Scott II-27—58,004—4-11-40.

(194) Department.

SERIES.

G.O. NO.

Dated

[Despatch Abstract.]

Appeal-Ramaswami Ayyangar, Sri V.N.-Ex-headmaster-Board High School, Sholavandan-Against reduction as L.T. Assistant-Rejected.

LOCAL ADMINISTRATION DEPT.
28902
11 SEP 1946
SECRETARIAT, MADRAS

LAD

E&P.H. no

LAD no 28902 12.9.46

From

V. N. Ramaswami Ayyangar,
Headmaster, Board High School,
Sholavandan - 1942-45

and Headmaster, Board High school,
Usilampatti, 1945-46, - reverted
as Assistant, Board High school Usilampatti
from 11-6-46, now on leave, - on loss of pay.

14 SEP 1946

To

The Secretary to the Government of Madras,

Local Administration Department, Madras.

Through the President, Madura District Board,
Madura.

53763

The humble appeal of the petitioner against the orders of the President reverting him as Assistant in P.D.B's Proceedings Ref. A.2 -6493 - 45 dated 9-6-46.

The petitioner begs to prefer this appeal against the orders of the President District Board reverting him from Headmastership to the post of an Assistant contained in the reference quoted above and humbly requests that the orders may please be cancelled on the following grounds:--

Among the XVIII charges levelled against the petitioner, the President District Board himself has made a distinction between serious charges and others. Thus, charges VII, VIII, IX, XIV, XV and XVIII are classed as serious calling for -- severe action. The petitioner would therefore touch upon -- salient points and fresh points only in respect of the non-serious charges and dwell more at length on the serious charges. The original explanations need not be reiterated here in full.

Ch. I. It is respectfully submitted that the Headmaster had not failed to direct the clerk to fix the arrears of fees in the case of pupils demanding T.C.'s which failure would have made him entirely responsible.

E&PH(B1)

The copy sent thro' the proper channel may be availed.

Ch. II.

Ch. II. The Headmaster's explanation just stated that he did attend to all the three branches of his work, allotting proportionate time to each, though he could not unfortunately -- devote more time to any branch without detriment to another. This cannot be fairly interpretted that the Headmaster sacrificed one part of his work for the sake of another.

Ch.III. Dropped.

Ch. IV. This charge has been stated by the President District Board in the summing up ~~of~~ as one that has been satisfactorily explained, please vide top para on page 8 of the -- President District Board's orders.

Ch. V. Will not be pressed.

Ch.VI. The President seems to be labouring under some misapprehension. The final promotion list must have been produced by the then Headmaster, Board High School Usilampatti into whose hands it was placed by the petitioner before he left Sholavandan on transfer. Any other list was only a "good rough" prepared at some intermediate or nearly final stage, which was ordered to be destroyed and assured to have been obeyed vide peon Mathuramuthu's statement of 23-10-45-- "தற்குப்புயர் தேர்ச்சியாகாதவர்களின் பெயர்களை மாணவர் பதிவேட்டிலிருந்து நீக்கி விட்டேன்" That which was ordered to be put up was the final one and as the same peon has deposed "ஆல் பாஸ் (All pass) என்று எழுதியதைத்தான் நான் சொன்னேன்." what I explained on 8-4-46 was what exactly was the truth and no after thought.

Ch. VII. The president concedes the petitioner's argument of congestion in Railway traffic, but has belittled its gravity saying the difficulty still exists though the War is over. There is really no comparision between the difficulty that was then experienced and the difficulty that exists to-day. That cannot be imagined at this distance of of time.

The safe remittance of the cash was the petitioner's exclusive responsibility and this paramount consideration made

made the short delays in remittances inevitable. The Headmaster was ever so anxious for daily remittances, but he was rendered powerless by the force of circumstances beyond his control.

This question must be viewed in conjunction with what -- would have happened if a loss in money had been sustained, in which case, the petitioner would have been accused of lack of discretion and rightly so.

The discretion of the petitioner has been exercised in the best interests of the Board to ensure a safe remittance of cash. It is only a lack of proper appreciation of the acuteness in traffic congestion that then existed that has resulted in the President's saying that whatever might have been the traffic congestion there should have been no delay in remittances.

The charge is ill-grounded.

Ch.VIII. The Headmaster has not infringed any rule relating to admission, having tested the pupil and admitted him on the basis of that test in the Second Form. The charge cannot be sustained so long as the genuineness of the test remains impeached. The President District Board has not challenged the validity of the test or its genuineness.

~~The~~ In Forms III and below, the Headmaster is empowered to admit pupils on the basis of the information furnished in the form of application and on the basis of tests, and a tuition certificate was certainly got from the pupil and attached to the admission application. The tell-tale white remnant of it, still sticking to the application, was pointed out both to the Headmaster then in charge at Sholavandan while the petitioner was going through the records there in his presence in Jan. 46 and to the ~~petitioner~~ President during the enquiry on 8-4-46. That it is not found in the file now is of a piece with the insertion of an old T.C. of the pupil taken two years back made after the Headmaster's transfer from the place.

Further, it would bear reiteration, that the presumption of the President that the boy who stayed two years at home -- would be nothing but the same old 5th class pupil and could not

not be taken as a private candidate who had made progress in education is hardly justified.

Ch. IX. The petitioner respectfully submits that due to the extraordinary delay in the issue of E.S.L.C.'s not merely the petitioner, but other Headmasters' were forced to admit pupils in 1945 on a promise of reduction of E.S.L.C.'s. The non-receipt of E.S.L.C.'s in time in 1945 created a situation in which importunate parents pressing for the admission of their sons could not be ignored, but some form of compliance with their wishes had to be shown. This, in this case, led to the admission on the basis of record sheets, coupled with the assurances of Headmasters regarding eligibility of pupils for admission into 4th form.

The detection of the wrong admission in question was made by the Headmaster almost at once and it was rectified by cancellation of the admission, which was untenable as per rules. It might therefore be seen that the Headmaster ~~thrusted~~ trusted and yet did not trust; he checked immediately what he trusted, to set wrongs right.

Admissions regarding E.S.L.C.'s were made according to the following scheme:--

(a) Passed E.S.L.C.'s with English optional, 4th Form

(b) Passed E.S.L.C.'s without English, III Form,

(c) Failed E.S.L.C's , II Form.

The pupil in question was admitted in Second form in strict accordance with this principle, This has been followed in other institutions and also recommended by the Inspectorate to be followed in several institutions, as the practice in the admission of such candidates seemed to vary with each school and required to be regularised.

It was the impression of the petitioner that he was competent to cancel a receipt and refund a sum at a certain stage and he did accordingly. At the worst, if he was irregular herein, he could be held guilty only of an error of judgment.

judgment.

(b) The clerk might have been honest or dishonest in making a report ~~of x h i x~~ required of him. Only, that there was a possibility of his having acted fairly, was pointed out casually. The lapse was that of the clerk and the Headmaster cannot be made the object of a charge of this nature.

The Headmaster and the clerk were conducting work ~~conducted~~ seated in different rooms and being in charge of a fairly big institution the Headmaster could but rely on his clerk on such matters. The petitioner cannot be justly accused of having been ~~fault~~ false to himself or to anyone in having acted on the report of the clerk and denied admission at ~~first~~ on the strength of that and then admitted the boy when a check ~~of~~ up showed the error of the report.

Ch.XI. Neither the disappointment of some nor the delight of others was the consideration that weighed with the Headmaster in making admissions. It is humbly urged that tampering and complementing written tests by Viva-Voce ~~ne~~ ones is not educationally unsound. The statement that everybody got the place he desired or sometimes one better is inaccurate. It was only after the sanction of several ~~fresh sanction~~ sections in the various classes and with the encouragement given by the President in the matter of making admissions to the fullest extent, that many of the persistent pupils who stayed on with mingled feelings of hope and despair, - perhaps forced to stay on due to impecuniosity - could be admitted.

Ch. XII. The essence of the petitioner's contention that there were no two lists and that he was not swayed by outsiders in announcing the selected candidates has not been disputed by the President. No charge thus arises here.

Chs. XIII & XIV. The petitioner begs leave to point out once more that the President District Board had at no time issued any instructions in regard to the disposal of

of waste paper, with the result that the Headmasters observed no uniform policy in this regard; a fact which can easily be verified by referring to the records of any school. The first order on the subject was the President District Board's reference 12037/45 dated 1-11-45 issued to all Headmasters.

The petitioner sold all remanants of answer papers left after using them for many miscellanous purposes, they having been scrutinised by the District Educational officer in his inspection. The price for which the waste paper was sold was 12 annas a viss, the market rate then in force. The petitioner can affirm without fear of contradiction that in no auction it could have fetched a higher price. Hence the procedure adopted by the petitioner on his own discretion, cannot but be accepted as invalid.

Chs. XV (a) & (b): Leakage of questions did not occur within the school, but arose from outside sources.

The reference to the unanimous resolution of the Headmasters, and the enquiry at Batlagundu was intended to show the nature and the extent of the abuses that had crept into the scheme yet. It was not possible for either the petitioner or other Headmasters to prove specific charges as high quarters seem to be involved.

The petitioner's care and concern to see that examinations were conducted on fair and honest lines may be investigated by an enquiry, if need be.

The reference to marriage festivities in the house of the Headmaster was made to show how worried and preoccupied he was with domestic affairs. He had to be absent from the Headmasters Headquarters for a good part the vaccation, being engaged in the dd difficult task of settling a daughter's marriage. Even when he was present, the work of tabulating the marks had to be got done with the help of the seniormost assistant.

It was in the midst of such preoccupation, the tentative promotion list was placed in the charge of the peon who was not

not careful or intelligent enough to keep it for the Headmaster who was engrossed in worked and indiscretely gave publicity to it.

There is no more striking proof possible than that the peon should, in a statement given behind the petitioner's back, of his own accord, have openly avowed that the Headmaster exclaimed, "alas, what have you done ! ", to show that the list had not been intended for publication.

The finality of a promotion list is to be decided by its having been submitted to the District Educational officer. It is no list which is not sent to the District Educational - officer, whether it is signed by the Headmaster or no. Had the Headmaster superceded a list submitted to the District Educational officer, he could be guilty of infringment of rules.

That which Sri S. Radhakrishna Ayyar put in the hands of the President District Board was only a tentative list, a good rough, and cannot be confused with the final list submitted to the District Educational officer.

The date of 4-6-45 on the promotion list proves nothing; 3-6-45 being a Sunday, papers received on that day could have been registered only on the next day. The only tappal cleared on 2-6-45 at 9-30 A.M. at Sholavandan may reach the District Educational officer's office on the fore-noon of 3-6-45.

The fact of other Headmasters in the District Board not having ordered wholesale promotion has been explained at length already in the explanation submitted on 27-4-46. I have stated "more Headmasters shunned service at Sholavandan than welcomed it" . Thereby hangs many a tale. The Institution of an enquiry into the carreers and fates of Headmasters working at Sholavandan ever since 1919 down to 1942 when I took charge, would be illuminating. Sholavandan has always been a storm centre. Knowing for certain the abuses in the school at Sholavandan, which is the worst affected in the matter of leakage, the petitioner stood up boldly for the voiceless

voiceless but honest pupils who suffered most.

The finding of the President under this charge is also vitiated by a reference to reports and rumours, which are the offspring of passion and prejudice and do not respect persons. They have no place in an impartial decision.

Ch. XVI. The petitioner still holds the view that sweeper Karuppayee's guilt in particular was not established. The appearance of a fourth tiffin was a material point in her favour. The petitioner would also refer to the retention in service of the sweeper even today. The presumption that she is just as bad or as good as any other ~~material~~ menial is confirmed.

Ch. XVII. Dropped.

Ch. XVIII. Inspite of the charges arising under this charge "that the explanation of the Headmaster is intended to mislead this office or betrays ignorance of departmental orders, the petitioner would still maintain that the proper procedure had been followed in having submitted a petition for changing the date of birth to the District Educational officer for orders, which should be entered in the appropriate column in the S.S.L.C., as the declared, indisputable age of the pupil.

Had the absence of a declaration been explained as due to the request of the parent for a change in the date of birth to the District Educational Officer during his inspection at Sholavandan in my absence or my explanation been sent to the officer for his remarks I feel sure he would have cleared everthing. Absolutely no charge lies against the petitioner in this affair.

Conclusion.

Conclusion: In his summing up, the President says that the Headmaster is weak and fickle. In his preamble, he levels the same two defects against the Headmaster.

The weakness seems to have been inferred from a statement of his own that the Headmaster did not check his subordinates; a charge which has never been proved. A perusal of the staff orders issued from time to time, the order of dismissal got for a very mischievous and dishonest waterman of the Sholavandan school, Muthiah by name, the recommendation for withholding the pay of the office Attender, Sri R. Manikkavachakam for having left the station during the summer vacation without permission etc., will show the truth to be very different. Perhaps the production of a tentative promotion list by the clerk has led the President District Board to infer that the clerk -- was left unchecked. The clerk lives in the midst of records. The clerk's room at Sholavandan was the record room. His very work is to keep records, to write out copies of them -- and search them out whenever required. It is utterly impossible for any Headmaster to prevent his clerk from doing things out of the way if he were so minded. The Headmaster can only trust, but be watchful.

The production of the list by the clerk to the President District Board only shows to what unscrupulous -- lengths this clerk could go to serve some private ends of his own.

The charge of fickleness appears to have been born of the "two" lists of promotion. As has been shown, it was not the result of a fickleness of mind, but a deliberate act of justice. This promotion does not come - "promotion without principles", but it must be classified as "justice in promotion".

When the school inspection was conducted at Sholavandan in January 46 the petitioner was not there to explain things. It has proved to be very unlucky.

Even

Even the absence of a declaration of the date of birth had not been properly explained, with the result that the D.E.O. was led to a wrong influence on the matter. The petitioner does not know whether even the explanation submitted by him on 27-4-46 was forwarded to the Educational authorities.

As regards the Educational progress of the school, the President District Board has curiously forgotten the inspection reports and the the percentage of eligibles in the S.S.L.C. The inspection reports of the years 1943, 1944, 1945 of the Sholavandan High school, the report on physical education by the Regional Physical Director in 1943 are all very commendatory. The inspection of B.H.S., Usilampatti where the petitioner was the Headmaster laterly, which took place in Novr. 1945, is another favourable record. The S.S.L.C. results of 1943, 1944 and 45 in Sholavandan were consecutively fair.

The petitioner does not maintain that his work was perfect in all directions; but he does contend that none can be perfect. Many of the defects pointed out as his, can be discovered in any office, if only keenly scrutinised. No office can escape blame if really holes are being sought to be picked, especially when the clerk in charge is an undesirable person. The petitioner does not wish to absolve himself by pointing out to others' faults. The petitioner has put in 26 years of service spending 21 of them under the Madura D.B. itself. He has been 4 years H.M. and has had very good reports of his work as H.M. It is therefore the contention of the petitioner that his imperfections in administration are of a venial character. They have not been proved to be wanton; no moral degradation attaches to any of them. And such imperfections require to be viewed far differently from how they have been looked upon.

The petitioner therefore prays that the orders of the P.D.B. reverting him as an Assistant in the B.H.S., Usilampatti on 100 + 16 P.M. be kindly annulled and the petitioner restored to the status quo.

Copies of statements requested to be furnished by the Dist. Board on 16-8-46 not being yet available, material points arising from a perusal of them will be referred to later, for which kind permission is sought.

Dated 9-9-46.

The petitioner humbly begs to remain,
Humble and most obedient
servant,
V. N. Ramaswami Aiyangar

Address:
Post office St., Usilampatti
Madura dist.,

Two copies submitred to the P.D.B., Madura.

(7)

Corrigenda to the appeal petition of Sri V.N.RamasamyAiyengar
Ex-Headmaster, Board High School, Sholavandan.

16 SEP. 1946 DISTRICT BOARD OFFICE MADURA

Page 4. Please read after 'Maruthamuthu's statement dated 23/10/45,'
"முத்தி ரட்டையரிடத்தும் சுவாமிநாதனிடத்திலும் வேறுதலைமையாசிரியர்களிடத்திலும்"
and then after 'deposed', "அதன் பின் (All pass) என்று எதிரியரிடம் குறுக்கு
விசாரணை. திரும்ப எனதயர்களால் எதிரியரிடத்து"

Page 5. Para 2. Delete 'Conducted' coming after 'conducting work'.

Para 2. Line 5. Read 'fault' as 'false.'

Page 6. Line 14. Read 'invalid' as 'valid.'

Page 9. Line 7. Please insert "issued" between 'orders.'
and 'from time to time.'

V. N. Ramaswami Aiyangar
Petitioner,
15/9/46.

Submitted to the President,
Madura Dt. Board,
for favour of Corrections
being made — in duplicate.

Ref. A.2. No. 16733/46
Encl:- I Part - 132 Pages
II Part - 30 "

District Board Office, Madura
Dated 21st October 1946.

From

Sri W.P.A. Soundrapandian,
President, District Board, Madura.

To

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

ASST. SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT
EDUCATION AND PUBLIC HEALTH DEPT.
64232
25 OCT 1946

Sir,

Sub:- Establishment - Secondary Education - Madura District Board - Appeal by Sri V.N. Ramaswami Ayyangar, Headmaster, Board High School, Sholavandan - reverted as assistant - forwarded with remarks.

Sri V.N. Ramaswami Ayyangar, B.A.L.T., Headmaster, Board High School, Sholavandan was in my proceedings Ref. A.2. No. 6493/45 dated 9-6-46 reverted to the post of assistant as punishment for certain irregularities for which he was found to be responsible and which showed that he was not fit to hold the post of headmaster of a high school. He has now preferred an appeal to Government against these orders. The appeal is submitted herewith.together with all the connected papers.

The charges framed against the ex-Headmaster will be found in my Ref. A.2. No. 6493/45 dated 7-1-46. The ex-Headmaster's explanation was offered in his C.No. 238/45 dated 11-2-46. Copies of the charges framed and explanation received are enclosed. The statements made by him on the dates of the personal hearing viz. 6th and 8th April 1946 as also the statement made by him on 6-9-45 i.e., during the preliminary enquiry are also enclosed.

Charges I, II, VII and XVI, though less serious than the rest, have been proved and show clearly that he could exercise no control over the work or conduct of his subordinates and his leniance amounted practically to indifference. There was in consequence absolute lack of discipline among the pupils, the teachers and the clerical and menial staff.

Any Headmaster would be prepared to admit that on proper admissions and promotions of pupils would depend the general efficiency and reputation of a school but it was in these vital matters that the petitioner was found to be most wanting. Charges VI, VIII to XIII and XV and the petitioner's explanation would fully bear out this conclusion.

Charge VI:- The petitioner is making a deliberately false statement when he states that "the final promotion list must have been produced by the then Headmaster, Board High School, Usilampatty, into whose hands it was placed by the petitioner before he left Sholavandan on transfer." This is the first time the petitioner has

made this statement. The petitioner knows it to be the fact that no promotion list was ever handed over by him to the headmaster from Usilampatti who relieved him and that no promotion list was traceable upto-date from the files of the school. The only copies of the list that became available were those obtained from the clerk of the school and from the District Educational Officer, Madura. The reference to a "good rough" of the list (whatever that might mean) is meaningless.

The copy of the first list of promotions (containing the names of pupils detained with their marks in the various subjects) duly bearing the full signature of the petitioner as Headmaster and the copy of the final list stating that all the pupils except two (one dead and the other who had no term days) have passed which also bears the full signature of the petitioner were produced by the clerk and are enclosed. They appear to be exact copies of the lists prepared on the two occasions and put up on the notice board of the school. These must be the copies intended for the office of the Headmaster and taken away by the clerk for his own use or another copy of each of these lists must have been in the school but not produced by the petitioner wantonly when called for.

Charge VIII:- The point to be explained regarding the admission of S. Baluchami is how he was admitted in the second form in 1945 while he had left that very school while studying in Class V by taking a transfer certificate in 1943. This was not a case of "private study" and no tuition certificate should have been accepted even if one had actually been produced. The transfer certificate of the pupil was produced from the school records and it may therefore safely be presumed that it had been deliberately suppressed to facilitate his admission into the II Form without reference to the District Educational Officer - Please see M.E.R. 37.

Charge IX:- The petitioner declares in connection with this charge that he knew "for a certainty that admissions relating to passed E.S.L.C's were made this year (45-46) only on trust and on the strength of assertions in the absence of certificates." This was a highly irregular procedure to follow and any Headmaster with a sense of responsibility would have chosen to wait for the production of the certificates instead of believing in the "assertions" of interested and anxious parents.

Charge X :- The petitioner's explanation, for its tone of irresponsibility and utter indifference, is of a piece with his explanations regarding the other charges against him. No special instructions of the Director of Public Instruction are required where M.E.R. 33 itself is clearly to the effect that the applications for admissions should be signed only by the parents or guardians. These applications are basic records and should not be accepted if signed by all persons and sundry for, if any difficulty should arise in the future, responsibility cannot be fixed as even the identity of these applicants would be in doubt.

Teachers have signed these applications in many cases and at least in these cases the petitioner should have known that they are not the guardians of the pupils and therefore refused to accept the applications. It is evident that the petitioner did not think it a serious violation of procedure though for a person admittedly inclined to accepting statements on trust this was positively dangerous and likely to lead to trouble later on with regard to dates of birth of pupils etc.

Charge XI:- The explanation is pointless as it only repeats that he admitted everybody as he had full discretion to do so. The facts furnished in the charges will speak for themselves.

In spite of the fact that there was great difficulty in the matter of accommodation, the petitioner was persistently demanding the opening of new sections only to admit all sorts of pupils indiscriminately into the lower classes. Additional sections are sanctioned only at the instance of the Headmaster and the management does not thrust sections on any school without their being asked for on the basis of the number of pupils reported to have been tested and waiting for admission.

Charge XII:- The petitioner has been contradicting himself in his explanation to this charge. His statement that "there were no two lists" is equivocal. It must mean there was only one list put up but he argues that no lists were put up at all and the selections were announced through a circular to the pupils or merely orally broadcast. In his statement dated 6-9-45, the petitioner said that he found eight pupils unfit for selection and "told" them so on the 4th January 1945. In what particular manner the boys were "told" about this is not explained. The fact remains however that between 4th and 8th January 1945, eight pupils were put to the necessity of troubling the assistants, etc. and by all means, fair and foul, trying to get selection.

A list of the pupils of VI Form and the marks obtained by them at the selection (half-yearly) examination is enclosed.

Charges XIII and XIV:- It is a fact that the petitioner avoided production of the answer papers of the selection examination. On 6-9-45, when these were asked to be produced, he stated that he did not "think the answer papers were in the school." If they had been sold privately with a view to the proceeds being used for "miscellaneous expenditure", that fact could have been proved from records. There must be accounts for it as these answer papers could not become the private property of the Headmaster to do whatever he pleased with them. He knows that paper is supplied by the board and, instructions or no instructions, the answer papers should be properly accounted for.

The action of the petitioner in remitting a paltry sum of Rs. 3-12-0 on 31-10-45 being the proceeds of a private sale of the answer papers concluded as early as 4-2-45 confirms the absence of bonafides in this matter. At the enquiry on 6-9-45, the petitioner never referred to this sale for obviously no such sale had taken place. This sale would appear to be wholly fictitious.

Charge XV:- This is the most serious of all the charges against the petitioner and it will be seen plainly that, by his conduct in connection with the common examinations to which the charge relates, he proved himself unfit for the responsible post of Headmaster of a high school. What is worse is that he is unrepentant and would not admit that he was in the wrong.

There was no meeting or conference of teachers in the year in question for settling the question of annual promotions though the petitioner admits that this is a departure from the practise of the previous years. The petitioner asserts that it is not necessary to consult the teachers in the matter of annual promotions and that some "understanding is reached"

14 16

regarding this important matter "before the school closes or during or immediately before the examination."

The petitioner states that he entrusted the work of promotions to an assistant and that the latter duly submitted his recommendations which however were not "available readily" at the enquiry and have not been made available up-to-date.

The petitioner admits having put up the common examination results on 1st June 1945 on the notice board but he would call it a "tentative list" which he simply "communicated" to the pupils (whatever that might mean) or "perhaps pasted on to the notice board." He admits that this "tentative list might also have been the final list" if he had not recalled it and issued a revised one. The petitioner thus admits having put up two lists. This could have been done only between the early hours of 1st June and the fore-noon of 4th June though the petitioner would have us believe that the two lists were put up within an interval of a few hours on the 1st June itself.

He states that this second and final announcement of promotions did not contain names and simply stated that all pupils of every class or form who had attended the examinations had passed and that it was only a copy of this announcement that was communicated to the District Educational Officer. A copy of the promotion lists obtained from the District Educational Officer, Madura and bearing his seal dated 4th June 1945 is sent herewith. This is a detailed list giaving the names of all pupils by class and form promoted that year. The date of approval of the lists and of its despatch is of course 1-6-45 though it has taken full three days for it to reach Madura, only 13 miles from Sholavandan.

The petitioner admits that he did not communicate to the District Educational Officer the principles on which the promotions had been made though in previous years he had done so. It is seen that the District Educational Officer directed him to explain these wholesale promotions in his No. 12/45 dated 10-6-45 and a reply was sent to him on 7th July 1945. But strangely enough, the connected files of both the Board High School and the office of the District Educational Officer are not traceable. It is not known what explanation was offered by the petitioner and whether it was accepted by the District Educational Officer.

The only explanation offered by the petitioner is that he was busy with "marriage activities" in his house and had not "sufficient leisure to meet the pressure for promotions and satisfy the people with records regarding progress, etc. " But he does not explain why he interested himself in this matter after having entrusted it to an assistant in view of his other engagements.

As if all this does not afford adequate material for assessing the true worth of the petitioner as the head of an educational institution, he condemns the common examination system in vogue in board secondary schools in this district. This system has been working for the last ten years but, according to the petitioner, it "fell into disrepute in 1944 and 1945." He refers to "wild abuses" and to a resolution of the Headmaster's Conference held in September 1945 which recommended the scrapping of these examinations.

B17 ⑨ 10

For a person of the petitioner's type, all examinations are a nuisance and at the hands of teachers and headmasters of this type, examinations will always be a farce. If they were school examinations instead of common examinations, it would have been easier still for these men to reduce them to a farce. If common examinations in which all the schools have a part can be spoilt, school examinations depending on the whims and fancies of the staff of one single institution presided over by a Headmaster like the petitioner should be easier to abuse. But even then there should be some failures and not all the pupils could expect to pass.

This was a first-rate scandal, even if the probable motives are ignored, and the petitioner brought on himself and the board of which he is a servant the ridicule of the public; and by the explanation offered by him for such outrageous conduct, he has only afforded the strongest proof of his unsuitability for the posts of Headmaster of a high school.

It was not surprising therefore that the unsatisfactory condition of this high school occasioned the following remarks by the District Educational Officer and the Divisional Inspector of Schools :-

" All the pupils studying in 1944-45 were promoted to the next higher forms for 1945-46. No definite principles were followed. The explanation of the Headmaster(Sri V.N. Ramaswami Ayyangar) may be o btained and action taken . x-x-x- There is laxity in admissions from private study." "

The District Educational Officer.

" All the pupils attending the school are reported to be promoted. Laxity in admissions from private study is also reported. Explanation is needed why recognition of this school should not be withdrawn."

The Divisional Inspector of Schools.

This appeal should have been preferred within two months of the date of issue of the orders complained of but it has actually been preferred three months after that date. The petition is belated.

In the light of the facts explained above, it was positively against the public interest to keep the petitioner in the responsible post of headmaster of a high school and he was rightly reverted to the post of assistant instead of being dismissed or removed from service outright. This petition of appeal of by Sri V.N. Ramaswami Ayyangar therefore deserves to be rejected.

1/3

PRESIDENT, DISTRICT BOARD,
MADURA.

N.N. 17-10-46.

17/10

Edn. & PH (BI) Dept.

Endt. No. 5376 B7/46-1 Edn B 29-10-46

Referred to the Director of Public Instruction, Madras, for remarks. 29/10/46

(By order).

Asst. Secretary to Government.

26/10/46 26/10/46

To

The Director of Public Instruction, Madras (with enclosures, to be returned with reply).

List of records sent as enclosures to Ref.A.2. No. 16733-46 dated 21st October 1946 of the President, District Board, Madura (not to be returned)

1.	Appeal petition dated 9-9-46 preferred by Sri V.N. Ramaswami Ayyangar, B.A.L.T.	12 Pages
2.	Proceedings Ref. A.2. 6493-45 dated 7-1-46 of the President, District Board containing the charges framed against Sri V.N. Ramaswami Ayyangar.	8 "
3.	Statement of marks of VI Form pupils at the half-yearly examination held in December 1944 of the Board High School, Sholavandan.	2 "
4.	Charges framed against Sri. V.N. Ramaswamy Iyengar, B.A.L.T.	8 "
	Total	30 ~~28~~ Pages

TO GOVERNMENT 1946 PUBLIC HEALTH DEPT

Edn. & PH (BI) Dept.

Endt. No. 5376 B3/46-1 Edn B 29-10-46

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

(11) 21 12

Proceedings of the President, District Board, Madura.
Name: Sri W.P.A. Soundrapandian. Ref. A.2. No. 6495/46
dated 7th January 1946.

Sub: Establishment - Education - Secondary - Sri V.N. Ramaswami Iyengar, Headmaster, Board High School, Usilampatty - charges framed and explanation called for.

The undermentioned charges are framed against Sri V.N. Ramaswami Iyengar, Headmaster, Board High School, Usilampatti (formerly of the Board High School, Sholavandan) who will submit a written statement of his defence in respect of the charges within ten days and also state if he wishes to be heard in person. A list of witnesses (with their addresses) who have to be examined for his defence may also be furnished.

ASST. SECRETARY 2 DEC EDUCATION AND PUBLIC

Charges.

(A) Irregularities in administration and maintenance of registers and accounts:-

I. Fees not collected under rule 38 of the Madras Educational Rules.

A transfer certificate No. 81 dated 26-6-45 was issued to S. Balasubramanian with entries therein regarding his promotion. But as seen from the attendance register, this pupil has studied in Form III and attended school from 12-6-45 to 13-6-45. School fee of Rs. 13-12-0 for the Long Term of 1945-46 has not been claimed and collected by the Headmaster before issue of transfer certificate under Rule 38 of the Madras Educational Rules.

II. The Headmaster did not note in the TERM FEE REGISTER the demand of school fees in respect of pupils who have put in attendance as detailed below:-

(a) Cases for 1944-45.

Admn. No.	Name of pupil.	Form or class.	Term in which attended with month and date.	Amount of fee due omitted to be brought to account.
1. 2336	N. Veerasami	II Form	Short Term 44-45	Arrear fee Rs.9-12 collected on 5-7-45. Fine on the first instalment due not collected.
2. 1991	S. Natarajan	II Form	Long Term 44-45 June 1944. 29th and 30th.	0 2 0 13 12 0
3. 2090	S. Rajappan	Class V	Long Term 44-45 19-6-44	6 4 0
4. 2062	P. Ayyavoo	,,	Long Term 44-45 14-6-44,19-6-44	6 4 0
5. 2042	S. Dorairaj	,,	Long Term 44-45 19-6-44, 30-6-44	6 4 0
6. 2025	V. Veerappan	,, IV.	Short Term 44-45 4-1-45, 5-1-45	3 12 0
7. 1761	S. Gurusami	I Form(a)	Short Term 44-45 4,5,and 6-1-45	8 4 0
8. 2044	P. Pitchai	Class V(a)	Short Term 44-45 28-1-45	3 12 0
9. 2038	M.P.S. Samidurai	,,	Short Term 44-45 20-1-1945	3 12 0

The names of the above pupils have not been removed from the rolls in the attendance and admission registers also for non-payment of fees and the amount noted as due from each has not been brought to account in the Term Fee Register. These amounts should be made good to the District Board

Funds.

(b) Cases for 1945-46.

1. 1926 T. Velu Class V. Long Term 6 4 0
28 and 29-6-45

III. Half fee concession under M.E.R. 92 - Renewal during 1943-44 - Chinnavelmani - Form VI - Admission No. 1650/1316 - not in order.

This pupil who was enjoying half fee concession under M.E.R. 92 during 1942-43 as per sanction orders of the President, District Board in his D.Dis No. 8361/42 dated 18-8-42 was removed from the rolls for non-payment of school fees on 26-2-43. He was re-admitted (Re-admission No. being 1884/1650) early in 1943-44 on 16-6-1943 and he was allowed renewal of half fee concession by the Headmaster with the sanction of the President, District Board in his D.Dis. 15076/43 dated 27-9-1943. The boy has remained in the same class for more than one year and the Headmaster's action in having secured fee concession for the pupil in violation of rule 92 (a) (i) of the Madras Educational Rules is irregular.

IV. The Headmaster made unauthorized changes in the dates of birth of the following pupils in the Admission Register of the school.

The entries relating to dates of birth of the following pupils have been meddled with without authority.

Sl. No.	Admn. No.	Name of pupil.	Original entry.	Unauthorised changes.
1.	142/1709	V. Venkataraman	15-7-1919	
2.	392	V. Soumyan	11-7-1921	30-7-1921
3.	593	P. Sundaram	24-2-1920	18-11-1919
4.	982/859	T. Chandran	23-4-1919	21-12-1922 18-2-1927.

The original entries in regard to the date of birth of Nos. 1 and 3 have been checked with the file containing "Application for admission of pupils" produced at the time of admission and found to be correct.

Application in respect of No. 2 was not produced for verification

Application for No. 4 is not seen in the appropriate place in the connected file.

V. School fees collected from the following pupils were not entered and accounted for in the Daily Fee Collection Register at the close of the day to which the collections related to.

Admn. No.	Name of pupil.	School fee receipt No.	Amount.	Date of collection	Date of credit.
1219	K. Raj	3702	7-14-0	14-5-44	
1848	D. Srinivasagem	3919	4-10-0	15-6-44	14-8-44 14-8-44

The fact that the amount collected on the above receipts escaped notice and was not brought to "Daily Fee Collection Register" on 14-8-1944 when this was detected was admitted by the clerk and Headmaster already but these pupils should have been, in the meanwhile considered as defaulters of fees and automatically removed from the rolls along with other cases for purpose of rule 90 (b) of the Madras Educational Rules by the end of June 1944. Instead of doing so, the names of these pupils have been kept on in the attendance register throughout. This irregular procedure goes to prove that this is a case of misappropriation of public money. This fact strengthens still from a perusal of counterfoils of the above fee receipts were among those used in a consecutive order on the respective dates of the transactions in question. Further there were fee collections only from three pupils in Form IV on 14-6-44, the consecutive receipts

Nos. being 3701, 3702, and 3703 the receipt number of the above K. Raj being 3702.

VI. The Headmaster did not produce at the preliminary enquiry the Annual Promotion list for verfication of the fee concessions granted to pupils as required under Rule 92 (a) (i) of the Madras Educational Rules.

VII. The Headmaster was not prompt in the remittance of fees collected by him and that large cash balances were with him pending remittance on the dates specified below:-

(i) Date of collection.	Amount collected.		Amount remitted with date.		
13-6-44	63-10-0		G. Fees.	47-0-0)	14-6-44
14-6-44	223 6-0		L.A.,,	5-0-0)	
15-6-44	621-2-0		G.Fees	267-0-0)	
16-6-44	633-10-0		L.A. ,,	53-0-0)	21-6-44
19-6-44	623-12-0		School,,	1713-4-0	20-6-44
Add previous balance	2065-8-0		Cash balance	0-14-9	
	0-10-9				
Total	2066-2-9			2066-2-9	
(ii) 4-1-1945	347 6 0				
5-1-1945	304 4 0				
6-1-1945	199 2 0				
	850 12 0			850 12 0	8-1-1945
(iii) 9-1-1945	870 6 0		G.Fees.	220 0 0	15-1-45.
10-1-1945	269 14 0		School fees	969 10 0	15-1-45.
11-1-1945	50 2 0		Cash balance		
Previous cash balance on hand	0 3 6		(Games fees)	0 15 6	
	1190 9 6			1190 9 6	
(iv) 13-6-45	325 12 0		G.Fees	136 0 0	15-6-45
14-6-45	434 8 0		L.A. fees	7 0 0	,,
Add sale proceeds of games articles	19 0 3		School fees	636 0 0	,,
			Cash balance	0 4 3	
	779 4 3			779 4 3	
(v) Previous balance	1 9 9				
15-8-1945	810 4 0		School fees	899 11 0	18-8-45
16-8-1945	88 4 0		Cash balance		
			(G.Fees)	1 9 9	
17-8-1945	21 3 0				
	901 4 9			901 4 9	

(vi) A huge sum of Rs. 1,138-4-0 minus Rs. 19/- Rs. 1,119-4-0 collected on ~~1944~~ 17-7-1944 has been kept on hand for a week and remitted on 24-7-1944 in chalan No. 409 on 24-7-1944.

(vii) The following are instances in which large amounts collected each day were not remitted the very next day into the treasury.

Date of collection.	Amount collected.	Date of remittance.
15-8-1944	843 8 0	17-8-1944.
15-9-44	747 0 0	18-9-1944
17-10-1944	696 7 0	19-10-44.
16-3-45	544- 1 0	19-3-1945
15-6-45	740 10 0	18-6-1945
17-7-1945	975 0. 0	19-7-1945
15-8-1945	810 4 0	18-8-1945.

The above irregularities continued even after the attention of all Headmasters had been invited to rule 12 of the Rules relating to receipts and expenditure of District Boards and the proviso thereunder by means of a circular of the President, District Board L.Dis. 9383/44 dated 9-9-1944.

B. Irregular Admissions.

VIII. The Headmaster disregarded Rule 37 of the Madras Educational Rules in the matter of admission.

Admissions 1945-46.

Admission No. 2389, Name of pupil - S. Baluchami - this is an old pupil of the school studying in Class V during 1943-44. Left school on 20-9-1943 with transfer certificate No. 83/43-44 dated 29-9-1943.

He has been readmitted in a higher class i.e., Form II on 28-6-1945 recording as a new case after "private study" without the permission of the District Educational Officer as required by rule 37 of the Madras Educational Rules. The marks scored by the pupil in a written test on the strength of which he was admitted into Form II were as follows:-

1. English 25 per cent.
2. Mathematics 10½ out of 20.

IX. Admissions without application and after unnecessary delay and other irregularities.

a) Admission No. 2375 Joseph Peter Alfred, IV Form: Several entries relating to this pupil in the Admission Register have been found cancelled by the Headmaster under his initials with date as 22-6-45 the recorded reason for cancellation being "cancelled as the pupil has not produced the certificate of the M.S.L.C. Examination of March 1945." The application from which the entries have been copied out in the Admission Register is not in the file. Such action is in violation of M.E.R. 33.

Fee Receipt No. (21674) dated 22-6-1945 (both foil and counterfoil) for a total sum of Rs. 8-6-0 comprising school fees and all special fees is seen cancelled by the Headmaster under his initials with date as 22-6-45. But this sum of Rs. 8-6-0 has been brought to account in the Daily Fee Collection Register at the close of the day on 22-6-45.

A sum of Rs. 7-4-0 relating to treasury remittance out of the total of Rs. 8-6-0 has been found deducted as follows in the office-copy of the chalan No. 28 dated 23-6-45.

"Amount Rupees three hundred and fifty nine and annas twelve only

Deduct printed receipt No. 21674 dated 22-6-45		7	4 0
Balance		352	8 0

In as much as the amount had been taken credit already in the Daily Fee Collection Register, a report should have been submitted to the President, District Board about this and refund of the amount obtained in the prescribed form.

14 (13)

This same pupil has been admitted in Form II on 9-8-45on the strength of a record sheet.
The number on rolls in Form III on 22-6-45 was only 79.

(b) Admission No. 2400 S. Parankundram Form IV:- The admission of this pupil was unnecessarily delayed by, from 21-6-1945 to 25-6-1945. The Headmaster Board High School, Sholavandan has made the following endrosement:-

"IV Form is now completely filled up"

This endorsement is contrary to facts as the number on rolls on 21-6-45 i.e., the same day was (87 minus withdrawals 9= 78)

X. Applications for admissions signed and presented by persons other than the parent or guardian and without written execution of authority by the parent as required by the M.E. Rules:-

The following are the instances:-

Name of pupil.	Admn. No.	Form or class.	Name of parent.	Name of guardian etc.	Applications signed by whom.
Paraman	2355	IV - F.	Makkankeruppan	Nil	
Vellaichami	2358	IV . F.	Sanyasi Maniam	Sanyasimaniam	A.Sitaraman.
eerabadran	2359	IV . F.	Ponnuchami Achari	Ponnuchami Acheri	do.
aruppiah	2423	I . F.	S. Bagavan	Nil	M.Gurusami
aman	2432		Thangammal	Nil	Poovenatha Pillai
amanujam	2438	Class V	Subbiah Asari	Nil	Illegible but not the parent's signature.
andiraj	2449	,,	Chinnasami Nowth	Nil	C.Subba Nowth
Rajamani	2452	,,	Subbiah Pillai	Nil	S. Sundararajan.
eerasami	2460	,,	Narasimhalu Naidu	Nil	Pandu
Peter	2478	,,	Mrs.Mary Sampooranam	Nil	S. David.
Alagarswami	2487	,,	A.Ayodhi Naidu	Nil	Balusami Naidu.
Balakrishnan	2489	,,	Venkatasami Naidu	Nil	R.Kenniah Naidu
Sundararajan	2499	,,	Sundararaja Iyer	Nil	C. Bashyam.
A.Muniyandi	2503	,,	Appaya Naidu	Nil	R.Sundaralinga Naidu.
V.Swaminathan	2506	,,	T.S.Venkatanarayana Iyer	Nil	T.V. Ramaswami
Krishnamurthi	2507	,,	S.Subramania Iyer	Nil	Do.
Krishnan	2514	,,	Mayandia Pillai	Nil	M.Karuppanan.
Sankara		,,	Venkatarama Iyer	Nil	T.V.Ramasami.
		,,	K.Mokkasami Servai	Nil	Lakshmanaperumal
		,,	Shanmugam servai	Nil	Ganapathy.
			Kalimuthu Servai	Nil	K. Mookkan.
			Ivemperumal Konar	Nil	Vasudevan, teacher, S.B.S. Thodaneri.
			ai Pillai	Nil	do. do.
			yengar, Station Sesha olavandan Iyengar.		D.Krishna Rao, Former Assistant, S.H.S.Sholavandan.

pupils though written tests
to be very poor.

m	Percentage of marks on which tted. admission is based.		
	English.	Math.	Tamil.
m	50	60	15
	7	40	28
	27	70	2
	3	55	50
	10	40	25
	3	55	60
	7	40	33

Principles for admission into this form as recorded by the master are "An aggregate of 75 out of 300 secures admission in Form II

		In class V.	English	Tamil	Math.
2437	S. Alagu Kone	Class 5	7½	Zero	77½
2445	P. Veluchami	,,	2½	Zero	90
2442	P. Muthiah	,,	7½	10	100
2444	P.Kadiresan	,,	5	40	85
2438	S. Ramanujam	,,	2½	30	52½
2470	B. Nagamuthu	,,	2½	90	72½
2488	S. Sundararaj	,,	5	30	72½
2484	K. Srinivasan	,,	5	20	80
2475	S. Peter	,,	2½	90	10
2451	S. Chellam	,,	2½	80	97½
2481	S. Solai	,,	2½	20	75
2450	S. Sivasami	,,	2½	40	70
2497	M. Gandanam	,,	2½	70	80
2456	N. Nathnavelu	,,	2½	20	72½
2418	A. Joseph	,,	2½	50	42½
2470	S. Rajangam	,,	5	70	70
2467	A. Muniyandi	,,	2½	30	65
2468	M. Sankiah	,,	Zero	30	90
2463	N. Saraswethi	,,	2½	Zero	47½girl
2464	U.S.S. Rajappa	,,	2½	20	40
2447	N.Periakaruppan	,,	2½	30	87½
2549	J.John Regis	,,	2½	80	75
2490	M. Philip	,,	10	50	40
2474	S.Meenakshisundaram	,,	5	60	80
2498	S. Ponnan	,,	2½	60	10
2469	V. Balakrishnan	,,	2½	40	87½
2436	S. Mahadevan	,,	5	70	10
2486	M.M. Muthu	,,	Zero	20	65
2443	P. Thangavelu	,,	5	0	85

The following is the footnote in the list and this was perhaps the principle adopted for admissions in Class 5.

"girls taken for their girlhood	3
85 and above	42
	45

But even this minimum of 85 was ignored.

XII. That, in connection with the selection of pupils for the S.S.L.C. Public Examination of 1945, the Headmaster prepared a list of pupils early in January 1945 accordingly. Some pupils had not been selected but he eventually included their names as a result of pressure not only from the pupils and their parents from the clerk sri S. Radhakrishna Iyer who are alleged to have accepted illegal gratification from pupils and their parents or proposed to be detained.

XIII. The valued answer papers of the Form VI Form held in December 1944 were not produced at the preliminary enquiry.

XIV. That according to the Headmaster, certain pupils weighing 5 visses were sent to the Railway station for Rs. 3-12-0 instead of Rs. 4-8-0 and the balance amount was remitted into the school fund. This matter had come to the notice of the D.E.O. during the enquiry.

XV. (a) That, in connection with the promotion of pupils in the various classes and forms, the Headmaster had first put up on the notice board the results of the examinations along with a list of pupils who were

few days, he announced that all the pupils of the school had passed except one who had died and another who had no term days.

(b) That in thus promoting every pupil of the school without observing any common principles, the Headmaster yielded to pressure not only from the pupils and their parents but from certain teachers notably Sri V. Narayana Rao and the school clerk Sri S. Radhakrishna Iyer who are alleged to have accepted for this purpose illegal gratification from pupils and their parents or guardians.

XVI :- Sweeper Karuppayee of the school stole several tiffin boxes of the pupils and teachers and a few of these vessels were actually found in her house when the Headmaster assisted by the menials of the school had a search made for them in his own presence The sweeper is alleged to have been fined Rupees five by cash recovery from her monthly wages though the amount of the fine does not appear to have been remitted to the credit of the district board up-to-date. These facts have not also been brought to the notice of the President and his orders obtained.

XVII. :- The Headmaster is reported to have received Rupees ten from one Sri Muniyandi Kudumban of Muthulingapuram hamlet of Karuppatty for admitting his son N. Ratnasami in the school.

XVIII:- The District Educational Officer has reported that the declaration of the parent of Samayakaruppan a pupil of Form VI of Board High School, Sholavandan regarding correctness of the date of birth taken at the time of opening of the S.S.L.C. is not traceable in the school.

Sd/. W.P.A. Soundrapandian,

President, District Board,
Madura.

D/1216

To Sri V.N. Ramaswami Iyengar, Headmaster, Board High School, Usilampatty who will acknowledge receipt of the copy of the charges framed against him and return the spare copy with the acknowledgment recorded thereon to this office. He is also informed that he may proceed to Sholavandan at his cost and peruse the records and registers connected with the charges in the presnece of the Headmasster.

Copy to the Headmaster, Board High School, Sholavandan.

Copy to the Headmaster, Board High School, Usilampatty.

List of marks of Sixth Form pupils at the Half yearly Examination held in December 1944

(15) 16

		English 50	V.T.C 50	Ele Math 50	Ele Science 50	Geography 20	History India 30	Optional 50
1	S. Subramaniam	12½	13	19	17	-7-	12	12
2	D. Devasirvatham	—	—	—	15	—	—	—
3	R. Dhanarajan	-5-	20	21	32	-4½-	-8-	29
4	S. Gurusamy	16	18	14	22	-5-	-8-	18
5	S. Krishnamoorthy	10	22	-2-	21	-5-	13	22
6	S. Ramegam	-5-	14	-1½-	20	-7-	12	20
7	D. Venkadachalapathy	-8½-	18	-1-	-8-	-7-	11	13
8	A. Velayudham	—	—	—	10	—	—	—
9	P.R. Sethuraman	24	19	10½	29	-7-	11	31
10	M. Jeyaraman	-11½-	-7-	-3½-	11	-4-	-7-	13
11	M. Soundararajan	20	18	13	14	10	16	27
12	P.S. Krishnamoorthy	28	25	27	30	-5-	-9-	17
13	R. Krishnan	14	16	21	15	-4-	-9-	-8-
14	M. Mallan	—	—	—	-8-	—	—	—
15	N. Ramiapapan	-3½-	18	-½-	24	-5-	-8-	15
16	S. Vairavan	-8-	18	-8½-	16	-7-	-12-	11
17	M. Rayanboo	-5-	21	-2-	32	-5-	-7-	22
18	S. Namasivayam	22½	24	13	34	10	15	18
19	R. Thukkaram	14½	18	10	26	-4-	-5-	18
20	R. Achuthanantham	12½	18	10½	37	-4-	-7-	21
21	R. Narasimman	15	15	10	31	-5-	-8-	26
22	V. R. Krishnan	19	28	25	31	-7-	14	15
23	S. Srinivasarayanan	-8½-	14	2½	12	-4-	-6-	13
24	A. Chinniah Samy	19½	21	21	27	-9-	15	26
25	S. Balasubramanian	15	21	-7½-	31	-8-	12	20
26	G. Mahadevan	-7½-	-6-	-1½-	-8-	-3-	-4-	-8-
27	M. Palaniyandi	-6½-	10	-1½-	19	-3-	-6-	2½
28	S. Murugesan	21	14	23	27	-6-	10	26
29	R. Pandurangan	23	20	28	26	-7-	11	18
30	R. Doraipandi	14	21	21½	32	-6-	10	13½

BOARD HIGH SCHOOL
SHOLAVANDAN.

		English 50	V.T.C 50	Ele Math 50	Ele-Science 50	Geography 20	History India 30	Optional 50
31	A. Chelladorai	20	30	15	27	-6-	-8-	29
32	B. Ramatchi	12½	20	16	27	-7-	14	25
33	A. Balakrishnan	15¾	27	19	26	-7-	10	23
34	R. Velayudham	16	30	20	35	-8-	14	32
35	R. R. Venkatachari	15¾	22	12	24	-6-	-9-	12½
36	S. Sankarasubramanian	-7½-	11	-6-	29	-6-	-9-	10½
37	V. Venkataraman	13¼	18	-2½-	19	-4-	-7-	18
38	T. Thirugnanasambandam	12	22	14	27	-6-	-9-	17
39	N. Muniyandi	24	22	14	23	-7-	-14-	-5½-
40	P.R. Venkatachalam	17	18	14	25	-7-	10	15
41	T.P. Yegnam	20½	18	32	30	-6-	-9-	13
42	P.M. Kumgopal	8¾	16	11	14	-7-	10	-7-

G. Yahnubhan
5.1.46
Headmaster

BOARD HIGH SCHOOL
SHOLAVANDAN.

Submitted to the Presendent D.E. Board Madura with ref to his A.6.17142/45 dated 6.1.46.

The marks entered in the consolidated Mark Register of VI form pupils at the half yearly Exam Dec 1944 are furnished Presumably these are the Selection Exam marks. No other record of the Selection marks is available in this office Exam marks is available in this office

The answer papers of the Selection Exam in 1944 are not found here.

G. Yahnubhan
Headmaster
5.1.46.

31 (16) 17

Proceedings of the President, District Board, Madura.
Name: Sri M.P.A. Soundrapandian. Ref. A.2. 6493/46
dated 9th June 1946.

Subject:- Establishment - Secondary Education - Charges against Sri V.N. Ramaswami Iyengar, Headmaster, Board High School, Sholavandan (now at Usilampatti) Orders passed.

At the beginning of the school year 1945-46(i.e.) just after the school had re-opened after the summer vacation, information reached the President that the administration of the Board High School, Sholavandan had seriously deteriorated. The clerk and certain assistants of the school and even the peon were reported to be exercising a baneful but powerful influence over the Headmaster who was either so weak that he could not effectively check them or for certain reasons was disposed to allow them a free hand in matters which the Headmaster was alone competent to attend to and for which he was alone responsible under the rules. In the selection of pupils for the S.S.L.C. examination of 1945 and in the annual promotion of pupils in June 1945 and in the admission of pupils into the various classes and forms several irregularities were committed and in the general confusion caused by the lack of control by the Headmaster, the clerk and certain assistants found their opportunity for deceiving the pupils and their parents and taking money from them under the pretext of helping them in various ways.

There was a strong rumour that eight pupils of VI Form had first been informed that they would not be sent up for the Public Examination but later unceremoniously sent up as a result of pressure from the clerk of the school. Similarly, there were two lists of annual promotions and during the interval between the publication of the two lists and during the summer vacation that preceded the announcement of promotions, there was said to be a good deal of bargaining between the clerk and certain assistants on the one hand and the pupils on the other. Finally every pupil without exception in every class and form from the lowest to the highest was promoted. The admissions of pupils that year were also an outright scandal and pupils not found fit for the tests conducted by the Headmaster and assistants were admitted into classes and forms even higher than those into which they had sought admission.

Though the public of Sholavandan were fully aware of these atrocities and admitted their truth in a general way and even complained about them, they were not willing to come out boldly and assist the authorities in ascertaining the facts. It was only with very great difficulty that this office was able to gather certain facts. The facts so gathered are no doubt only a very small part of which had really taken place but not brought to light as a result of the threats of the servants affected who are said to have been going about telling people that complaints of corruption would recoil against themselves and involve them in prosecutions. These servants are also known to have appealed to public sympathy where threats would not succeed. In spite of it certain facts did come to the notice of this office and it was considered necessary in the public interest to take suitable action against the servants involved.

P.T.O

32

Three teachers were transferred and charges were framed against one of them. The clerk of the school and the peon were placed under suspension but later permitted to rejoin duty as the investigation and enquiry were taking up a good deal of time . Charges were also framed against Sri V.N. Ramaswami Ayyangar, Headmaster who was also transferred.

These proceedings relate solely to the Headmaster's part in the schools maladministration narrated-beabove

Eighteen charges were framed against the Headmaster and his explanation and the findings thereon are as follows:-

Charge No. 1:- The Headmaster contends that the entire responsibility for the improper issue of transfer certificates and failure to collect the fees and other amounts due to the school must rest on the clerk of the school.

Though the clerk's share of responsibility is not small in such matters, it is the Headmaster as the head of the institution that is ultimately responsible to the district board and its President for all financial and administrative irregularities.

Charge No. II:- The Headmaster states that his work falls under three heads viz., (a) teaching (b) supervising the work of his assistants and (c) General correspondence and administration and that "a/ Headmaster with a lively sense of his duties cannot have anything more than an hour or two to devote to his official routine work if he is to do justice to the duties that (a) and (b) impose upon him." He states that it would be "practically impossible for a Headmaster to aim at perfection in the realm of clerical work, unless he had the good luck to possess a very dutiful, energetic and keenly loyal clerk" and that unfortunately his clerk fell far short of his expectations. The Headmaster winds up by saying that the clerk should make good the loss as it was the result of his inefficiency.

The Headmaster's explanation is not acceptable. He was responsible equally for the work under all the three heads mentioned by him and he would not be justified in sacrificing any one of them for the sake of any other. He must have at least aimed at perfection in all the three aspects of his work and if he had really done so, there would not have been such gross imperfection in all the three branches of his work.

Charge No. III:- (will be dropped)

Charge No. IV :- The Headmaster's explanation is not fully acceptable. These unauthorized changes could have been made during his regime as much as in any previous one. A Headmaster is expected to check these registers off and on and note such defects and bring them to the notice of the authorities for suitable action being taken thereon.

Charge No. V:- (will not be pressed)

Charge No. VI :- The annual promotion list is an important record and must have been in the school along with other records. The Headmaster's explanation that as the clerk was under suspension he was not able to get at it is not acceptable.

This record was ultimately produced by the clerk under suspension from among his own papers and not even a copy of it was said to be traceable in the school. This is not believable. As there was a complaint that the Headmaster had put up two lists of promotions it was at least of temporary advantage to him to withhold this record from perusal by the President, District Board and his officers. If on the other hand the record was not in the school at all at that time or subsequently, it only goes to prove the utter

 33 (17) 18

and punishment. The Headmaster's statement at the personal hearing held on 8-4-46 that the copy of the list shown to him was the only copy evertaken of the list and was put up on the notice board without keeping another copy for the office file is evidently an afterthought and entitled to no consideration.

Charge No. VII:- The explanation of the Headmaster for all its elaborateness is most unconvincing. Rule 12 of the rules relating to Receipts and Expenditure of District Boards and the proviso thereunder must have been strictly observed and no excuses of any kind can be put forth by the Headmaster or accepted by the district board. Traffic congestion on the railway and difficulty in securing tickets have been known to exist ever since the commencement of the war and still exists though the war is over and would not justify repeated delays in the remittance of large amounts into the treasury. The Headmaster's personal attention should have been paid to this important matter and delays in remittances and remittances of part of fee collections on hand should have been scrupulously avoided. There were two ~~peni~~ peons in the school besides a clerical attender and the clerk and any one of these could have been employed regularly for taking the school collections to the treasury in conformity with the rules.

Charge No. VIII:- This is a case of admission of an ex-pupil of the school who had taken out a transfer certificate and left the school two years back being readmitted into a higher class in the same school as a private pupil after the usual test. The Headmaster contends not only that he did not know that the pupil in question was an ex-pupil but that he is not bound to make any enquiry and may rely on statements made to him by the pupil and straightway admit him. He states that in this case he took a tuition certificate from the pupil but it is not now available for perusal and instead there is a transfer certificate issued to the pupil in 1943 when he left the 5th class.

It is clear that the Headmaster did not take even ordinary care to prevent such admissions and his explanation betrays a sense of utter indifference to such matters. If pupils and possibly the clerk conspire to deceive the Headmaster, it would appear that the Headmaster will allow them to do so and do nothing to verify the correctness of such admissions at least subsequently and at leisure. If such a verification had been made in this case, the fact of a transfer certificate having been issued to the pupil could have been detected. That such detection is possible has been shown in this same case. The Headmaster cannot be absolved of blame in such matters for as head of the institution he is responsible to the district board and its president for efficient school administration. He would have done well to have allowed his assistants to help him in this important task of admissions and not left it practically in the hands of the clerk.

Charge No. IX :- (a) The Headmaster's explanation is very unsatisfactory. He had no business to admit pupils into any class or form 'on trust'. He should have insisted on the production of all the necessary certificates before admitting them whatever the pressure brought on him and from whichever quarter.

Having issued a receipt for the fees etc., paid by the pupil in question and made an entry in the Daily School Fee Register the Headmaster should not have cancelled the receipt and repaid the amount informally. The amount should have been remitted into the treasury and a refund applied for.

When the Headmaster was prepared to admit the pupil on trust into IV Form, it is surprising that he was subsequently admitted only into II Form and not III though on that very day there was a seat avaialable in III Form. The Headmaster really

undersigned is aware that certain Headmaster/s and assistants would like to have this common examination system abolished and they know why they desire it. A system by which, however roughly, the comparative merits of teachers can be assessed, by the results of a common examination conducted on the basis of common text books and common syllabuses is not likely to be relished by a section of the teachers. In any case it is upto Headmasters and their assistants to make this system as successful as possible and no Headmaster who values his reputation will dare to condemn this examination and besides, justify his section in totally ignoring the results of the examination and promoting everybody to the next higher class or form. No other Headmaster of a board school has done so in this district.

It appears that the District Educational Officer, called for the Headmaster's explanation for this phenomenal conduct and some explanation was offered but the connected papers are not forthcoming from either the high school or the District Educational Officer. The inference is obvious; somebody is interested in suppressing them.

It is amusing that this Headmaster who has so vehemently attacked the common examination system should ~~suitably-o~~ suddenly climb down and state that he "would not have had the boldness to do it and incur the wrath of the organizers, however, righteous might have been the cause; but with the strain mounting by (his) own domestic worries and the persistent impeachment of the common examinations scheme and its conduct by the parents and pupils made (him) take a step which (he) considered certainly righteous and hence justifiable." This is pure bathos.

It is a fact, that he had a marriage to be celebrated in his house on 31st May 1945 and along with it, as usual, some smaller celebrations. The rumour goes that these circumstances were availed of by pupils and parents and the school clerk and certain assistants to please the Headmaster by helping him to have the domestic festivities conducted with all facilities. (Charges framed against the clerk and one of the assistants Sri V. Narayana Rao are being dealt with separately) The Headmaster is reported to have told the public by way of explanation of this unprecedented event in the annals of the Board High School, Sholavandan. viz., promotion of every pupil from the lowest class to the highest form (barring VI Form) that he had done so to celebrate the victory of the United Nations in a fitting manner.

(b) The Headmaster does not deny having issued, if not published, two lits of promotions, He also asserts that the interval between the issue of these lists was only a few hours and not days. He adds that when the first list was handed over to the peon, he was simply asked to keep it and wait for orders and not paste it on to the notice board. It was therefore according to the Headmaster an act of indiscretion on the part of the peon to have put up on the notice board. But the Headmaster does not explain why if it was not intended to be put up at all and if fresh orders were necessary to have it put up the Headmaster did not keep the list with himself until he was sure of himself and knew what he intended doing finally in the matter.

The explanation is so puerile that it does not deserve any notice. There is on the contrary abundant proof of the fact that not two hours but at least two days should have elapsed between the publication of the first and the second lists of promotions. The final list though dated 1-6-45 was received by the District Educational Officer only on 4-6-45. There are on record two lists of promotions duly signed by the Headmaster and they were made available by the courtesy of the clerk of the school Sri S. Radhakrishna Iyer. If they had not been

produced, it would have been easy for the Headmaster to state that two lists were never put up and only one was put up and that was the final list announcing that all had passed.

The Headmaster relies on the statement given by Peon Nathuramuthu that he was given two lists to be put up on the same day and that the peon has admitted to having heard the Headmaster explain in a tone of horror "Alas, what have you done? and that is clear proof of the first list being only a tentative list. This peon admits that this "tentative" list was put up by both the peons of the school (Peon Karuppana Thevar is the other peon) but the other peon states that he did not know of any second list having been published because he did not go to the school for the rest of the day. If it is not a fact that two lists were not put up on different dates it may be correct to presume that both the lists were put up on the same day not on the 1st June but on 3rd or 4th June 1945.

Charge No. XVI:- In his first explanation the Headmaster stated that he never accompanied the peons or Karuppayee or her husband for any preliminary investigation into the theft of tiffin boxes. But Watchman Velukone, Sweeper Karuppayee and peons Naruthamuthu and Muthukaluva Thevar speak to the fact of the presence of the Headmaster outside the sweepers house when it was being searched. The Headmaster however admitted at the personal hearing on 8-4-46 that he was "present at some distances from the sweeper's house" and that the search was not made" in his presence. He also states that he is sure that three vessels were recovered from her house. The Headmaster evidently wished to make the whole thing appear insignificant and vaguely implicating everybody and not definitely and particularly implicating the sweeper but as the evidence was strongly against the Headmaster's profession of ignorance of the details of the incident, he perhaps thought it better to admit more detailed knowledge.

It came out during the taking of evidence on this incident that the sweeper was fined Rs. 5/- and that the amount was recovered in cash. There is however nothing on record to show that the fine was imposed or later realized except the statements of Peon Naruthamuthu and waterman Alagappan. This may not deserve notice but it has not been explained why the sweeper was continued in service when it had been proved that she had thieving propensities. She should have been punished at least by a fine but the Headmaster is emphatic that she was not fined.

Charge No. XVII:- (will be dropped)

Charge No. XVIII :- The explanation of the Headmaster is intended to mislead this office or betrays ignorance of departmental orders. In his proceedings R.C. No. 5156-M/39 dated 28-4-40, the Director of Public Instruction has informed all heads of institutions that at the time of opening the S.S.L.C. book in the IV form for a pupil, a declaration to the effect that the date of birth entered in the school register is the correct date of birth of the pupil and that no alteration of that date will be demanded in future on the plea that the correct date was not given at the time of admission should be invariably taken from the parent or guardian and filed in the school.

To sum up, it will be seen that out of the eighteen charges framed against Sri V.N. Ramaswami Iyengar, Headmaster Board High School, Sholavandan (now at Usilampatti) all

except four charges viz., charges Nos. III to V and XVII have been proved satisfactorily. Charges No. VII, VIII, IX, XIV, XV and XVIII are very serious ones and call for severe action.

The Headmaster appears to have had no control over his staff or their work or conduct and to have left things very much in the hands of his subordinates not realizing his own responsibilities as Headmaster or the consequences of such indifference. The efficiency of the high school has suffered most grievously and it will take a few years of very hard work to bring it back to normal condition.

It has been proved beyond doubt that the Headmaster has a weak and fickle mind and could never act with firmness or consistency in matters, relating to the affiars of the school. His general attitude to work connected with the stewardship of a high school e.g., admissions and examinations has been undesirable and not conductive to efficiency of either the teacher or the taught. By outlook and temperament, he has shown himself to be unsuited and unfit for the responsible post of Headmaster of a high school.

The District Educational Officer, Madura has in his inspection report of the Board High School, Sholavandan for 1945-46 observed as follows:-

" All the pupils studying in 1944-45 were promoted to the next higher form for 1945-46. No definite principles were followed. The explanation of the Headmaster (Sri V.N. Ramaswami Iyengar) may be obtained and action taken. Disciplinary rules for the pupils have been framed and the staff is governed by the Board regulations. There is laxity in admissions from private study."

The Divisional Inspector of schools, Madura Division, has remarked on the above inspection report as follows:-

"All the pupils attending the school are reported to be promoted. Laxity in admissions from private study is also reported. Explanation is heeded why recognition of this school should not be withdrawn."

In these circumstances, the undersigned has no option but to direct that Sri V.N. Ramaswami Iyengar, B.A.L.T. be removed from the post of Headmaster and appointed as a L.T. Assistant on Rs. 100/- plus a personal pay of Rs. 16/- per mensem the salary he was drawing on the date of his promotion as Headmaster.

President, District Board, Madura.

To Sri V.N. Ramaswami Iyengar, B.A.L.T., Headmaster,
Board High School, Usilampatti.

Copy to Headmaster, Board High School, Usilampatti.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC INSTRUCTION, MADRAS
R.C.No.10389 G1/46, dated 10-3-1947.

Appeal - Sri V.N. Ramaswami Ayyangar Ex. Head Master, Board High School, Sholavandan, Madura District Board.

Ref:- Government endorsement No.53763 B1/46, dated 29-10-1946.

Submitted.

2. The order of punishment is dated 9th June 1946 while the appeal against it is dated 9th September 1946. Thus the prescribed time limit of 2 months for appeal has been exceeded. On this technical ground and the appeal may be rejected.

It is further submitted that in view of the above no detailed remarks are offered.

The enclosures together with the personal file of the appellant are herewith sent.

For Director of Public Instruction

To

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

m.k.11/3.

(21) 40 22

Appeal. Ramaswami Ayyangar Sri V.N. Ex headmaster Board High School. Sholavandan - Petition against reversion as d.T. Assistant

From the P.D.B. Madura Ref. A.2 no 733/46 dt 21.10.46

Memo no. 53763-B1/46-2 Edn dt 20/3/47.

The Special Officer, District Board, Madura, is requested to report the date on which the appellant received the copy of the proceedings Roc 6493/45 dt 9.6.46 Communicated to him.

20/3/47

19.3.47

20.3.47

To
The Special Officer
D.B. Madura.

C.F. 32 (a).

D1 41 23 26784 6 47

Local Administration Department

From (Name)
D.I.R. Muir, Esq.,O.B.E.,I.C.S.

Designation
Collector & Special Officer,

Station
Madura District Board, Madura.

Received Registered

To

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

Enclosures :

No. A.2. 16733/46 dated 30th March 1947.

Sir,

Sub: Establishment - Appeal - Ramasamy Iyengar Sri V.N. Ex.Headmaster, Board High School, Sholavandan - Madura District - Petition against reversion as L.T. Assistant.

Ref: Government Memo 53763-B-1/46-2 Education dated 20-3-47.

I have sent the original file bearing No. 6493/45 dated 9-6-46 to Government as enclosure to my Ref. 16733-46 A.2. dated 21-10-46 while forwarding the appeal petition of Sri V.N. Ramasamy Iyengar. I am therefore unable to furnish the date on which the appellant received the copy of the proceedings reverting him as Assistant.

p40 ante (T)

p13 infra

2.1.47

For Collector & Special Officer,
District Board, Madura.

N.N. 2/4

B 2/4

E & PH (B1) Dept.

Cmo. 53763 B1/46.

Appeal - Ramaswami Ayyangar, Sri V.N. - Ex headmaster - Board High School, Sholavandan - Against reversion as L.T. Assistant.

From the President, District Board, Madura, Ref. A2. no. 733/46 Dt 21. 10. 46.

From the Director of Public Instruction, RC no. 10389 B1/46 Dt 10. 3. 47.

Memo no. 53763-B1/46-3 Edn Dt 12/4/47

The original of the District Board Office file no. 6493/45 Dt 9. 6. 46 on the above subject is forwarded to the Special Officer, District Board, Madura, and

The is requested to report the date on which the appellant received the Copy of the proceedings Roc.6493/45 Dt 9.6.46 communicated to him.

11/4/47

11.4.47

work
11/4/47

To

The S.O., Dt Bd., Madura,
Thro the DPI, Madras.

(with Dt Bd office file at ⊕).

Dept with-avel to DPI
17/4

Board High [illegible], Headmaster

Ref.No.16733/46/A.2.

ASST. SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT EDUCATION AND PUBLIC HEALTH DEPT.

B1 44/ 25 (23)

District Board Office,
Madura,
dated 13/5/47.

From
Sri Rao Sahib
V.Hanumantha Rao Naidu, B.A.,
Collector & Spl.Officer,
District Board, Madura.

To

The Secretary to Government,
Education & Public Health Dept.,
MADRAS

Sir,

Subject:- Establishment - Secondary education - Sri V.N.Ramaswami-Iyengar - Ex Headmaster, Board High school, Sholavandan (Madura District) - Against reversion as L.T.Assistant. appeal

42035

Ref :- Government Memorandum No.53763-B.1./46-3 dated 12-4-47 and reminder thereon dated 9-5-47.

pp42-43 ante.

(T)

- - - - - -

The date on which the appellant received the copy of the proceedings Roc.6493/45 dated 9-6-46 of the District Board, Madura has been called for from the Headmaster, Board High school, Usilampatti. It will be reported to Government on hearing from the Headmaster.

14.5.47.

For Collector & Spl.Officer,
District Board, Madura.

G.V.S.14/5/

EPH (B1)

May lie over till 15/6/47.

B 14/5

17/5/47
work
17/5/47

17.5.47

it back to normal condition.

BY REGISTERED POST - ACKNOWLEDGMENT DUE.

C.F. 32.

Local Administration Department

Received Registered

From (Name) Sri Rao Sahib V.Hanumantha Rao Naidu, B.A.

Designation Collector & Spl.Officer,

Station District Board, Madura.

To

The Secretary to Government,
Education and Public Health Dept.,
M A D R A S

ASST. SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT EDUCATION & PUBLIC HEALTH DEPT. 26 MAY 1947

Enclosures: 130 pages

No. A.2.16733/46 dated 21 - 5 - 1947.

Sir,

Subject:- Establishment - Education - Secondary - Appeal - V.N.Ramaswami Iyengar - Ex-Headmaster, Board High school, Sholavandan - (Madura District) - Against reversion as L.T., Assistant.

Ref :- Government Memorandum No.53763 - B.1/46 -3 dated 12-4-47 and reminder thereon dated 9-5-47.

- - - - -

The appellant received the copy of the proceedings Roc.No.6493/45 dated 9-6-46 of the President , District Board, Madura on the afternoon of 11-6-1946.

The original of the District Board office file bearing No.6493/45 dated 9-6-46 on the above subject received from Government is sent herewith.

23.5.47.

For Collector & Spl.Officer,
District Board, Madura.

G.V.S.22/5/

Education and Public Health Department (B1).

APPEAL - Ramaswami Ayyangar, Sri V.N. - Ex-headmaster - Board High School, Sholavandan - Against reduction as L.T. Assistant - Rejected.

From Sri V.N. Ramaswami Ayyangar, dated the 9th September 1946.

From the President, District Board, Madura, Ref.A2.No.16733/46 dated the 21st October 1946.

From the D.P.I., R.C.No.10389-G1/46 dated the 10th March 1947.

ORDER MS.NO. 1282 EDUCATION, dated 19-6-1947.

(25) 28 , Education and Public Health Department (B1). 49

Cmo 53763 for/47

APPEAL - Ramaswami Ayyangar, Sri V.N. - Ex-headmaster - Board High School, Sholavandan - Against reduction as L.T. Assistant.

---

pp1-10 From Sri V.N. Ramaswami Ayyangar, ex-headmaster, Board High School, Sholavandan, dated the 9th September 1946.

pp13-17 From the President, District Board, Madura, Ref.A2.16733/46 dated the 21st ~~September~~ October 1946.

p39 From the Director of Public Instruction, R.C.No.10389-G1/46 dated the 10th March 1947.

---

p10 The appellant, Sri V.N. Ramaswami Ayyangar is a permanent L.T. Assistant with 21 years' service under the Madura District Board. He had served as headmaster for four years. In his

pp31-38 proceedings No.A1.6493/45 dated the 9th June 1946, the President, District Board, Madura, reverted the headmaster to the post of assistant as a punishment as he was found unfit to hold the post of headmaster of a high school. The assistant has now appealed

p1-10 to Government against the President's orders and requests that he may be restored as headmaster.

2. The appellant received the proceedings of the President

p45 dated the 9th June 1946 on the afternoon of 11th June 1946 and his present appeal is dated 9th September 1946. Attention is in this connection solicited to the remarks of the President, District Board,

p39 Madura, and the Director of Public Instruction on pages 13-17 and page 39 c.f. respectively. Both of them point out that the appeal is belated (by nearly a month) and that on that ground it may be rejected. The Director has not offered any remarks on the appeal on its merits. The petitioner has not adduced any reasons for the delay in preferring the appeal. It is for consideration whether the Director's recommendation may be accepted. If so, the draft order below is for approval.

3. The file may be circulated to H.M.(Education) for orders.

SECRETARY, EDN. AND P.H. DEPT. 18 JUN 1947 GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS

27.5.47