

closed
cs

Scot II-27-58,004-4-11-48.

Education and Public Health

(194⁷) Department.

Ms **SERIES.**

G.O. NO. 2050 Edn.,

Dated 23-9-1947.

[Despatch Abstract.]

Establishment-Ramnad District Board-Board High School, Tirupattur-
Ex-Headmaster-Mahadeva Sastri Sri S.V.-Petition against reduction as
L.T. Assistant-Reconsideration of previous orders-Refused.

Back Papers.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.	G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.
Go	1004	E S	13-5-47				

Further Papers.

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

Registered Post

C.F. 32.

Local Administration

Department

Received

Registered

From (Name)

Rao Sahib Sri B.

To

Designation

Madhava Rao Naidu, B.A.,
Special Officer,

The Private Secretary to His
Excellency the Governor of
Madras, Madras.

Station

Ramnad District Board
and District Collector
Ramnad at Madurai.

Enclosures :

Roc.No. A9/13173/47

dated

26-7-1947

194

Enclosure

Sir,

4

Sub:- Memorial to His Excellency the Governor
of Madras, presented by Sri S.V. Mahadeva
Sastri, B.A., L.T., - Ex-Headmaster, N.M. Board
High School, Tirupattur against the order
of Government Ms.No.1004 Edn., dated 13-5-47
submitted-

P3 infra

I submit herewith the memorial presented by S-i.
S.V. Mahadeva Sastri, B.A., L.T., to His Excellency the Governor of
Madras, against the order passed in G.O.No.Ms.1004 Edn., dated 13/5/47
of the Government of Madras, Education and Public Health Department
rejecting his appeal against the reduction from the post of the
Headmaster to that of an L.T., Assistant.


The points enunciated in the Memorial have all
been duly considered by the Government and final orders have been
passed.

Memorandum
for 18/8/47

The connected files of this Office R.Dis.26237/47

P.T.O

2
Kept below
and D.Dis.23175/41 with the Service Register of Sri S.V.Mahadeva Sastri, B.A., L.T., are enclosed herewith.



Rm
25.7.47

Kept below
Special Officer.

Governor's Secretariat

62121
Endorsment KN.Dis.dated the 31st July 1947.

Transferred to the Secretary to Government, E & P.H.

Department for disposal with reference to the sub-paragraph of Instruction V(1) of the C.Memorial Rules - Instructions regarding the submission and receipt of petitions and other papers of the same class addressed to the Government of Madras. The communication has not been acknowledged.



Att-I
to B.N.
25-10

1) G.O. No. 1231/Edn. (By order of His Excellency the Governor).

4/7/40

2) " " 639/Edn.

5/5/42

Private Secretary to
H.E. the Governor.

The Humble Memorial submitted by

S.V.Mahadeva Sastri, B.A.L.T., (On leave)
(Ex-Headmaster, N.M.Board High School, Tiruppattur, Ramnad Dt.)
10/107, Gundu Rao Street,
Manamadura.

To His Excellency The Governor of Madras,
Madras.

Through
The Special Officer, Ramnad District Board,
Madura.

May it please Your Excellency!

3
I was the permanent Headmaster of the N.M.Board High School, Tiruppattur, ever since it was raised to a full-blown High School, in 1942 till 1946. In the latter year, some trivial charges were framed against me and an enquiry was rushed through, without some important witnesses being present. Findings were given by the Vice-President of the District Board against me and I was reduced to an L.T.Assistant. I preferred an appeal to the Government against this order in September 1946 and the Government in their G.O. Ms. No. 1004 Edn. dated 13-5-47 have rejected my appeal. (Enc.I) I now approach Your Excellency to render justice to me tempered with mercy. I attach herewith a copy of my appeal to the Government. (Enc.II)

In this connection I would most humbly submit the following for Your Excellency's Kind consideration:--

1. The charges have not been proved, but only asserted by the Vice-President to have been proved after he has said in more than one place that he suspects me,
2. The enquiry is vitiated by the several defects pointed out by me in the appeal, (please vide Enc.II) PP-7-13
3. I joined duty as Headmaster of the Tiruppattur school in June 1940 and opened IV Form. In 1942, when VI Form was opened in spite of the adverse remarks passed by a gentleman who acted as President of the District Board for a few months, I was appointed as Headmaster of the Full-blown High School by the then President, having been recommended by the District Educational Officer also. Hence those remarks may not be given any weight now, in considering my present petition. My work as Headmaster during 1942 to 1946 only should, I submit, be considered now.
4. The strength of the School steadily rose during my period of Headmastership from less than 200 in 1940 to 600 in 1946,
5. Every year I celebrated the anniversary of the school to make the institution very popular,
6. In the 4 years 1943 to 1946, the results in the S.S.L.C. Public Examination were highly satisfactory and Parents' meetings were held to eulogise the Headmaster and the staff,
7. The District Educational Officer and the Divisional Inspector of Schools have always had a good word to say about me in their Annual Inspection Reports,
8. Any reports that might have been invited from the District Educational Officer, Divisional Inspector of Schools and The Director of Public Instruction in connection with my present appeal may kindly be taken into consideration.

I have now put in 23 years of service in this District Board and have only about 6 years more to serve. I would therefore most humbly appeal to YOUR EXCELLENCY to show mercy to me and restore me to the Headmastership of the High School without any break in service.

Manamadura,
30-6-1947.

I beg to remain,
Your Excellency,
Your most obedient servant,

S.V. Mahadeva Sastri

Advance copy sent direct..

30.6.47

S.V. Mahadeva Sastry
30.6.47

Enclosure II

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

2. I am a B.A.L.T., of the Madras University and entered
service under the Ramnad District Board as the Mathematics Asst.
of the Board High School, Rajapalayam in July 1924. I was
appointed as the Headmaster of the N.M. Board High School Tirup-
pattur in June 1940 and was asked to open IV Form there. When
the VI Form was opened in June 1942 the District Educational
Officer 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 Rs 110-16 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 Headmaster from 8-6-44 as per Roc. A-9/13453/44
dated 25-8-44 of the President and I continued to be at Tirup-
pattur 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.

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 con-
duct 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 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 the previous day, viz., 14-5-46.
Two important witnesses, peon Arakkiasami (who is con-
nected with charges 6&7 and teacher K.R. Ramaswami Iyer,
(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.
- (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 water-
woman 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
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 Head

Headmaster of the Board High School, Tiruppattur, and I was transferred on "public grounds" as Headmaster, Board High School, Paramakudi in Roc. A-9/26237/46 dated 14-6-46 of the President. I was also sanctioned my increment in July 1946 when these proceedings were pending disposal. Then all 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 conduct of the Headmaster is not free from doubt." "The statement of the Headmaster.....is highly suspicious 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:--

Charges 1, 2 and 3 relate to the appointment of menials and payment of wages to them. I desire to state that the President has not ~~any~~ 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 headmaster 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 contingent bills the names of the sweeper and waterwoman were not written. The bills were claimed:--

(1)	Wages of sweeper	Rs 8.
(2)	Wages of waterman	Rs 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. 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 Swarnathammal, 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. So the charge of misappropriation cannot be considered to be proved.

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 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 the watchman or of an unknown stranger who was never produced. Thus the charge cannot be considered to be proved.

Headmaster of the Board High School, Tirupattur, and I was...
...in the findings on the charges against me, remains like...
...The statement of the Headmaster is not free from doubt...
...The charge is proved...
...I suspect the genuineness of his (Headmaster's) statement...
...not been examined plainly and in full at the regular enquiry and...
...cannot be considered to have been conclusively proved.

Coming to the charges themselves:-

Charges 1, 2 and 3 relate to the appointment of menials and...
...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 (sweepers and waterman) paid from...
...contingencies is the same as that followed by my brother Headmaster...
...of the Board High School at Pannakudi and Kanakudi. In the...
...Tamil Nadu 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 contingent bills the names of the sweepers...
...and waterman were not written. The bills were drawn:-

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

For nearly 15 years in the two High Schools at Pannakudi and...
...Kanakudi and for 6 years in the High School at Tirupattur the...
...bills have been passed. I never had any question raised 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 order of the President. I...
...regarding the vouchers, since only one individual was made respon-
...sible for the whole amount, assistance was got from only one...
...She paid the amount due to the others. There has been no mis-
...appropriation by me as conceived by the President. This woman...
...Jnan Gyanthammal, has complained of non-payment. This woman...
...refused to receive her share after she had been dismissed. It...
...is the dismissal that made her complain at all against me. One...
...too received payment later. So the charge of misappropriation...
...cannot be considered to be proved.

Charge 4. The auction tickets were those concerned...
...by the Assistant Engineer. If they were serviceable, they would...
...not have been auctioned. The remnants of three unserviceable...
...tickets were auctioned. One teacher has corroborated my state-
...ment as per the findings of the Enquiry Officer himself. The...
...other teacher who wrote the whole auction record was not present...
...at the time of enquiry, not having been summoned in time. I...
...enquired, he would have said that he made the correction at the...
...time of auctioning itself, since the whole lot of three was...
...auctioned instead of only one ticket. The auction bill is...
...to have shown that the watchman carried two tickets to the...
...I do not know who this Sumathi Pillai is. He was not present...
...the time of enquiry nor was his evidence taken in my presence...
...should think that the evidence of the teacher is sufficient to...
...show that the watchman carried two tickets to the auction...
...was never produced. The charge cannot be considered to be...
...proved.

7. Charge 5. The Vice President says that the clerk admits...
...the clerical error. Yet he says that when Rao Saheb A. Ramachan...
...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 Arokiasami 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...
...all right by that time. A word about this peon's conduct has to...
...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 Scout master 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 ~~show~~ 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 suspen-
...sion. This peon came to the school already with a bad reputation...
...While he was in the Women and Children's Hospital at Kanadukana han,
...his conduct was not satisfactory. On the initiative of the Doore...
...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.) 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 memo was issued to him asking him for an explanation, he re-
...fused to receive the same. It was at 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 work from him, to main-
...tain 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...
...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 un-
...derstood 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 menials 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. No. 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

award a penalty, his duty ends with the recording of his finding 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 biased 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 me, contrary to Rule No. 35 of the Madras Provincial and Subordinate Services.

Extract from the Memo of the President.

Consequent on the reversion of Sri S.V. Mahadeva Sastri, Headmaster, 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, N.M. Board High School, Tiruppattur.

13. The school pupils' Literary Association Anniversaries were presided over by Sri Rao Saheb A. Ramachandran Pillai, Sri P.S. Kumarasami Raja, Diwan Bahadur CV. CT. V. Venkatachalam Chettiar, and Rao Bahadur R.V. Ramasundaram Pillai in the years 1941, 42, 43 and 1944 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 co-operation 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, will speak for themselves:--

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

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

"Teaching is on efficient lines and the Headmaster has secured the willing co-operation 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."

Review of the Divisional Inspector of Schools

"It is satisfactory 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 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
your most obedient servant,

(True Copy) S.V. Mahadeva Sastri

S.V. Mahadeva Sastri
30.6.47

16

SOA
28/8

P. 15 C. 7.

To
The Sph. Officer,
Dt. Bd., Ramnad
at Madurai.

22/8/47
av
22847

17

9

E. & P. H.
G. 3

Memo. No. 62/21-2-G3. Edn., dated, 25-

Memorial to H.E. the Governor
Mahadeva Sastri, Sri S.V. —
Ex-Headmaster, N. H. Board
High School, Tirupattur — Against
Reduction as L.T. Agst.

Ref: Govt. Memo. No. 62/21-1-G3. Edn.,
dated, 7-8-47

The attention of the
Sph. Officer, Dt. Bd., Ramnad,
is invited to the reference
cited above and he is requested
to send the personal file
referred to therein without
delay.

2281

18

C.F. 32.

Local Administration Department

From (Name)

Sri C. Vivekanandamurthi B.A.,

Designation

Spl. Officer, Ramnad Dt. Board & Station

Dt. Collector, Ramnad at Madura.

Received Registered

To

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

Enclosures: Roc. No. A. 9. 13173/47. dated 23--8--1947.

Sir,

Sub:- Memorial to His Excellency the Governor-Mahadeva Sastri-
Sri S.V.- Ex-Headmaster, N.M. Board High School, Tirupattur
Against reduction as L.T. Assistant- Personal- file
sent-

Ref:- Memorandum No. 62121-1-g.3. Edn. dated 7-8-47.

The personal file of Sri S.V. Mahadeva Sastri B.A.L.T., is sent
herewith in a separate sealed cover.

br. 25/8



L. J. Indrasam
For Special Officer. v/s.

Self H. no.
R. V. R. R.

2319

$$1) \frac{k + p_{II}}{g_3} \text{ дефиниция}$$

K. S. Lakshminarayana - Ramnada DP RD - Board High School
 Tirupattur - ~~Petition against~~ Ex-Headmaster
 - Mahadeva Sathi S. V. - Petition against
 reduction as L.T. Assistant - Reconsideration

(8) of previous orders - Refused
Read again in 1004 Edu dtd 13.6.47
p34 from S. S. V. Mahadeva Sastri, B.H.T., Manamad
pic 1947 The Special Officer, Ramnad dtd 30.6.47
pic 1947 No. cm. A9/13173, dtd 26.7.47
pic 1947 " 23.8.47

By Registered Post

678
123

2050 Edu J 23.9.1947.

The Special Officer, Ramnad ^{8c} ~~10~~ ¹³
is requested to inform the petitioners, Sri
Sr. Mahadeva Sastri that the previous
order of the Govt. in the matter cannot be

✓

reconsidered
Ar 228/47
22/8/47

To
The Special
Officer
Ramnad
DC Bd
at Madurai.
(with the
(U) - personal file,
Service Register
and school office
files etc)
2 letters

get
with
RP
26/9

1401 P. 228 P. sub 3 5235

✓
E and P. H Dept
G3

Subject

Petitioner - Mahadeva Sashi, Sri S.V.
Ex Headmaster Board High School, Tirupattur
Punishment - Reduction as L.T. and
to Ramnad DC - / Memorial to H.E. against
the orders of the Govt rejecting his appeal.

P3cf

from Sri S.V. Mahadeva Sashi, B.A.T.
dated 30-6

PP1-2cf

The Special Officer, Ramnad DC
Room A9/13173/47 dated
26-7-47

P2cf
P19cf

" Governor's Sect Ltr No. XIV Dis dated 31-7-47
" Special Officer, Ramnad DC Bd.
Room A-9.13173/47 dated
23-8-47

PP175-184 of W

The petitioner, Sri S.V. Mahadevasan
B.A.T. was the Headmaster of the DC Bd
High School, Tirupattur from 1942 to 1946.
In 1945, the P.E. DC Bd Ramnad received
certain complaints against the petitioner
as the H.M. of the above school. They were
enquired into, ^{charges} framed against him
and as a result of ~~the~~ the petitioner was
reduced as an L.T. and as a punishment
Against the order of the P.E. reducing him
as L.T. and, the petitioner preferred
an appeal to Govt. The appeal,
the remarks of the P.E. and the D.P.T. ^{known} are
at pp. 1-21 of G.O. 1004 Edn dated 13.5.47
The appeal was ~~examined~~ and ~~was~~ rep.
by the Govt - vide order no 4 of 10 above G.O.
The petitioner has sent a mercy petition
(memorial) to H.E. the Governor, ~~who~~ as
H.E. has transferred it to the Secy E+P
Dept with reference to Instruction

(Y)


(Y)

P3cf

P2cf

Mr. C. Memorial rule. The petition
 is ~~the~~ one for a reconsideration of
 the order in G.O. no. 1004 Edn 13.8.47.
 Please see the notes and orders at pp 1-4 of
 the above G.O. No fresh circumstances
 have been cited in the present petition
 for a reconsideration of the above order.
 The personal file of the petitioner is at (U).
 This for order whether the S.O. Ramnad should
 may be told to inform the petitioner that
 the govt see no reason to reconsider the previous
 order. ~~contained~~.

The case has been considered
 in detail in the notes on pages 2-4 of 9772 (U) / h
 No case for reconsideration.



S. h
 17/9/47
 TSA
 19.9.47

A draft order is sent for approval

av
 22.9.47
h
 22.9.47

Pst of P.H.
 No 145 of 1947
 P23.24 of 9772
 PP 1-4 of 9772

C.I. P.H. Madras
 C.I. P.H. Madras
 9772.

pp 21-22 of (X)
 1/12/47
 (w)

To the Spl. Officer,
 Ramnad dt. Bd.
 at Madurai.
 (with encl)
 sealed w

13
 E.P.H (93)
 Estt - Ramnad dt. Bd High school, Tirupattur.
 Ex. head master - Sri S.V. Mahadeva
 Sastri - personal file - Return to.

G.O. NO. 2050. Edn. 2/23.9.1947.

MEMO. 9772.47.93.1. Edn 2 (12.12.47).

The personal file of Sri
 S.V. Mahadeva Sastri, ex. headmaster
 dt. Bd. High school, Tirupattur, Ramnad dt.
 is sent herewith. The Spl. Officer,
 Ramnad dt. Bd. at Madurai is requested
 to acknowledge the receipt of the same.

11.12.47.
 av
 11.12.47

Note:- please see the orders at pp 21-22 of (X) and

the address entry on p. 22 of. with the ~~dispatch~~
It is not known how the personal
file of the at (w) was not sent. ^{It was mixed up with papers} ~~this may~~ ^{from C.D. Section.}
however be sent to the spl. Officer, Ramnad
at Bd. now. The draft overleaf is
for approval.

12.12.47
av
H.22.47

CF. 32.

Local Administration Department

From, (Name) Sri C. Vivekanandamurthi, B.A.,
Designation Special Officer, Ramnad
District Board and District
Station Collector, Ramnad at Madura.



Received 12 JAN 1948 Registered

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

Enclosures:

L. Dis. No. 25212/47 dated 24--12--1947

Sir,

Subject:- ESTABLISHMENT - Ramnad District Board
High School, Tiruppathur - Ex Headmaster-
Sri S.V. Mahadeva Sastri - Personal file-
Receipt - Acknowledged.
Reference:- Government memo No. 97772/47 G3-1 Education
dated 12--12--47.

I acknowledge the receipt of the personal file of Sri
S. V. Mahadeva Sastri, B.A.L.T., ex headmaster, Board High School,
Tiruppathur.

E.P.H (93)

For Special Officer.

nv. 5/1.

may be filed with G.O. No. 2050. Edu. 2/23.9.47.

not put up.

5/1

10.1.48

12.1.48

