closed

Scott II-27—58,004—4-11-46.

# EDUCATION AND PUBLIC HEALTH (1947) Department.

30

## SERIES.

**G.O. NO.** 2295 Edn.

**Dated** 30-10-47.

---

## [Despatch Abstract.]

Examination - S.S.L.C. - Public Examination 1945 - Malpractice - Tuticorin Centre - Suit notice - Orders passed.

## Back Papers.

| G.O. | No. | Department. | Date. | G.O. | No. | Department. | Date. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | | | |

## Further Papers.

| G.O. | No. | Department. | Date. | G.O. | No. | Department. | Date. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | | | |

---

Sectt. II-74.

**G. No.** ✓ **Department.**

## List of records put up

| Number. | Date. | Department. | Signature of Clerk putting up the paper. | Signature of Clerk removing the paper. |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | |

[P.T.O.

| Number. | Date. | Department. | Signature of Clerk putting up the paper. | Signature of Clerk removing the paper. |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | |

---

151 (3)

19 NOV 1946

ASST. SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT
1 NOV 1946
EDUCATION AND PUBLIC HEALTH DEPT.

DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC INSTRUCTION
12 NOV 1946
c11065
MADRAS

Tuticorin,

26th October, 1946,

From

Sri S.V.Subramania Iyer,
Vakil,
Tuticorin.

To

68498

The Secretary, Education department,
Government of Madras, Secretariat,
Madras.

The Director of Public Instruction,
Madras.

The Secretary, S.S.L.C. Board,
Madras.

Sir,

Under instructions of my client Sri K.Subramania Iyer, residing at No.3, Caitan Lane, Melur, Tuticorin, for himself and as next friend of his son K.S. Krishnan, I send you the following notice of suit :-

2 My client's son K.S.Krishnan aforesaid was a candidate for the S.S.L.C. examination 1945 with Physics as his optional subject. He was a bright student having secured more than 50% in all his subjects except Tamil in the said examination. He was a scholarship-holder and was one of the surely expected passes of the year. His conduct and character have always been good. His student-career so far has been without any blemish.

3 The examination results were published in June 1945. His result (No. 24081) and that of candidate No.24105 were however not published as being with-held. His S.S.L.C. book which was received here sometime later contained the endorsement that his 1945 & class Record and the examination results were cancelled and that he had been debarred for 2 years from appearing again for the examination being guilty of a malpractice during his Physics-Practical

examination--copying his readings from candidate No.24105.

4 A week prior thereto, the Headmaster of his school sent for the boy and showed him a communication he had received from the Secretary, S.S.L.C. Board touching the alleged malpractice. The Boy was working at one end of a 20 feet long table just near the place where the Chief Superintendent (the Deputy Inspector of Schools, Koilpatti) was sitting while candidate No.24105 was working at the other end with not less than 3 intervening boys working at the same table. There was an Assistant Superintendent also on watch, and only 8 candidates were there in all. The boy denied his copying anything from candidate No.24105.

5 The boy said that the experiment in question having been done by him before successfully as class work was very familiar to him: that when on account of a defective laboratory outfit his observations went wrong bringing a totally different and false result he had to repeat the experiment which brought correct results; and that in the circumstances he had to score out his previous record of observations and write out an entirely new one.

6 In the circumstances, the headmaster sent a report pointing out the utter impossibility for one in the Boy's place to copy out from candidate No.24105. The Headmaster had also made a note that the boy was above average and could not have thought of copying from candidate No.24105 who was a below-average student.

---

He had also enclosed with his report a plan of the Examination Hall--indicating the position of the Table in the hall and the place assigned for each of the 8 candidates at the Table and marking also clearly the place where the Chief Superintendent was sitting.

7 The Commissioner for Government examinations in his communication dated 19-6-46 says "Mr.S.J.Savarirajan, Principal, Voorhes College, Vellore, Member of the S.S.L.C. Board and Chief Examiner in Physics for 1945 reported that candidate No.24081 (my client's son) copied his readings in Physics-Practical from candidate No. 24105. This case of malpractice was enquired into as usual. Cases of malpractices are carefully scrutinized by a Committee of 3 members of ~~Public Instruction (~~ S.S.L.C. Board and orders passed by the Director of Public Instruction (President of the Board) after taking into account all the facts connected with the case and the recommendations of the Committee of this Board. This is the usual practice followed. In the case the candidate No.24081 was found guilty unanimously. Hence the candidate was punished in accordance with the prescribed procedure."

A

8 Except for the Report of the Headmaster which was decidedly in favour of the Boy, there was no record, evidence or statement either from the two Superintendents or any candidate to warrant the conclusion of "guilty" against the boy. No member of the Committee ever had any local inspection of

the examination hall to verify up the truth of the several facts contained in the Headmaster's statement. The boy's father was never informed of the Committee's inquiry. The non-mantion of the Headmaster's report and the enclosed plan of the Examination Hall in the said communication is significant and has ~~merely~~ much to be regretted. The communication is also silent regarding the basis for the Board's conclusion.

9 When the several decisive facts contained in the Headmaster's report--that the Boy was working at one end of the table just near the place where the Chief Superintendent himself was sitting, while the other candidate No.24105 was at the other end of it 20 feet off with more than 3 intervening candidates working on same side at the same table; that there were only 8 candidates in all with 2 Superintendents to watch them up; that the boy is above average having no necessity to copy from candidate No.24105, a below-average student etc., remain uncontradicted by any legal evidence on record, the assertion in the said communication that the alleged malpractice was enquired into, carefully scrutinised by a Committee of three S.S.L.C. Board Members who after taking all the facts unanimously found the boy ~~b~~ guilty of the malpractice and hence punished, is indeed strange, as being repugnant to any known rule or principle of legal procedure. The committee's conclusion--their unanimous finding the boy guilty of the alleged malpractice is against the natural justice, good-conscience and fair play. It is arbitrary and high handed as it is unjust and improper to have blocked the prospects and career of a young boy.

10 The said act of the S.S.L.C. Board cancelling the Boy's 1945 examination results & and class Record & and debarring him for 2 years from appearing again for the examination without even a prima facie case of the allege mal-practice made out against him is quite illegal and ultra vires of their powers. Having secured more than 50% of the marks in all the subjects except Tamil in which he has obtained 44% he ought to have been declared eligible for College course of studies. In Physics-Theory he has obtained 38 out of 60. Of the two experiments given him at the Physics Practical Test he has secured in one 14 out of 20 marks. So, even if he gets Zero in the 2nd experiment under reference he gets 52% in the subject.

11 By the said act of the S.S.L.C. Board the boy has lost 2 years of his precious life, and the likelihood of his starting his life as a brilliant Science Graduate 2 years earlier which certainly means a lot. His enthusiasim for higher studies and his highspirit have suffered also a lot. It has besides caused him and my client much mental worry and annoyance.

12 It is just and necessary the Board should make amends (1) by removing the great slur it has cast on the boy's character by an immediate cancellation of the order against him, (2) by declaring him eligible for College course and (3) expressing regret for the wrong it has done him and my client.

13 Please note that unless the said amends are made within the statutory period of 2 months my client will be much reluctantly driven to the necessity of

(6)

filing a suit against the Government impleading the Director of Public Instruction and the S.S.L.C. Board as parties for the said reliefs, for damages Rs.1000/-, and other appropriate reliefs as he may be advised on as incidential thereto with costs of the suit.

Yours faithfully,

Vakil Tuticorin
30/10/46.

Endorsement 66498/46-B1 Edn dated 8/11/46. E&PH

8/11/46

Forwarded to the Director of Public Instruction, Madras, for very early remarks

(By order)

Assistant Secretary
4/11/46

To
The D P I

---

(6) B1 7

SUBJECT.

S.S.L.C. Public Examination, 1945 - Malpractice - Tuticorin Centre - Lawyer Notice -

---

R.C.No.11065-E-1/46

Station, Madras,
Dated the 1st December 1946.

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

4 - DEC 1946
74603

To
The Secretary to the Government of Madras,
Education and Public Health Department,
FORT ST. GEORGE.

Sir,

PP 1-6 ante

In resubmitting herewith Government Endorsement No.66498/46-B 1 (Edn.), dated 8th November 1946, I have the honour to furnish below the facts of the case:-

The assistant examiner in Physics-Practical who valued the answer papers of the Caldwell High School, Tuticorin, reported that the answer paper of K.S.Krishnan (Register No.24081) contained evidence to show that the candidate should have had recourse to malpractice by copying from Register No.24105 in his experiment on the determination of the latent heat of steam. The Chief Examiner in this subject (Mr. S. J. Savarirayan, M.A., Principal, Voorhees College, Vellore) made the following remarks:-

"It is impossible in an experiment on 'determination of the latent heat of steam' to obtain the same weight of steam and the same resulting temperature".

"I agree entirely with the report of the assistant examiner".

The matter was considered by a sub-committee (malpractice) of the S.S.L.C. Board and the committee unanimously held the view that the candidate (Register No.24081) was guilty of malpractice and the usual punishment viz., cancellation of marks at the examination of 1945 and school record for 1944-45 and barring him from appearing for the S.S.L.C. Public Examination of 1946 was accordingly imposed on him by the Commissioner for Government Examinations, Madras.

PP. 57-59 of (t) All

A Lawyer's notice was received in October 1945 on behalf of the candidate and the Advocate was informed that the orders passed already could not be reconsidered.

P. 61 of (t)

In June 1946 when the Hon'ble the Minister for Education enquired about the case, he was informed that the candidate in question had been unanimously found guilty of malpractice by the committee and punished as in similar cases.

PP. 1-6 ante

In the Lawyer's notice now received, it is stated in paragraph 8 that no member of the committee visited the place for local enquiry. It is no doubt true that this has not been done but it is not necessary. The internal evidence, viz., the answers copied is enough to arrive at a judgment.

In

8

P.5 ante In paragraph 10 of the notice, it is alleged that the candidate was debarred for 2 years from appearing for the S.S.L.C. Public Examination. This is not true. The candidate's school record for 1944-45 and public examination marks of 1945 alone were cancelled, besides debarring him from appearing for one year only i.e., for the examination of 1946. According to this order, he could have joined any recognised High School in Form VI in 1946-47 with a view to appear as a pupil candidate for the S.S.L.C. Public Examination of 1947.

P.5 ante In paragraph 12 of the notice the Board is required to make amends (1) by removing the great slur it has cast on the boy's character by an immediate cancellation of the order against him, (2) by declaring him eligible for college course and (3) expressing regret for the wrong it has done him and the boy's parent. None of these requests can be complied with.

Under these circumstances I am to state that the lawyer may be informed that the requests contained in his notice are not admissible.

I have the honour to be,
Sir,
Your most obedient servant,

for Director of Public Instruction, Madras.

m.a./2-12.

2.12.46.

---

24/23/1

(1)

E.& P.H.(G.3)

Examinations - S.S.L.C. - Public Examination - 1945 -
Malpractice - Tuticorin Centre.

Pp/-6 ante C.No.66498/46 - From Sri S.V.Subramania Iyer, Vakil, Tuticorin, dated 26.10.46.

P7 ante From the D.P.I., R.C.No.11065-E-1/46 dated 1.12.46.

Memo No. 66498-G3/46-3 [illegible]

It ~~is~~ has been suggested that in coming to the conclusion that the candidate Sri K.S.Krishnan was guilty of malpractice, the Chief Examiner appears to have relied solely on the fact that in an experiment on "Determination of the latent heat of steam", the same weight of steam and the same resulting temperature were given in the answer paper of the candidate as in that of another candidate which it is said is impossible except as a result of copying. Assuming that this view is

Based on legal [illegible]
pp 1-2 [illegible]

10

~~-2-~~

1/45

view is correct, it is no evidence to show that only the boy under reference, namely, Sri K.S.Krishnan, is guilty and not the other boy. It ~~has~~ also been pointed out that if the facts stated in the notice ~~which it is~~ which it is alleged are supported by the report of the Headmaster, are correct, then the theory that this boy was guilty of copying ~~XXXX would~~ may not stand. ~~necessarily fall xxxx to the ground.~~ The D.P.I. is therefore requested to offer his remarks on the above points and also to state whether there is any other evidence to support the conclusion of the Chief Examiner that the candidate, Sri K.S. Krishnan, was guilty of malpractice.

2/ The connected records of the case may also be sent to Govt. for reference.

18/1/47

21.1.47.

22.1.47

To

The D.P.I. ~~(with encl - p.p.1-6c.f. to be xxx retd. with reply.)~~

dfd 28/1

---

27/13

13

⑧

11

E+PH (B3)

Examination - S.S.L.C. - Public Examination - 1945 - Malpractice - Tuticorin Centre.

pp1-6 ante C.No. 66498/46 - From Sri S.V. Subramania Iyer, Vakil, Tuticorin dt- 26/10/46

pp7-8 ante From the DPI Rc.No.11065-E-1/46 dt- 1-12-46

Memo. No. 66498-5/G3/46 Edn dt- 12-2-47

Sri ~~Mr.~~ S.V. Subramania Iyer is informed that the question is under the consideration of Govt.

To Sri ~~Mr.~~ S.V. Subramania Iyer, Vakil Tuticorin.

8/2/47.

8.2.47

8.2.47

11-2-47

12/2/47

dfd 14/2 Copy to the D.P.I.

12

13

G3 (9)

C.F. 32.

In reply, please quote number, date and short title.*

EDUCATION DEPARTMENT.

Received ______ Registered 4 APR 1947

From (Name) Dr. S.R.U.Savoor, M.A., [illegible]

(Designation) Director of Public Instruction,

Post Box ______, (Station) Madras.,

Telegraphic Address ______

27086.

Recd. on 9/4/47.

To

The Secretary to Government,
Education and Public Health Department.

Roc. No. 11065-E1/46, dated 31st March 1947.

Sir,

Enclosures ______

Spare Copies ______

Subject: S.S.L.C. Public Examination - 1945 - Malpractice - Tuticorin Centre.

pp.9-10 ante

Reference: Government Memorandum No.64498-G3/46-3 Education dated 23rd January 1947.

********

The reasons for which Candidate K.S. Krishnan was held guilty of malpractice while the other was not, are given on pages 2 and 3 of the note file of Dis.No.126/45 dated 5th July 1945 of the Office of the Commissioner for Government Examinations submitted herewith. The reasoning to my mind is cogent and conclusive in the case of both the boys.

(t)

So far as I can determine from the Disposal file referred to above, no report appears to have been received in the Commissioner's Office from the Headmaster pointing out the ~~appear~~ utter impossibility of the 1st candidate to copy from the 2nd or the attainments of these. In order to make sure whether the Headmaster could be held to have sent any report like the one referred to in the Vakil's statement, I called for the office ~~of~~ file of the school. From it I gather for the first time that two letters might have been sent by the Headmaster to the Secretary, S.S.L.C.Board on the subject - one on 1st June 1945 and the other on 7th June 1945. These are not traceable in the Office

X

14

~~..2..~~

Office of the Commissioner. As regards the letters themselves, I agree that the opinion of the Headmaster is very clear but this does not mean that it need be conclusive also. The Headmaster's opinions are based on information within his knowledge. There is nothing contradictory, if the experience of teachers in this matter is to count at all, in very decent boys who need not ordinarily expect to fail resorting to malpractice either out of fear of the moment or an apprehension that they might after all fail. There is such a thing as boys getting confused in the midst of examinations and in consequence, apprehending that they might fail, resorting to malpractice. There is nothing ~~unusual~~ unheard of either - I am making only a statement, I am not commenting on the educational or ethical aspect of it - in students who ordinarly fare well in some examinations failing to do well or equally well in the final examinations.

The connected records are sent herewith.

I have the honour to be,
Sir,
Your most obedient servant,

for DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC INSTRUCTION.

RR.2/4.

---

15

(10)

E. & P.H. (G3).

Memo. No. 27086-1-G3. Edn., 2., 24-4-'47.

Examinations — S.S.L.C. Public Examination — 1945 — Malpractice — Tuticorin Centre.

~~57~~ 24/4

pp. 13-14 ante

Ref: From the D.P.I., Roc. No. 11065-E1/46, dated, 31-3-'47.

The D.P.I., in his letter read above, has stated that, on a perusal of the concerned school record, two letters on the subject,

'X' on p. 13 ante

one on the 1st. June 1945 and the other on the 7th June 1945, might have been sent by the Headmaster to the Secretary, S.S.L.C. Board. He is requested to ~~forward~~ to

~~2~~ 16

Obtain and forward to Govt. copies of these ~~le~~ two letters at an early date.

23/4/47.

av 23/4/47

23.4.47

To

✓ The D.P.I.

25/4

---

17

C.F. 80.

EDUCATION **DEPARTMENT.**

11

93

ASST. SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT
2 MAY 1947
EDUCATION AND PUBLIC HEALTH DEPT.

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

Recd. on 3/5/47.

*Subject.*

EXAMINATIONS = S.S.L.C. Public Examination = 1945
Malpractice = Tuticorin Centre:

***

37584

| |
|---|
| **ENCLOSURES.** |
| No. ............ |
| ............ |
| Spare copies ............ |

RC. No. 11065-E/46

*Station* M A D R A S , *Dated the* 30th April 1947.

From (Name) DR. S.R.U. SAVOOR, M.A., D.Sc., I.E.S.,

(Designation) DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC INSTRUCTION, MADRAS

To The Secretary to the Government of Madras,

EDUCATION AND PUBLIC HEALTH Department.

Sir,

pp. 15-16 ante REF: Education and Public Health Department Memo.No.27086-1.G.3. Education, dated 24th April 1947.

P. 18 infra

I have the honour to submit herewith copies of letters dated 1st June and 7th June 1945 from the Headmaster, Caldwell High School, Tuticorin.

I have the honour to be,
Sir,
Your most obedient servant,

for DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC INSTRUCTION.

KAN.1/5

4/5

P.T.O

18

- 2 -

Copy of letter dated 1st June 1945 from the Headmaster Caldwell High School, Tuticorin:

---

REF:- R.C.No.232-B/45 dated 29th May 1945.

The letter therein referred to was directed to the Chief Superintendent for the S.S.L.C. Public Examination of the year.

The required explanations have been sent to the Chief Superintendent, the Junior Deputy Inspector of Schools, Koilpatti on his demand and the same would have reached by this time.

The students with Nos. 24081 and 25105, alleged to have had recourse to malpractice are well above the average of the class and are expected to score about 50% in all the subjects and much higher marks in their subjects. Hence there should have been no necessity for taking recourse to such practices. Further my impressionof their conduct throughout their course have been quite satisfactory and I cannot imagine how they could have taken recourse to such things. Hence I should think that any disciplinary action against them should be ~~unmetted~~ unwarranted and unjust.

---

Copy of letter dated 7th June 1945 from the Headmaster, Caldwell High School, Tuticorin to the Secretary, S.S.L.C. Board.

---

Alleged malpractice by candidates Nos.24081 and 24105.

------

The numbers of the above candidates did not appear in the list of successful candidates. Does that mean that disciplinary action has been taken against these fandidates.

It is earnestly requested that these cases be reconsidered in the light of the explanations by the Chief Superintendent and the candidates themselves and my own remarks.

Please let me once again affirm that these candidates were expected to pass creditably and malpractice is far from their character. So I cannot think of any reason why these students should be punished like that.

---

/True copy/

for Director of Public Instruction.

KAN.1/5

sol
1/5

---

19

⑫ G3

TUTICORIN,
8-5-1947.

From
Sri.S.V.Subramania Iyer,
Vakil, Tuticorin.

To
The Secretary,
Education Department,
(Govt.of Madras)
Secretariat,
Madras.

ASST. SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT
14 MAY 1947
EDUCATION AND PUBLIC HEALTH DEPT.

[illegible]

P.11 ante

Ref: Memo No.66498.G3/46, Education
Dated 12-2-'47.

--------

Sir,

May I know ifth-e Government have considered the questio-n and if so, the result?

Thanking you,

I have the honour to remain
SIR,
Yours faithfully,

S.V.Subramanian
Vakil Tuticorin

Edn. and P.H. Deptt
G3

The main file has been sent to Legal on 5.5.47. No interim reply seems necessary. May be filed with the main file
12.5.47

ar
12/5/47

E. S. P. H.
G3

Confidential

**Memo. No. 27086-A-G3. Edn., 8., 24-6-'47.**

Examinations — S.S.L.C. Public Examination, 1945 — Malpractice — Tuticorin Centre.

P. 17 C. 7. ante

Ref: From ~~the~~ D. P. I., Rc. No. 11065-E/46, dated, 30-4-'47.

The D. P. I. is requested to ascertain and report whether the candidate ~~(No. [illegible])~~, K. S. Krishnan, has appeared for the S.S.L.C. Public Examination held ~~this~~ year [illegible] whether he and has been declared eligible.

20/6/47.

To
The D. P. I.

Received one sealed cover
25/6

23.6.47

AV
23/6/47

---

CONFIDENTIAL

(IX) 93

C.F. 32.

PUBLIC INSTRUCTION Department

From (Name) Sri D.S. Reddi M.A.(Oxon)
M.B.E.,
Designation Director of Public
Instruction, Madras.
Station

Received ........ Registered ........

To

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

ASST. SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT
22 JUL 1947
EDUCATION AND PUBLIC HEALTH DEPT.

Enclosures:

Rc. No. 11065 E/46 dated the 21st July 1947.

Sir,

EXAMINATIONS -- S.S.L.C. 1945 -- Malpractice
Tuticorin centre.

P.21 ante Ref: E.P.H. Memo. No.27086-4-G-3 Edn. dated 24.6.47

59336

---------

I have the honour to state that the candidate K.S. Krishnan did not appear for the S.S.L.C. Public Examination of 1947 though he could have done so as he was debarred for one year only Viz., from taking the examination of 1946.

21/7

for Director of Public Instruction.

GAW/21.7.47.

(15) Regd. + Ack Due

No.5313/BK/HQ.,
Ordnance Depot,
Avadi. 15 Jul. '47.

To

The Secretary,
Education Department,
Fort St.George,
MADRAS.

G

ASST. SECRETARY TO GOVT.
16 JUL 1947
EDUCATION AND PUBLIC HEALTH DEPT.

SUB: APPEALS & PETITIONS:

PP.27-31 infra

Sir,

5 7954

I have the honour to forward the attached application dt. 15-7-47 from Clerk Mr. K.S. Krishnan of this Depot. ~~and recommend.~~

This individual, since his entertainment to date, proved himself to be hardworking, efficient and reliable.

May your decision as to whether he is qualified or not, please be communicated to this Office at your earliest convenience.

I have the honour to be,
Sir,
Your obedient servant,

GBUrquhart
MAJOR,
Offg. CHIEF ORDNANCE OFFICER.
(G.B. URQUHART.)

Encl: One.
PVN/KS:
Copy to:-
The Director of Public Instruction, Egmore, Madras.
The Minister for Education, Secretariat, Madras.
Mr. S.V. Subramania Iyer, B.A., B.L., Vakil, Tuticorin.
H.Q.

26

27

⑯

From

K. S. Krishnan,
Accounts Clerk,
Barrack Group,
Ordnance Depot,
AVADI.

To

The Secretary,
Education Department,
Fort St. George,
MADRAS.

Through

The Chief Ordnance Officer,
Ordnance Depot, AVADI.

Sir,

SUB: APPEAL FOR THE ELIGIBILITY FOR COLLEGE COURSE.

I appeared for the S.S.L.C. Examination in the year 1944-45 at TUTICORIN Centre my registered No. being 24081 and although I obtained good marks, I was debarred for two years due to the alleged suspicion of mal-practive in --- Physics Practical Examination.

I was seated just in front of the two hall superintendents and the other boy from whom I was alleged to have been copied and who is the son of one of the Superintendents and class teacher of the School where the examination took place, was seated more than 25' away from me just behind an opague glass Almirah which contained some Acids for the laboratary.

One can easily guess or imagine that there could be obsolutely no chance of copying the other boy from my seat without going over to his seat which I never did nor no such occasion happened.

---2

I appealed to the Secretary, S.S.L.C. Board through my lawyer Mr.S.V.Subramani Iyer, B.A.,B.L., Tuticorin, for which I was informed that the matter once decided could not be considered. As no satisfactory judgement was given, I further appealed to the Secretary, Educational Department, Madras University, Fort St. George, whose final decision has not yet been received.

Presumably refers to the petition pp. 1-6 ante

I had a personal interview with the Secretary in this connection who informed that my case is kept in abeyance and it will take atleast a month before a final decision is arrived at. He had put many questions to clear his doubts and to which I replied him to his satisfaction.

I have been working in Ordnance Depot, Avadi as an Accounts Clerk for the past 24 months giving entire satisfaction to my superiors.

Now that a ruling has been received from G.H.Q. Delhi, that those who have passed the S.S.L.C. Examination can only be retained in Service and others be given notice of discharge forthwith.

As I am not in possession of the S.S.L.C. Certificate to prove that I have passed the S.S.L.C. Examination, I was selected as one among those who are being retrenched for want of minimum qualification required -(i.e.)passed S.S.L.C. Exam. or Matriculation.

I narrated the whole story which affects my whole career to the Chief Ordnance Officer, Avadi, under whom I am now serving, who had sympathy on me and allowed a months time to get the final decision from your office prior to my discharge.

Under the circumstances, I earnestly pray that my case may please be considered favourably within the specified time allotted by the Chief Ordnance Officer, Avadi.

Thanking you in anticipation,

I beg to remain,
Sir,
Yours most obediently,
K Balakrishnan.

Avadi.
Dt.15 July, 1947.

Copy to:

i. The Director of Public Instruction, Egmore, MADRAS.
ii. The Minister for Education, Secretariat, Madras.
iii. Mr.S.V.Subramani Iyer, B.A.,B.L., TUTICORIN.
iV. The Chief Ordnance Officer, Ord.Depot, AVADI.

32

---

33

(18)

E.& P.H. (G3)

Confidential U.O. Note. No. 27086-5-G3. Edn., dated, 7-8-47.

Examinations--S.S.L.C., 1945--Malpractice--Tuticorin centre.

......

P. 23 ante Ref: From the D.P.I., Rc. No. 11065 E/46, dated 21--7--1947.

....

Legal note on H. 5-6 N.7.

There is no direct evidence in this case that the student with ~~with~~ register number 24081 copied from the answer paper of the student with register number 24105. The conclusion that the former student copied from the latter is based on inferences drawn from the answer books of the two candidates and the impossibility to obtain the same weight and the same resulting temperature. It is not possible for a layman to say how far this line of reasoning is so conclusive as to admit of no doubt and to exclude the possibility that the student found guilty might have crammed the answer from some previous experiment conducted by him. But it has to be said that the probabilities do not support this conclusion.

It is seen from the report of the Chief Superintendent that the students were strictly watched and no malpractices were detected. The two students were sitting in opposite benches at a distance of about 20 to 25 feet apart. One of the reasons given by the members of the Sub-Committee is that the student with register number 24081 could easily have jotted down the relevant figures when moving about the laboratory in connection with weighing, etc. The sketch of the examination hall ~~at the flag (R)~~ shows that the balances were behind the table on which the student with register number 24081 was working, and the gates were on the eastern and southern sides only. There could therefore have been no occasion for this student to go near or by the side of the table where the other student was working. The report of the Headmaster also shows that the student was well above the average of the class, and judged from his conduct during the school course, he could not have resorted to malpractice. The Board of Examiners had not the Headmaster's report before them and it is quite possible that they might have come to a different conclusion if they had these considerations before them. Taking all these circumstances into consideration, it ~~cannot be said~~ is argued that it is not proved beyond reasonable doubt that this student was guilty of malpractice. Before a penalty involving a stigma on the character of a student and loss of opportunity as the penalty in this case, is imposed. t'

The Govt. are advised

2/

guilt of the student should be reasonably clear ~~by~~ but that cannot be said of this case.

There are decisions in which it has been held that a suit for reliefs of the nature claimed in para 12 of the suit notice is not maintainable. ( see I.L.R. 47 All 434 and I.L.R. 40 cal 588). But in view of the circumstances stated above, It is suggested that the proper course ~~seems~~ is ~~to be~~ to cancel the order of the Board. It is also suggested that ~~It is suggested that~~ ~~As regards the actual relief to be given,~~ if the order of the D.P.I. in this case is set aside, it will logically follow that the candidate's answer paper should be revalued and a certificate should be issued on that basis ~~accordingly~~. ~~The D.P.I. may be consulted U.O. on the points raised above before issuing final orders in the matter.~~ The note above may be sent

'B' on p. 9 N.F.

5/8/47. to the D.P.I. u.o. for remarks.

[illegible] 5-8-47

[illegible] 6.8.47

S [illegible] 7/8/47

To the D.P.I.

(with D.P.I.'s office file to be returned with reply)

[illegible] with enc. 8/8/47

(Reminded on 25/8)

---

G3. (19)

To

The Secretary,
Education Department,
Fort St. George,
Madras.

ASST. SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT
29 AUG 1947
EDUCATION AND PUBLIC HEALTH DEPT.

No. 2259/YD/LB
Ordnance Depot,
Avadi
28 August '47.

Sub: S.S.L.C. Public Examination 1945 - Malpractice - Tuticorin Centre.

p. 11 ante

Ref: Your Memo No.66498 G3/46 Education dated 12-2-47 and our letter No.5313/BK/HQ dated 15-7-47 forwarding the the application of Mr.K.S.Krishnan, Clerk of this Depot.

pp. 25-31 ante

69534

Sir,

May your decision on the matter please be communicated to this Office at a very early date, as the question of Mr. K.S.Krishnan's retention in the service depends on your decision.

In this connection it is pointed out that the matter is long outstanding and an early decision is requested.

I have the honour to be,
Sir,
Your most obedient servant,

I J Naidu
O.O.(C).
for Chief Ordnance Officer.
(I.J.NAIDU).

(20)

E. & P.H. (G3).

Letter / Ref No. 27086-7 G3. Edn., dated, 3-9-47.

To

The Chief Ordnance Officer,
~~No. 2259/YD/LB~~ Ordnance Depot,
~~Avadi~~ Avadi.

Copy to the D.P.I. Depd 4/9

Sir,

Examination — S.S.L.C. — 1945 — Malpractice — Tuticorin centre.

---

P. 35 ante.

With reference to your letter No. 2259/YD/LB, dated 28-8-47, on the subject mentioned above, I am directed to say that the matter is under consideration.

Y. o. S.

2/9/47.

2/9/47

2/9/47

3/9/47

SUBJECT.

Examinations - Secondary School Leaving Certificate 1945 - Malpractice
- Tuticorin Centre.

---

10 OCT 1947

R.O.C.No.11065-E/46

Station, Madras, Dated the 8th October 1947.

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

To

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

Sir, pp 33-34 ante

80268

Reference:- Government Confidential U.O.Note No.27086-5-G 3 Edn. dated 7th August 1947.

- - -

p18 ante

The case was referred back to the malpractice committee for remarks in the light of the letter of the Headmaster of the school. The committee is of the unanimous view that the original findings were given after a careful scrutiny of the answer scripts and that the testimony of the Headmaster regarding the conduct and ability of pupils can have no relation to their conduct in the examination hall, where even clever pupils are tempted to resort to malpractice in their despair. Again in doing practical work, pupils have to move about the laboratory room constantly and hence the distance in the seating arrangement cannot be a material factor in deciding the guilt of pup concerned. The committee is not, therefore, inclined to alter its original recommendation in this case.

p23/r

In the circumstance, the original orders of my predecessor (Dr. B.B.Dey) in this case may be allowed to stand.

I have the honour to be,
Sir,
Your most obedient servant,

9/10

for Director of Public Instruction,
MADRAS.

**Enclosure**

(r)

Disposal No 126/45 of the office of the C. of E., Madras in original to be kindly returned when no longer required.

m.a./8-10.

~~185~~ 40

(22)

Edu and P.H. Dept.
G3.

Examination - S.S.L.C. - Public Examination 1945 - Malpractice - Tuticorin centre - Suit notice - Orders passed

pp 1-6 CF Read:- From Sri S.V. Subramania Iyer, Vakil Tuticorin Dt: 26-10-46.

pp 7-8 CF From the DPI R.C No 11065 - E-1/46 dt 1-12-46

pp 13-14 CF " " " " 31-3-47

p 39 CF " " " " 8-10-47

— o —

Order / Ms. No 2295 Edn dt. 30. X. 47

Sri S.V. Subramania Iyer is informed that ~~his~~ the request contained in his notice on behalf of Sri K. Subramanya Iyer, Tuticorin, and his son Sri K. S. Krishnan cannot be complied with.

para 12 on p 5 CF

p 15 17 CF

28. X. 47

Despd 5/11/47

To

Sri S.V. Subramania Iyer.
✓ Vakil. Tuticorin.
✓ The DPI. (with C).
Copy To: The Chief Ordnance Officer, Avadi, w.r.t. to his letter. No. 5313/B4/AQ 15-7-47. p 25 CF

21/X/47.

27-10-47

Notes

(23)

E+PH (G3)

Examination - S.S.L.C - Public Examination, 1945 - Malpractice - Tuticorin Centre - ~~Lawyer notice~~.

PP1-6 cf C.No. 66498/46 - From Sri S.V. Subramania Iyer, Vakil, Tuticorin, d/- 26/10/46

PP7-8 cf From the DPI. Rc.No. 11065-E-1/46 d/- 1-12-46

~~Memo~~

~~Order~~/ Ms. No. dt. - 46

Sri S.V. Subramania Iyer, is informed that the requests contained in his notice on behalf of Sri K. Subramania Iyer, Tuticorin, and his son K.S. Krishna ~~for himself and as next friend of his son, Sri K. S.K. whom~~ are inadmissible.

Based on DPI's conclusion at p. 8 cf

VCS
16/12/46.

23.12.46

To

Sri S.V. ~~Subramania Iyer~~

~~The DPI.~~ Vakil, Tuticorin

Note

May be sent to Legal Dept. for acceptance before circulation. This purports to be a suit notice under the Civil Procedure code. In the circumstances reported by the D.P.I. the threatened suit may be awaited. No reply seems necessary. The notice is dated 26.X.46 signed by the Advocate 30.X.46 and received by Govt on 1.11.46

VCS
16/12/46.

23.12.

25.12.46

Legal

0.54

E+PH (G3)

U.O.No. 66498-G3/46-2 Edn

3/1/47

ASSISTANT SECRETARY

- 6 JAN 1947

LEGAL DEPARTMENT.

Legal Department

In coming to the conclusion that the

G3

candidate was guilty of malpractice, the Chief Examiner appears to have relied solely on the fact that in an experiment on "Determination of the latent heat of steam" the same weight of steam and the same resulting temperature were given in the answer paper of the candidate as in that of another candidate which it is said is impossible except as a result of copying. Assuming this view is correct, it is no evidence to show that the boy under reference is guilty and not the other boy. If the facts stated in the notice which it is alleged are supported by the report of the Headmaster, are correct, then the theory that this boy was guilty of ~~copy~~ copying must necessarily fall to the ground. There seems to be no other evidence to show that the candidate copied from another candidate. The Director of Public Instruction may be requested to say whether there is any other evidence to support the conclusion of the Chief Examiner.

7-1-47 S.

8/1/47. E&PH.

Legal u.o 54-1
9.1.47

ASST. SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT
9 JAN 1947
EDUCATION AND PUBLIC HEALTH

1647

Pl. see Legal note ~~abov~~ which is recd. E&PH (G3)

~~A draft memo to the DPI is subd for approval~~. The records of the case with full containing full materials are not before us. The draft to DPI issue but. The statutory period of (suit notice i.e.) two months time expired on 1.1.47 and it is open to the party to file a valid suit in the Court unless he is asked not to do so pending examination of the case by Govt. Any such action may add to his grounds if ultimately his request is denied. Further, Govt. have no sufficient materials before them to take that course of action too. In the circumstances it is for consideration whether Govt. may proceed examining the case further irrespective of the course of action which the party may take. We may hope that the party will await Govt.'s orders on the suit notice.

18/1/47.

21.1.47.

Legal may kindly advise whether it is advisable to tell him merely that the question is under consideration

but see above.

22.1.47 S 23/1/47

Legal.

G3

Issue suffix the same to Legal

Issued as Memo. 66498-G3/46-3 Edn. 23-1-47

Legal Department

There is no objection to informing the petitioner that the question is under the consideration of the Government. This will not weaken the case of the Government if ultimately it is found that the petitioner has no case.

A

E&PH (G3)
Memo. 66498-G3/46-4 Edn.
29.1.47.

3.2.47 S. 3/2/47 E&PH

O. 962

ASSISTANT SECRETARY
30 JAN 1947
LEGAL DEPARTMENT.

Legal u.o. 0962/47-1
4.2.47.

E&PH (G3)

Please see Legal note above. An interim reply may be given to the legal adviser as at A above. A draft ~~reply~~ memo is subd. for approval.

8/2/47 8.2.47 S 11/2/47

ASSISTANT SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT
6 FEB 1947
10290

PP.9-10 ante [Issued as Memo. No. 66498-G3/46-3. Edn., d., 23-1-47.]

PP. 13-14 ante. No. 27086. From the D.P.I., Roc. No. 11065-E1/46, d. 31-3-47.

P. 13 c.f. Please see the reply from the D.P.I. on pages 13-14 c.f. to the Memo. on pages 9-10 c.f. The Director ~~D.P.I~~ refers to the records of the Office of the C.G.E., explaining why the Candidate, Sri K. S. Krishnan (24081) and

and not the other boy was guilty of malpractice in the examination and agrees with the views expressed therein. He also points out that the Headmaster's report in favour of the candidate in question does not appear to have been received in the office of the C.G.E. He, however, states that, on a perusal of the concerned school record, two letters on the subject might have been sent to the Secretary, S.S.L.C. Board. But he is of the view, for the reasons explained by him in his letter read above, that the opinion of the Headmaster need not be conclusive, though ~~it may be clear~~ it his opinion might have been clear.

P.P. 13-14 c.7.

P. 13 c.7.

A Pl see below

P. 14 c.7.

W
23.4.47

2. The report of the Assistant Examiner on pages 3-4 c.f., at (t), ~~and~~ the Chief Examiner's remarks thereon at page 1 c.f., and the notes on pages 2-3 n.f. of (t) may be perused. These records lead to the conclusion that Sri K.S. Krishnan is guilty of malpractice in the examination. In the circumstances, it is for orders whether the lawyer may be informed that his requests are inadmissible ~~as he has already been given an interim reply.~~ Legal may advise with reference to the records at (t).

p 11 c.f.

22/4/47.

av 23.4.47

A above. If the matter should be pursued copies of the Headmaster's letter may be called for before sending the case to Legal.

W
23.4.47

S

YS. It would, prima facie, make a lot of difference to the case as to whether the reports were not before the Sub-Committee or the C.G.E. when they arrived at their decisions.

W
23/4/47.

P

A draft Memo. to the D.P.I. is submitted for approval.

23/4/47.

av 23.4.47

W
23.4.47

[Issued as Memo. No. 27086-1-G3. Edn., d., 24-4-47.] P.P. 15-16 c.7.

C. No. 37584. From the D.P.I., Rc. No. 11065-E/46, d. 30-4-47. P. 17 c.7.

The D.P.I. has forwarded to Govt. copies

---

26

Copies of the letters called for in the Memo. at pages 15-16 c.7. — Vide page 18 c.7. The file may now be sent to the Legal Dept. for advice, ~~taking into~~ That Deptt will ~~[illegible]~~ doubtless take into consideration the letters in question ~~also~~ and the remarks of the D.P.I. on page 16 c.7. The point indicated at 'P' at p.4 ante.

3/5/47.

av 3.5.47

W
3.5.47

S

Legal

W
DS(W)

Legal.

E.&P.H. W.D. No.
27086-2-G3.
5-5-47.

5027

ASSISTANT SECRETARY
6 MAY 1947
LEGAL DEPARTMENT

C

A

LEGAL DEPARTMENT.

There is no direct evidence in this case that the student with register number 24081 copied from the answer paper of the student with register number 24105. The conclusion that the former student copied from the latter is based on inferences drawn from the answer books of the two candidates and the impossibility to obtain the same weight and the same resulting temperature. It is not possible for a layman to say how far this line of reasoning is so conclusive as to admit of no doubt and to exclude the possibility that the student found guilty might have crammed the answer from some previous experiment conducted by him. But it has to be said that the probabilities do not support this conclusion.

It is seen from the report of the Chief Superintendent that the students were strictly watched and no malpractices ~~was~~ were detected. The two students were sitting in opposite benches at a distance of about 20 to 25 feet apart. One of the reasons given by the members of the Sub-Committee is that the student with register number 24081 could easily have jotted down the relevant figures when moving about the laboratory in connection with weighing, etc. The sketch of the examination hall at flag (R) shows that the balances were behind the table on which the student with register number 24081 was working, and the gates were on the eastern and southern sides only. There could therefore have been no occasion for this student to go near or by the side of the table where the other student was working. The report of the Headmaster also shows that the student was well above the average of the class, and judged from his conduct during the school course, he could not have resorted to malpractice. The Board of Examiners had not the Headmaster's report before them and it is quite possible that they might have come to a different conclusion if they had these considerations before them. Taking all these circumstances into consideration, it cannot be said that it is proved beyond reasonable doubt that this student was guilty of malpractice. Before a penalty involving a stigma on the character of a student and loss of opportunity as the penalty in this case, is imposed, the guilt of the student should be reasonably clear but that cannot be said of this case.

A

X

There are decisions in which it has been held that a suit for reliefs of the nature claimed in para 12 of the suit notice is (see ILR 47 All 434 and ILR 40 Cal 588.) not maintainable. But in view of the circumstances stated above, the proper course seems to be to cancel the order of the Board.

B

20/5/47 E&PH

E.&P.H.(G3).

Legal no 5027c/47
21.5.47.

Asst. Secretary to Government
43594
2 MAY 1947
Education and Public Health Dept.

P. 23 of (t)

1/ The punishment inflicted on the candidate No. 24081 K.S.Krishnan by the S.S.L.C. Board for alleged malpractice was the following:--

The marks of the candidate at the Public Examination of 1945 and the School record for Form VI in 1944-45 were cancelled; he was further debarred from appearing for the Public Examination of 1946. The candidate has already undergone the punishment inflicted. It is not known whether the boy joined the School in the VI Form in 1946-47 and appeared for the S.S.L.C. Public Examination in April 1947.

2. The question for consideration is whether the candidate (No.24081) copied at the Public Examination of 1945. The notes of the members of the Examination Committee are at pages 2-3 ~~[illegible]~~, of 't' (D.P.I's Office

Dis.No.126/45 dated 5-7-1945). The views of Sri V. Jambunatha Iyer were that it was not possible for the student to write from memory the results as recorded in the previous records of his note-book; that all the mistakes and slips in the figures found in Script No. 24105 were faithfully repeated in the answer-book of candidate No.24081. The conclusion arrived at was that this boy copied the answer from candidate No.24105 while moving about in the laboratory in connection with weighing, fetching water, etc., and that it was easily possible to jot down the relevant figures required for the final calculation with or without the candidate's consent.

P. 3 of (t)

Ibid

3/ Legal, however, hold the view that the guilt of malpractice has not been proved beyond all reasonable doubt and that therefore the orders attaching stigma on the character of the student and loss of opportunity as a penalty, deserve to be cancelled. The legal opinion is thus contrary to the expert professional ~~[illegible]~~ view held by the Examination Committee.

'X' on p. 6 ante

I am inclined to agree with the views of Legal dept.
P. 18 C

4/ The report of the Headmaster which is now available was not before the Examination Committee and it is not known whether the Committee would have come to a different conclusion if they had that report before them when they gave the opinion.

~~The point for~~ It is for consideration, ~~is~~ whether the D.P.I., may be asked to refer to another Examination Committee the matter again with the additional information (the reports of the Headmaster) now available and to submit to Government the opinion of the Committee in the matter.

I do not think this is necessary.

5/ Any orders now issued must take into account the punishment mentioned in para 1 above, which has already been undergone by the candidate. The order if cancelled now may encourage the student to sue for ~~compensation~~. ~~For orders as to circulation.~~ Legal have however noted that there are decisions in which it has been held that a suit for reliefs of the nature claimed in para 12 of the suit notice

AV
22/5/47

P 6 ante. With reference para [illegible] I do not [illegible] is not maintainable.

6/ May be circulated to Hon(Edn), and Hon(Home). [illegible]

27.5.47

it would be feasible to allow item (2); if there is no case for allowing item (3), we are only giving the benefit of the doubt. We can only say that on the facts item (1) alone can be accepted.

Hon(Edn)

Hon(Home)

'T' at p.6 ante Box

I am not satisfied that Govt. have the legality to have to cancel the Board's order. That order was passed under a certain set of rules: in these rules there is no provision for Govt. interference. Nor a general revisional power be invoked apart from these rules.

Legal may kindly see and advise as to the exact form in which an order can be passed, to a reply sent to the notice of 'Dir.'

[illegible]

Legal.

A

Legal Department

The rules contained in the book relating to the S.S.L.C. scheme are only executive instructions and they have no statutory force. It is understood that the D.P.I. imposes punishments in his capacity as president of the Board and Commissioner of Examinations and that in such cases he acts generally on the advice of the Board. There is nothing in the rules that the order of the Board or the D.P.I. is final and consequently Government are not precluded from interfering with their orders.

E.&P.H. W.O. No. 27086-3-G3. 31-5-47.

(with Book)

(Sealed Cover)

C.No. 6083

2/6/47

ASSISTANT SECRETARY
C
-2 JUN 1947
LIC

B

As regards the actual relief to be given, if the order of the D.P.I. in this case is set aside, it will logically follow that the candidate's answer paper should be revalued and a certificate should be issued accordingly. It is not known whether he has appeared for the S.S.L.C. Examination held this year. If he has done so and has also been declared eligible, the course indicated above may not be necessary. The relief granted may be adjusted according to the circumstances, and the petitioner may be referred to the D.P.I. for orders on his petition.

A

Sealed Cover

16/6/47.

Legal 20. No 6083/47-1 16.6.47

E&PH G3

50252

Recd. on 17/6

The information referred to at 'A' above may be obtained from the D.P.I. A draft Memo. is submitted for approval.

20/6/47.

23.6.47

23.6.47

P. 21 c.7. Issued as ~~Memo.~~ No. 27086-4-G3. Edn., 2., 24-6-47

P. 23 c.7. C.No. 59336. From the D.P.I., Rc. No. 11065 E/46, d., 21-7-47.

P. 25 c.7. C.No. 57954. " " Chief Ordnance Officer, Avadi, No. 5313/BK/HQ, d., 15-7-47.

Please see the note of the Legal Dept. ~~from~~ page 8 ante. It has been ascertained from the D.P.I. that the candidate has not appeared for the Examination held this year. The file may be sent to the Legal Dept. w.o. for suggesting the suitable relief ~~action to be taken now in the matter~~ to be given.

2. A petition since read from the

10

the Candidate has been added to the C. 7. at pages 25-31. The immediate relief required seems to be that the candidate should be declared ~~[illegible]~~ ~~[illegible]~~ eligible for the College course by cancelling the order of the S.S.L.C. Bd; The other reliefs asked for in para 12 of the suit notice on p 5 c.f need not be granted - vide 'B' of the note of Legal Dept 6 ante.

28/7/47.

The ~~release~~ relief sought for in para 12 of the suit notice on page 5 c.f. are:--

(1) removal of the great slur on the boy's character by immediate cancellation of the order against him;

(2) declaring the boy eligible for College course; and

(3) expression of regret for the wrong done to the boy.

ITEMS (1) & (2) ABOVE: The Legal Dept. suggest that the orders of the Commr. for Govt. Examinations Dis. No. 126/45, dated 5-7-45 be set aside by Govt; The Commr. for Govt. Examinations will logically follow up this order by arranging for the revaluation of the particular paper in Physics, complete the entries in the S.S.L.C. Book of the boy and issue a supplementary eligible list if the boy secures the marks required for declaring him eligible.

May be done.

A specific direction may be given on these lines.

ITEM 3 ABOVE: As observed by Secretary on page 8 ante the relief prayed for need not be granted.

2. The case may be circulated to H.M.(Edn.) for orders.

30.7.47

30/7/47

H.M. (Edn.)

I am afraid this matter should be considered from a public point of view. It is ~~one thing~~ 1. whether we are entitled to interfere in a matter of examinations and ~~another~~ 2. whether in a matter like this we should not give an opportunity to the Commissioner for Examinations to meet the case that has been set up by Legal. In the circumstances, I would like to invite the opinion of the D.P.I. before issuing final orders in this matter.

TSA
1.8.47

1 - AUG 1947

11

Please see the minutes of H.M.(Edn) on page 10 ante. With reference to point 1. raised therein, attention is invited to the note of the Legal Dept. on page 8 ante. The Govt. can interfere in the matter. With reference to point 2 in the minutes, a u.o. note to the D.P.I. is submitted for approval.

5/8/47.

5/8/47

6.8.47

7/8/47

pp. 33-34 c.f. (issued as U.O. note No 27086-5 Edn dt. 7-8-47)

P. 33 c.7. C.No. 69534. From the Chief Ordnance Officer, Avadi, No. 2259/YD/LB, dated, 28-8-'47.

Please see the reminder from the Chief Ordnance Officer, Avadi, on page $\overset{37}{33}$ c.7. The matter is pending with the D.P.I. Please see the w.o. note to the D.P.I. on pages ($\overset{33-34\ CF}{13-14}$ ante). He was reminded on 25-8-'47. His reply may be awaited till 10-9-'47. An interim reply to the Chief Ordnance Officer ~~is~~ may be sent. A draft letter is submitted for approval.

~~p. 14 ante~~ removed from the file

2/9/47.

2.9.47

3/9/47

av 2.9.47

Issued as letter/Ref. No. 27086-7-G3. Edn., d., 3.9.'47.

f 3.9 CF

30

EDN.& P.H.(G3).

p 39CF

From the D.P.I., Roc. No. 11065-E/46, dated 8-10-47.

Attention is invited to the minutes of H.M.(Edn.) on p.10 ante, and the reply of the D.P.I. on page ~~17~~ 39CF to the U.O. note on ppx. ~~33-34~~ 33-34 ~~ante~~ CF.

p10 ante

2. H.M. has raised the question whether Govt. are entitled to interfere in matter of examinations. Attention is invited to the opinion of Legal Dept. on page 8 ante, wherein the view has been expressed that Govt. are not precluded from interfering with the orders of the Board of Examiners ~~of~~ or the D.P.I.

p10 ante

p 39CF

23/1

p 39CF

3. As directed by H.M., the opinion of the D.P.I. ~~have~~ has been obtained, and it is on p.39 ~~ante~~ C.F. The Director for the reasons mentioned by him has stated that the orders of his predecessor (Dr.B.B.Dey) may be allowed to stand. The Malpractice Committee ~~has~~ is also not inclined to alter ~~his~~ its original recommendation in the case.

4. The case may be circulated to H.M.(Edn.) and H.M.(Home) for orders.

11-X-47

14/10/47

H.M.(Edn.) ✓

H.M.(Home)

Bon

32
14/X

We may agree with the DPI.

TSA
15-10-47

Ingrae
16/X.

Please see the orders in circulation above. A draft order is submitted for approval.

27/X/47.

28-X-47

27-10-47