him and his illegal action in appointing menials without the approval of the competent authority.

The above two charges are proved and the Headmaster is guilty of the charges of (1) sending a improper claim in contingent items than what is actually due (2) misappropriating the balance amount left after disbursement for his own use (3) that he does not observe rules for claims and disbursements.

Charge N. 3: That he has not got the approval of the undersigned for the removal of Swarnathammal, waterwoman and for appointing Irulayee in her place.

Explanation:- Part time appointment like sweeper and waterman paid from contingencies have been made only by the Headmaster always. It was the practice obtaining at Kamuthi High School also, while he was there from June 1933 to June 1940. In the Tiruppattur High School he appointed one Bairavan for the first time in 1940 then Manikkam, (the present watchman) and when he was appointed as watchman on his recommendation, this Sornathammal and lastly Irulayee. In no case was the President's approval obtained. The Headmaster is responsible for seeing that the work is done satisfactorily and payment made. These are appointments not of a permanent nature.

Findings:- His explanation for not obtaining he approval of the President for the appoitment and termination of services of menial staff is not satisfactory. This ought to have been done only with the approval of the President District Board.

Charge No.4. That he sold one backbench in auction on 12-10-45 for Rs 3-8-0 to one K.Karuoolah and corrected the number in the sale list as three and took the two benches to his house.

Explanation:- That this and the next charge are unfounded charges The work of repairing the broken articles of furniture was supervised by Messrs. M.S.Sivasubbu Pillai and K.R.Ramaswami Ayyar, teachers and only with their help auction of the unserviceable articles was conducted. It is false to say that he has taken home any articles of furniture belonging to the school. The teachers mentioned may be enquired.

Findings:- The bidder says that he took only one backbench in auction and not three as noted in the sale list. In the enquiry the Headmaster says that the backbenches are condemned ones and are parts of benches. If that be the case there is no meaning in noting in the sale list as 3 benches auctioned. He ought to have mentioned in the sale records about the condition of the benches sold in auction as one bundle of 3 backbenches and full particulars should have been given in the sale list and in the sale notice. This he has not done. No motive has been suggested against the sale purchaser to depose falsely against the Headmaster. There is no reason to disbelieve his statement that he took one backbench only in auction. The correction made in the sale list dated 17-10-45 against item 7 is also highly suspicious. The conduct of the Headmaster is not free from doubt. The statement of the sale purchaser is more entitled to weight and so the explanation of the Headmaster is not satisfactory. Further the whole thing came to light only from the complaint of the night watchman. The neighbour to the school Subbiah Pillai also corroborates the statement of the night watchman that he took 2 backbenches to the Headmaster's House. Though the assistant of the school deposes in favour of the Headmaster that one bundle of broken furniture was sold in auction there is no motive for the sale purchaser and also the nightwatchman of the school to say that the former purchased only one backbench and latter saw 2 backbenches were taken to the Headmaster's house.

More weight should be given to the words of the two persons who have no connection with the school than that of the assistant who is a direct subordinate to the Headmaster. From the above I hold that the charge is proved.

Charge No.5:- That he purchased 2 buckets for Rs 2-14-0 and supplied one bucket to the school and took the other to his house. He corrected the entry 2 entered against the item bucket in the stock register as 1 under his initials and shown the issue entry as 1 and the balance nil. In the contingent register it is written that one bucket was purchased.

Explanation:- Here a clerical error made by the then school clerk has been made much of. He showed the local member the correction two made by him in his handwriting (the word one in the handwriting of the clerk being scored off) in the office copy of the Contingent bill for the month. In the fair copy of the contingent bill which may be found in the District Board Office,'two'may be found mentioned. 2 buckets were purchased and both were issued for use The clerk made an error in entering it as 1. Subsequently on being pointed out by him, he corrected the 1 as 2 in the stock register also. The statement that he corrected the 2 as 1 is wrong. The office copy of the contingent bill may be verified again to see which statement is correct.

Findings:- The school clerk corroborates thatt of the explanation of the Headmaster. He should have taken care of the correct entry. The District Board Member verified the stock and found only one new bucket in the school whereas the Headmaster purchased 2 new buckets. From the above verification of the District Board Member Sri Rao Sahib A.Ramachandran Pillai and the statement of the peon Sankaran that the Headmaster took one of the new buckets for private use in his house it is clear that the Headmaster has misappropriated the school property.

Charge No.6:- That he kept Rs 10 due to peon N.Arokkiasami, peon of the school, being the collections made from the pupils for Deep

Deepavali till 25-12-45 and handed over the amount to the scout association only after the peon spread the news about his non-payment of the share.

Explanation:- No sum was due to peon Arokkiasami as such. It was a collection made by the class monitors on his authority and he had the discretion to distribute it as he thought proper. Since in his opinion Arokkiasami did not deserve any gift he did not give it to him. But he told him that if he showed better behaviour, he would consider his case. But by the 25th December he had become worse and was actually under suspension. So he paid the amount to the scoutmaster to use it for the purpose of scouting.

Findings:- This is a petty matter and the Headmaster ought not to have interfered. His action is very mean and questionable and proves how he is a misfit to hold a post fro Headmaster. Besides interfering in the peon's affairs he has kept the amount till 25-12-45 which tends to the idea of misappropriating the amount if it is not found out and questioned. This charge has also been proved against him.

Charge No.7:- That he placed the peon R.Arokkiasami under suspension without the orders of the President, District Board.

Explanation:- Ever since Arokkiasami joined as peon in the schol his behaviour was not satisfactory. He represented to the secretary and superintendent of the District Board Office, both in person and in his demi official letter to kindly transfer him. Afterwards he wrote a formal complaint also. The immediate cause for suspension was his refusal to receive his memo asking him to explain his conduct. When he found that he was insubordinate and impertinent and in addition refused to receive a memo also, he did not know what else to do since he could not exact any work from him. He immediately reported the fact to the President also. If his action is wrong he begs to be excused for the same.

Findings:- The Headmaster took the law in his hand to order the school peons and menials as he liked. He stopped the waterwoman from service and appointed new ones without my permission. In this case he has suspended the school peon R.Arokkiasami without the previous approval. Here also the Headmaster does not accept the charge wholly and saysthat if his action is wrong he may be excused. This clearly shows his impudent behaviour exhibits his utter ignorance of rules and regulations. So this charge is also proved against him.

Charge No.8 That he is not issuing kerosene to the night watchman properly and utilising the kerosene purchased for the school use in his house.

Explanation:- This is an absolutely false staement and the Issue Register in the school will prove this.

Findings:- Though the Headmaster says that he is maintaining a proper account for the kerosene purchased there is no necessity for the school peon to complain against the Headmaster of the school if his dealings with them were proper. So I suspect the genuineness of his statement and his dealing with them which has given room for petty and frivolous complaints. From the charges enumerated above and from the explanation, the Vice President, Ramnad District Board after due enquiry has observed as follows:-

"Ifind the Headmaster guilty of the charges of misappropriation and mismanagement of the public money and the articles of furniture entrusted to his care. His behaviour towards the menials is very mean, questionable and proves beyond doubt that he is a misfit to hold a responsible post as a head of an institution. He has suspended one of the peons and appointed waterwoman as he pleased without the orders of the superiors without observing the rules on the subject. Further as a Headmaster, he ought to have won the good opinion of the pupils, parents and the public of the locality. Contrary to this he has incurred the displeasure of one and all of them. The pupils and the public of the place have lost their confidence in him and I agree with their views that he is not getting on well there. The same state of affairs continued ever since he was appointed as Headmaster from 17-6-40. Any amount of warning is of no avail. The previous President Sri S.Jayaram Reddiar B.A. found him and observed tactless and his work unsatisfactory on similar complaints. He made detailed and

and elaborate enquiries and gave him a severe warning. He has also recorded that his work (S.V.M.) and conduct is not good and has proved himself quite unfit to be a Headmaster. Even after this warning he had troubles with the pupils, parents and public and behaved with them in such a tactless manner which ended in rough handling by them pupils while he was in his office room itself. Even after these incidents and after continuous warning by the public of the place he did not mend his ways and it will be only a slur on the management if no action is taken drastically against the impudent behaviour of this individual who is holding a responsible post which requires tact and capacity for management and the guiding factor to drive the institution to an efficient one which are all lacking in him. Considering all these points I am strongly of opinion that Sri S.V.Mahadeva Sastri is incapable of managing the institution when he has not got the cooperation of the staff, pupils, parents and public. I can say that he is fit to be an assistant and not as Headmaster of any institution.

So I recommend that he may be reverted as an assistant to work under Headmaster.

On perusing the materials and records placed before me I record my findings on the above charges:-

I have been receiving complaints both from the Public and members of the Board about the behaviour of Mr. S.V.Mahadeva Sastri towards the menials, students and members of the staff and the public at large. The culminated points reached when written complaints about the illegal gratification received from the menials that payment to the menials and the misappropriation of school articles etc. which necessitated me to depute the Vice President to inquire into the charges. I find from the observation of the Vice President that the charges are all proved and Mr. Mahadeva Sastri has proved himself to be an undesirable man to hold the post of a Headmaster which requires tact and driving capacity. He has no winning manners to assure the confidence of the public. So I entirely agree with the Vice President and I have no hesitation to record here about the utter incapacity and tactlessness of Mr.S.V.Mahadeva Sastri. Hence I hereby order that Sri S.V. Mahadeva Sastri is reverted as an Assistant of a High School in this Board from the date of this order. Separate orders will issue about his posting as an assistant.

(sd) S.Arthur.

For Vice President in charge.

To Sri S.V.Mahadeva Sastri, Headmaster, R.S.Board High School, Paramakudi.

Copy to the Headmaster, N.M.Board High School, Tiruppattur, Ramnad

Copy to the District Educational Officer, Ramnad.

Enclosure II. 14 (13)

Memorandum of the President, District Board Ramnad at Madura.
Raja Sri R. Shanmuga Rajeswara Sethupathi M.L.A.,
. Roc A 9/26237/45 Dated 14-6-46.

The following transfers are ordered on public grounds:-

1. Sri S.V.Mahadeva Sastri, B.A.L.T., Headmaster, N.M.Board High School, Tiruppattur to be the Headmaster, R.S.Board High School, Paramakudi.

2. Sri K.Krishnan Nair, B.A.L T., Headmaster, R.S.Board High School, Paramakudi to be the Headmaster, N.M.Board High School, Tiruppattur.

No. 1 to move first after handing over charge to the first assistant.

(sd.) S. Arthur,
For President.

Enclosure III.

D.O. letter to the Secretary, District Board Office, Ramnad.

S.V.Mahadeva Sastri, B.A.L.T., Tiruppattur,
Headmaster,
N.M.Board High School, Dated: 14-11-45.

Sir,

Sub:- Peon Arokkiasami--work and conduct unsatisfactory--fact reported--transfer requested.

I regret to report that peon Arokkiasami (recently posted here from Kanadukathan Women & Children's Hospital) does not work properly and is disobedient also.

He does not go to school in the morning and supervise the work of cleaning the premises, latrines etc., when his turn comes in alternate weeks.

He rings the bells at odd times and dislocates the work of all classes (at 11-10 a.m. instead of at 11-30 a.m., at 2-50 p.m. instead of at 3-10 p.m. and so on). Every time he pleads ignorance though he is really careless and negligent.

Since he has not furnished security, I cannot send him to the sub.treasury for remittance (unless the amount is very small) and encashment of cheques.

He wants all privileges like masters. He refuses to go to school on holidays thugh the clerk, teachers and myself go there to do any urgent work.

Of late, there is a complaint that books, pencils, pens etc. left inadvertently in classrooms in the evenings by pupils and masters are found missing. There is a suspicion that he is responsible for the loss of these articles.

Hence I request that he may be transferred immediately.

yours sincerely,
(sd) S.V.Mahadeva Sastri.
14--11--45.

26237/45
19986/46
27 9 46

Registered Post A.D.

C.F. 32.

Local Administration Department

From (Name) Raja Sri R. Shanmuga Rajeswara Sethupathi M.L.A.,
Designation President,
Station Ramnad District Board at Madura.

Received Registered

To

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

Enclosures: four (& Appeal petition)

No. Roc A 9-26237-46 dated 10 1946;

Sir,

ASST. SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT 65335 29 OCT 1946 EDUCATION & PUBLIC HEALTH DEPTT.

Subject - Appeal - Sri S.V. Mahadevasastry B.A.L.T. against the orders of reversion as an assistant from Head-mastership-

pp 1-8 ante

Forwarded herewith the appeal petition of Sri S.V. Mahadeva Sastry B.A.L.T., against the orders of his reversion from the post of Head-master of a High school to that of an assistant with the following remarks in addition to the findings observed by me in my proceedings Roc A 9-26237-45 dated 1-9-46.

pp 175 to 184 @ 206

3(a) Sri S.V. Mahadeva Sastri B.A.L.T., while submitting his explanation to the charges framed against him, desired an oral enquiry to be held and to be heard in person. He did not ask for copies of all statements and so they were not furnished. All records connected with the charges were also made available at the time of enquiry but he did not ask for them.

@ 133

3(b) Notices for the enquiry to be conducted by the Vice-president on 28-4-46 were issued on 17-4-46. The above enquiry had to be postponed owing to Rama Vilas Bus Strike and the Head-master was also informed by wire about the adjournament of the enquiry. Another date for the enquiry held on 15-5-46 was intimated on 14-5-46 by wire. He had not raised any objection at the time of the enquiry about the shorter notice nor did he say that that two individuals mentioned now in his application are important factors in the case and that their evidence were important. This is after thought. But one of the witnesses connected with charge No. 4 referred to by him Sri M.S. Sivasubbu Pillai was enquired into and his statement was recorded. As for peon Arokiasami his statements were obtained already and the charges No. 6 and 7 were proved. In as much as intimation was given so far back as 17-4-46 about the proposed enquiry, he ought to have intimated to me about the individuals to be examined on his behalf to rebut the charges. This he has failed but now he wants to take a cloak under this plea. As such his pleas that the absence of Sri K.R. Ramasami Iyer and peon Arokiasami at the time of enquiry will not in anyway absolve him from the charges.

@ 125

@ 130

3(c) At the regular enquiry conducted by the Vice-president almost all the persons concerned were examined in the presence of the petitioner and their statements were also recorded. He ought to have raised objections at the time of the enquiry about the manner and mode of the enquiry conducted. What he says cannot be relied on and this is only an afterthought to shield the charges.

@ 130

(d) His plea that he was not given time to put in a further written statement of his defence is a deliberate lie. In the enquiry conducted before the Vice-president his statement was also recorded and he has admitted that he has nothing to add regarding other points what he has explained before.

plaints

(e) His argument that he was sanctioned an increment and that he was transferred on public grounds will not in any way affect the charges and prove that he is free from the charges. His plea that the increment was sanctioned recognising his meritorious work cannot stand to reason but the accrued increment was sanctioned as a matter of routine for the period of duty put in by him and the charges were only pending enquiry on this score the increment cannot be stopped. Further whether he is transferred on public grounds or on complaint, he is entitled to travelling allowance unless the transfer is on request.

4. From the preliminary enquiry conducted by Sri Rao Sahib A. Ramachandran Pillai B.A.B.L., District Board Member and by the regular enquiry conducted by the Vice-president it is clear that all the charges are proved beyond doubt.

-2-

Charge No.1,2, &3:-

His plea that he has not been given any instructions before, that my approval is necessary in the matter of appointment and termination of services of menials paid from contingencies in the school is not correct. But is his duty to obtain the same in as much as he has neither been delegated with powers nor he is the appointing authority. While the charge against him for not obtaining the approval for the termination of services of a waterwoman and for the appointment of a substitute was pending disposal, he had the boldness to terminate the services of sweeper and appointed a substitute without getting any approval subsequently. This will clearly prove his arragant attitude to disregard the rules and disobey the orders of his superiors though the irregularity was once before pointed out to him.

As for vouchers for the payment of wages to the menials paid from contingencies, he gave a statement before the Vice-president at the time of enquiry that he paid the amount to one individual only for the whole amount though the amount is due to different individuals who worked during the period. But in his explanation dated 11-3-46, he says that he paid the wages in proportion to the work done by the menials. Both his statements are contradictory and suspicious and his irregular action in payment paved the way for the temporary misappropriation and for wrong and false payments. From the observations made by Sri Rao Sahib A. Ramachandran Pillai B.A.B.L., District Board member it will be clearly seen that the Head-master himself made payments to different individuals and not to one individual for payment to others who did the same work for the month. From the details furnished by the above member payments made to waterman for November 45 comes to Rs. 5-1-6 as follows while he obtained acquittance for Rs. 8/- and thereby misappropriating a sum of Rs. 2-14-6.

1. Brahim Waterwoman	Rs.	1- 0-0
2. Irulayee		1-12-0
3. Muthathal alias Thappa kattai		0- 4-0
4. Somathammal		2- 1-6 (paid on 28-1-46.)
	Rs.	5- 1-6

Though the amount is a paltry sum yet the fact of misapproporiations remains unquestioned.

Charge No. 4:- The bidder says that he took one bench in auction and that it was not either broken form or parts of benches as alleged by the petitioner. Further if the articles sold in auction are in parts of the benches then there was no necessity to mention in the sale list as three benches and the conditions of the benches might have been mentioned in the sale list. The night watchman says that he took two benches to the appellant's house and one Subbiah Pillai also saw it. From the statement of the bidder, peon and subbiah pillai it is clear that he misapproporiated the school property and recorded false statements in the sale list-

Charge No. 5:- The peon has given a statement that he took one of the new buckets purchased to the appellant's house by replacing an old bucket. Sri Rao Sahib A. Ramachandran Pillai B.A.B.L., District Board member who verified the buckets in the school says that there is only one new bucket in the school out of 2 buckets purchased.

Charge No. 6:- He placed peon Arokiasamy under suspension from 12-12-45 and remitted the share of Deepavali collection due to him to the Scout Master for the use of scouts only on 25-12-45. In as much as the collections were made by the peons for Deepvali, he need not have interfered with the distribution of the amount and kept it himself until it was brought to the notice of the authorities. Further he handed over the amount to the Scoutmaster only after the peon spread the news of nonpayment of his share. This shows his low mentality.

Charge No. 7:-

His statement that no action was taken on his complaints against the peon Arokiasamy is utterfalsehood. On his reports against the peon, he was asked to frame charges and obtain and submit the explanation of the peon. Contrary to the orders issued and without awaiting orders, he placed the peon under suspension from 13-12-45 The complaints received from him were forwarded to Sri Rab Sahib A. Ramachandran Pillai member Ramnad District Board for enquiry and on receipt of his remarks from the above member, the peon was transferred. His statement that no action was taken till the peon was transferred, is not correct.

Charge No. 8:-

If the Head-master had issued kerosene properly then, there would have been no complaint at all.

From the findings observed in my proceedings Roc -- 9-26237-45 dated 1-9-46 and from the above remarks it will be seen that all the charges against him are proved. Though he was been informed that my approval for the appointment and termination of services of menials paid from contingencies is necessary. He terminated the services of the sweeper subsequently. This will clearly show his arrogant attitude. Further he has no winning manners to assure the confidence of the public. Complaints have been received from the public and members of the Board about the behaviour of Sri S. V. Mahadeva Sastry B.A.L.T., towards the menials, students and member of the staff and public at large. As observed by the Vice-president and from my Findings in proceedings dated 1-9-46, it will be clearly seen that he is tactless and thoroughly unfit to hold a responsible post and his appeal petition deserves no consideration and it may kindly be rejected.

I forward herewith the following records for perusal.

1. D. Dis 23175-41 (pages 54 + 4)
2. F.Dis 23470-45 (Pages 10)
3. Vouchers for the months of October and November 45.
4. Current file (A 9-26237-45 (186 Pages)

President,
Ramnad District Board at Madura.

GJA-19-10.

18

Edn. & PH (B1) Dept.

Endt. No. 65335-B1/46-1 Edn dt 7/11/46.

Referred to the Director of Public Instruction, Madras, for remarks.

(By order).

A 7/11/46



Asst. Secy. to Government.

4/11/46 6/11/46

To

The Director of Public Instruction (with enclosure in orgl. (to be retd. with reply).



19 (16)

C.F.

EDUCATIONAL DEPARTMENT.



Received ..... 19 . Registered ..... 19 .

Subject.

APPEAL - Sri S.V. Mahadeva Sastri, formerly Headmaster, Board High School, Tirupattur - District Board, Ramnad against reduction as L.T. Assistant.

Dely 11.4.47
D 15801 46
23

ENCLOSURES.
No. .....
.....
Spare copies .....

R.C. No. 10831 G1/46

Station Madras, Dated the 23--4--1947 19

From (Name) Dr. S.R.U. Savoor, M.A., D.Sc., I.E.S.,

(Designation) Director of Public Instruction

To The Secretary to the Government of Madras,

EDUCATION & PUBLIC HEALTH Department.

Sir,

In resubmitting herewith the papers referred to me for remarks with Government endorsement No. 65335 B.1/46-1 Edn., dated 7th November 1946, I have the honour to state as follows:-

2. The appellant, Sri S.V. Mahadeva Sastri, B.A.L.T. was formerly the Headmaster of the Board High school, Tirupattur, under the District Board, Ramnad. In his Pros. dated 18-2-1946, the President, District Board, Ramnad, framed eight charges against him and after conducting an enquiry issued his Proceedings dated 1-9-1946 reducing Sri S.V. Mahadeva Sastri as L.T. Assistant. Against this order of punishment, Sri S.V. Mahadeva Sastri preferred his appeal dated 20-9-1946 to Government. This appeal is in time and may be considered.

(a)|175-184

3. CHARGE (i) This charge is only technical since the appellant did not take the acquittance of the menials to whom he had made payments. As it is not suggested that he misappropriated any amount, no serious notice need be taken of this charge.

(a)|102 & 176

CHARGE (ii) Apart from taking a single acquittance for payments made to 3 or 4 persons the appellants has not

(a)|102

18

Edn. & PH (B1) Dept.

Endt. No. 65335 - B1/46-1 Edn. Dt. 7/11/46.

Referred to the Director of Public Instruction, Madras, for remarks.

(By order).

A. Sharma
Asst. Secy. to Government.

4/11/46 6/11/46

DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC INSTRUCTION
10831
9 - NOV 1946
MADRAS

To
The Director of Public Instruction (with enclosure in orgl. to be retd. with reply).

GOVERNMENT OF INDIA
Rejd
NJ

19 (16)

C.F. 36.

EDUCATIONAL DEPARTMENT.

ASST. SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT
26 APR 1947
31785
PUBLIC HEALTH DEPT.

Received ..... 19 Registered 19

Subject.

APPEAL - Sri S.V. Mahadeva Sastri, formerly Headmaster, Board High School, Tirupattur - District Board, Ramnad against reduction as L.T. Assistant.

Enclosures.
No.
Spare copies

R.C. No. 10831 G1/46

Station Madras, Dated the 23--4--1947 19

From (Name) Dr. S.R.U. Savoor, M.A., D.Sc., I.E.S.,
(Designation) Director of Public Instruction

To The Secretary to the Government of Madras,
EDUCATION & PUBLIC HEALTH Department.

Sir,

In resubmitting herewith the papers referred to me for remarks with Government endorsement No. 65335 B.1/46-1 Edn., dated 7th November 1946, I have the honour to state as follows:-

2. The appellant, Sri S.V. Mahadeva Sastri, B.A.L.T. was formerly the Headmaster of the Board High school, Tirupattur, under the District Board, Ramnad. In his Pros. dated 18-8-1946, the President, District Board, Ramnad, framed eight charges against him and after conducting an enquiry issued his Proceedings dated 1-9-1946 reducing Sri S.V. Mahadeva Sastri as L.T. Assistant. Against this order of punishment, Sri S.V. Mahadeva Sastri preferred his appeal dated 20-9-1946 to Government. This appeal is in time and may be considered.

(a)|175-184

3. CHARGE (i) This charge is only technical since the appellant did not take the acquittance of the menials to whom he had made payments. As it is not suggested that he misappropriated any amount, no serious notice need be taken of this charge.

(a)|102 + 176

CHARGE (ii) Apart from taking a single acquittance for payments made to 3 or 4 persons the appellants has not

(a)|102

not explained either in his written ~~xxxxxxxx~~ explanation or at the enquiry what he did with the balance of Rs 2-14-6 as according to his own statement for the amount paid was only Rs 5--1--6. Hence there seems to be a case of misappropriation.

CHARGE (iii) The appellant has stated that it was the usual practice for Headmasters to appoint and remove menials according to exigencies of service. This statement of the appellant has not been disproved. This charge may therefore be ignored.

CHARGES(iv) and (v):- These charges relate to the auction sale of broken benches and alleged loss of a bucket costing Rs 1-7-0. As regards (iv) the appellant contends that the teacher who recorded the auction sales was not present and his evidence taken. The entry in the sale list shows "Benches (Back) 3" and auction was knocked off by K. Karuppan for Rs 3--8--0 and he has also signed in the list. The auction took place in October 1945 and there was absolutely no reason for him to have waited till 27-1-1946 to give a written statement to the effect that he took only one back bench. The allegation against correction of 1 into 3 does not seem to have any basis. If at all one is inclined to think that there is any correction, the correction seems to be from 2 to 3.

As regards the bucket the ex-clerk who made the entry confuses that he made the entry wrongly. The buckets (2) were received and issued. From the entry in the contingent register it is seen that for Rs 2-14-0 only one bucket was purchased but from the District Board Office file (R.O.C. No. 406/45) it is seen that sanction was asked for and given for the purchase of 2 buckets. From the entry in the stock ~~xxxxxxx~~ book, it is seen that the original entry in red ink of bucket purchased locally is 1 and this is corrected into 2. But, then the balance should be 1 and not nil, but this entry "nil" is not correspondingly altered. It may however be noted that the charge is that the Headmaster corrected the entry "2" in the stock register as one and the balance Nil. In the preliminary enquiry it was found that one bucket was missing. The person to whom it was issued should have been held responsible for the loss and questioned. Of course the Headmaster is responsible for the proper maintenance of the registers and I agree with the view that the registers were not properly maintained. The charge that 2 back benches and 1 bucket were taken away by the appellant may not be held to be conclusively proved.

Apart from these there seems to be some force in what the appellant has stated regarding the enquiry. The enquiry which was originally fixed to take place in April 1946 was postponed to May 1946 for reasons best known to the President, District Board. On 14th May 1946 notices were sent out by wire etc that the enquiry would be held on 15th May 1946 at 6 P.M. The hurry with which it was conducted and concluded vitiates the enquiry to a certain extent in that ample opportunity was not afforded to the appellant to either cross examine peons or to defend himself.

CHARGE (vi) The conduct of the appellant in regard to the distribution of Deepavali collections is irresponsible and irregular When the amount was collected from the students for a specific purpose, the amount should have been distributed to the peons. The Headmaster had no authority from the students or any one else to withhold the amount and he has no authority to retain the amount in his own hand. It was only after petitions went against the Headmaster that he handed over the amount to the Scout Committee. He had no authority to dispose of the amount in that manner.

CHARGE (vii) This charge indicates another irregular action of the appellant but his bonafides in the matter need not be questioned. The bad conduct of the peon has been shown in the many reports sent by the Headmaster to the President, District Board.

Since

Since things became unbearable, the appellant placed the peon under suspension and reported the matter immediately to the President, District Board. The fact that the President did not disprove of the action at the time indicates that the President was aware of the bad conduct of the peon. The appellant ~~should~~ should have known that he should have taken the orders of the President, District Board before suspending the peon. But I suggest that no serious notice need be taken.

CHARGE (viii) This charge has not been proved.

4. In the light of the above remarks and from a careful study of the files, I consider that there has been a mass of prejudice and that the punishment of reduction from the status of Headmaster to that of a L.T Assistant is too severe and that the ends of justice would be met if an increment is stopped. I therefore recommend that the appellant be restored to the status of ~~xxx~~ Headmaster and that the punishment is modified into one of stoppage of one increment in the Headmaster's scale for a period of one year without the effect of postponing future increments.

5. The following records of the District Board office are herewith enclosed together with the personal file of Sri S.V. Mahadeva Sastri

(a) D.Dis No. 23175/41
(b) F.Dis No. 23470/45
(c) Vouchers for the months of October and Novr. 1945
(d) Current file A9-26237/45
(e) file R.O.C.No. 406/45
(f) Stationery stock book and
(g) Contingent Register.

place below

For Director of Public Instruction.

P.R.K. 24/4/47

Education and P.H. Department (B1).

APPEAL - Mahadeva Sastri, Sri S.V. - Ex-headmaster - Board High School, Tirupattur - District Board, Ramnad - Against reduction as L.T. Assistant - Rejected.

From Sri S.V. Mahadeva Sastri, dated the 20th September '46

From the President, District Board, Ramnad, Roc.A9.26237/46 dated the 24th October 1946.

From the Director of Public Instruction, R.C.No.10831-G1/46 dated the 26rd March 1947.

ORDER MS.NO. 1004 EDUCATION, dated 13. 5 — 1947.

The Government have considered the appeal preferred by Sri S.V. Mahadeva Sastri, Ex-headmaster, Board High School, Tirupattur, against the proceedings of the President, District Board, Ramnad, N.Roc.A9.26237/46 dated the 1st September 1946, reducing him as L.T. Assistant from that date. The proceedings arose out of certain petitions against the appellant received by the President. Charges 1 and 2 against the appellant should be viewed together and they relate to the improper taking of a single acquittance for payments made to two or three persons. The proper procedure ~~is~~ was to obtain acquittances from each individual for the amount due and disbursed to him ~~but the President~~ In his findings against charge 1 the President has clearly stated that there was no payment ~~the amount of Rs.4--13--6 was not paid to another woman~~ to another woman as alleged. In the absence of proper acquittance and in the light of what is proved under charge 2, the findings of the President ~~are not incorrect~~ with regard to charge 1 cannot be said to be incorrect.

Charges 4 and 5 relate to the auction sale of broken benches and loss of one bucket. In view of the ~~independent witnesses about~~ the evidences given by the auction purchaser; the ~~night men who has deposed~~ deposition of the night watchman that two benches were taken to the appellant's house and ~~in view of the~~ the independent evidence of the peon, Sanakaran, ~~who has stated~~ that the appellant took one of the two ~~benches~~ buckets for private use in his house, the findings of the President ~~is~~ in these cases were correct. The appellant should not have also kept the

Deepavali collections due to a peon and placed him under suspension without the previous orders of the President.

In view of the findings in the above matter the general effect of the charges which have been established, the Govt see no justification to uphold the appeal. It is therefore rejected

3. The appellant is referred to the President, District Board, Ramnad, for orders on his appeal.

To

The P.D.B., Ramnad (with enclosures - 'Q', 'X', 'g', 'u' 'b', 'p' and two registers) by regd. post.
The D.P.I.
The appellant by name. (para three only).

Education and P.H. Department (E).

C.No.65335 B1/47

APPEAL - Mahadeva Sastri, Sri S.V. - Ex-headmaster, Board High School, Tirupattur - District Board, Ramnad - Against reduction as L.T. Assistant.

From Sri S.V. Mahadeva Sastri, dated the 20th September 1946.

From the President, District Board, Ramnad, Roc.No.A9. 26237/46 dated the 24th October 1946.

From the Director of Public Instruction, R.C.No.10831-C1/46 dated the 23rd April 1947.

The appellant Sri S.V. Mahadeva Sastri was formerly the headmaster of the Board High School, Tirupattur. He has appealed to Government against the orders of the President District Board, Ramnad, No.Roc.A9.26237/46 dated the 1st September 1946, reducing him as L.T. Assistant from that date. The appeal has been preferred in time.

2. In 1945, the President, District Board, Ramnad received certain petitions against the appellant that regarding the irregular payment of wages to the water-woman of the school, maintenance false records and accounts and etc., and they were forwarded for enquiry and report to the District Board Member, Sri Rao Sahib A. Ramachandran Pillai who was residing at Tirupattur. The member after holding an enquiry submitted a report on 30th December 1945 and stated that the allegations made against the appellant had some substance in them and that made against the headmaster and suggested that a thorough investigation might be made. On receipt of the above report, the President framed certain charges against the appellant and his explanation was obtained. An oral enquiry was also held on 15th May 1946. The appellant was found guilty of all the eight charges framed against him and he was reduced as an L.T. Assistant in the Proceedings of the President, No.Roc.A9.26237/45 dated the 1st September 1946. It is against this punishment order that the appellant has preferred the present appeal.

3. The remarks of the President, District Board Ramnad,

3. Specific attention is invited to the antecedents of the headmaster as contained in the Proceedings of the President on pages 182 to 183 of 'Q'. In the circumstances stated therein, it seems that there is no strong case to set aside the orders of the President. The file may be circulated to A.D.I. (Education).

9.5.47

I find it difficult to accept the DPI's reasoning about the remarks of the Members; I think the President's findings in those days were correct. With particular reference to his views, and the several efforts he has made which have been frustrated, I consider that the DPI's recommendation must be accepted, and that the appeal must be rejected.

7/5/47

I agree with the Legal R.P.H. The appeal may be rejected.

TSA
10-5-47

10/5 (Cr.).

SECRETARY, EDN. AND P.H. DEPT.
10 MAY 1947
GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS

8/5/47

A draft order is submitted below for approval.

12-5-47

10/5/47

15/5/47