Supdt

Sectt. II-27—60,004—17-11-48

Edn. (19~~4~~50) Department.

MS SERIES. (1)

301

G.O. NO. (307) Edn.

Dated 4/2/50

(33)

[Despatch Abstract.]

Legislative Assembly Question no. 189 — Sri M. D. Thiagaraja Pillai M.L.A. Recognition of the Ramaswamy Aided Ele. School, Mappilaikuppam. Papers recorded

Back Papers.

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

Further Papers.

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

1

STARRED

Secretariat of the Madras
Legislature
(Assembly Section)
21/9/49

104/vel

p 23 CF

SRI M.D. THIAGARAJA PILLAI, M.L.A.,

EDUCATION AND PUBLIC HEALTH DEPTT.

*Q.No.189.- Will the Hon. the Minister for Education be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that the recognition of the Ramasamy Aided Elementary School, Mappillaikuppam, Nannilam has not been renewed and that yet the institution is allowed to function ;

(b) whether it is a fact that the teaching grant due to the school has not been paid and that the teachers are inconvenienced on this account; and

(c) what action is proposed to be taken ~~to~~ to ease the situation? ~~and~~

~~(d) whether this attitude of the Government is not contrary to the policy of the Government x to encourage Elementary Education in the Province?~~

E.P.H dept
Draft answers

'NO' — Recognition has been granted. from 17th Oct 1949

'NO' — Arrears of teaching grant and Dearness Allowance have been paid to the school

Does not arise

HB
12/1/50

12/1/50.

22/1/50

20

A.K.21/9

To. The Secretariat of Madras Legislature

Public (Elections) dept.

28/9

E.P.H.D.
No. 74826-E/49-2 Edn
24.1.50

(Draft answers approved by HM (E L))

2/

(M)

EP/6
C1

Legislative Assembly question No 189 – Sri. M.D. Thiagara
Pillai M.L.A – Recognition of the Ramaswamy Aided
Elementary School, Mappilaikuppam.

J.V.
10/10

4
10/10

Memo No 74826 – C1/49–1 Edu dated 8-10-49

A copy of the Legislative Assembly Question No 189 is forwarded to the D.P.I. He is requested to furnish at an early date the particulars required for answering the question and any supplementary questions ~~that may~~ likely to arise therefrom

To,
The D.P.I
(with a copy of the question)

WE

12/10

7/10/49

7/10/49

8/10/49

Legislative Assembly Question no 189 - Sri M.D. Thirup
Pillai M.L.A. - Recognition of the Ramaswamy Aide
Elementary School Mappidaikuppam.

Memo no 74826-C/49-1 Edn dated 8-10-49

A copy of the Legislative Assembly Question no
is forwarded to the D.P.I. He is requested to
furnish at an early date the particulars
required for answering the question and any
supplementary questions that may arise there

7/10/49

To
The D.P.I.
with a copy of the
question

3/9

EDUCATION DEPARTMENT

FROM
THE DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC INSTRUCTION, MADRAS.

To
The Secretary to Government,
Education and Public Health Dept.,
Madras.

1 NOV 1949

Rc.334 B2/49 dated 29-10-49

Sir,

824668

Sub:--Elementary Education--Aided--Ramaswamy Elementary School Mappidaikuppam--Renewal of Recognition

Ref:--Assembly Question No.189.

Detailed remarks on the subject have been submitted to Government in my Rc.No.334 B2/49 dated 16-3-49 while resubmitting another Government reference No.4030 C1/49-1 Education dated 5-2-49.

2. A copy of the Assembly Question under reference has been received without any endorsement or letter. Enclosures may be forwarded, if necessary for taking further action in the matter.

Yours faithfully,

31.10.49

For Director of Public Instruction

Clb.29-10-49

29/10

29.X

Rc 334 B2/49 4/9

Office of the Director of
Public Instruction, Madras
dated 29th October 1949

Subject: Elementary Education - Aided - Ramaswami Aided Elementary School, Mappillai Kuppam - Irregular termination of the services of teachers by the ~~management~~ manager

EDUCATION AND PUBLIC HEALTH DEPT.
- NOV

Reference: Memorandum dated 15-9-49 of the Manager of the above said school addressed to the Hon. Minister for Education bearing Government Endorsement No. 73638-C.1/49-1 Education dated 6-10-49

Resubmitted to the Secretary to Government, Education and Public Health Department.

85027

2. Details remarks on the subject have been submitted to Government in Rc 334 B2/49 dated 16-8-49 of the Director while resubmitting another Government Endorsement No. 4080 C1/49-1 Education dated 5-2-49.

31. 10.49

for Director of Public Instruction

To
The Secretary to Government,
Education and Public Health Department

SP 29.X

Vk 29.10

29/10

TELE :- "TYAGARAJAPILLAI"
M. D. TYAGARAJA PILLAI, M.L.A.
GENERAL MERCHANT.

KORADACHERI S. I. R.
(TANJORE DIST.)

5 Personal

⑥ 97

No. 226 C/ Date 15th Sept. '49

Dear Sir,

I am sorry that you should have cancelled your trip to Tanjore. I was eagerly looking forward to your visit.

During your visit I wanted to represent to you the case of an Aided Elementary School run at Mappillaikuppam. The Manager of the institution Mr. R. M. Narayanaswamy Pillai is a personal friend of mine since a long time. He is fighting out this case on a matter of principle because his case is so just. I enclose the Memorandum that we wanted to present to you.

ASST. SECRETARY TO GOVT., EDUCATION AND PUBLIC HEALTH
24 SEP 1949
73638

The only request I would make to you now is to spare a few minutes and acquaint yourself with the facts of the case. Then you will surely understand the justness of the Manager's case.

I hope that this representation to you will result in a quick disposal of the case.

With best regards,

Yours faithfully,

15/9

To
Sri. Madhava Menon Avl.
Minister for Education,
Government of Madras.
Madras.

6/ (7)

Mappillaikuppam,
15th Septe. 1949,

MEMORANDUM SUBMITTED TO THE HON. THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION? GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS.

I am the managerof the Ramasamy Aided Elementary School, Mappillaikuppam in Nannilam Taluk, Tanjore District.

My appeal to the Director of Public instructions, Madras, against the order of the Divisional Inspector of Schools, Mathurai, is remaining undisposed. The appeal was preferred by me on the 3rd of January this year. Although the appeal is nine months old it is strange that the Director of Public Instructions should remain silent without passing orders.

A copy of my reminder dated 3rd August 1949 addressed to the D. P. I. is attached for favour of your kind perusal. This will throw sufficient light on the situation.

I now pray that you will kindly intervene and cause favourable orders to be passed without further delay.

R. M. Narayanaswamy

Yours faithfully,

THE RAMASAMY AIDED ELEMENTARY SCHOOL, MAPPILLAIKUPPAM

Dated the 3rd August '49.

To
The Director of Public Instructions,
Government of Madras,
MADRAS.

Through:- The Proper Channel.

Sir,

I beg to invite your kind attention to my letter sent to you on the 3rd of January this year containing my appeal against the order passed by the Divisional Inspector of Schools, Madura, on my appeal dated 20-11-1948 to him Although seven months have elapsed, it is painful to note that no orders have been passed by you on my appeal to you. I am at a loss to understand the reason for this egregiously long silence on your part and I should deem it a favour if you would pass favourable orders on my appeal without furtar delay.

In this connection, I may be permitted to state certain facts and relevent points for your consideration:-

1. The teaching grant for the school has not been paid since January 1949. Consequently the seven teachers on the rolls have to suffer. It passes one's comprehension as to why the seven teachers, who have proved to be faithful honest, loyal and obedient should be put to untold hardship and suffering by being denied their remuneration grant for such a long period as eight months. The miserable plight of these teachers in such circumstances can be more easily imagined than described. The management have been paying a subsietence allowance to them purely from a humanitarian point of view.

2. I have been running the institution solely from a sense of public spiritedness and philanthropic outlook primarily for the purpose of enabling the poor and indigent peoples of the locality to get educated. It is that view that I have been collecting no tution fees for the school boys. This fact should be taken note of by you.

3. Mappillaikuppam is an area where compulsory primary education has been ordered by the Government. Mine is the only institution in the village.

4. There are about seven Harijan Students studying in the school and this fact I have specially to mention because Harijan Education forms part of the Government scheme of Harijan uplift.

5. It is the avowed object of our National Government to encourage Private Agencies to start schools in schoolless centres and to liberalise the rules concerning payment of grants etc. When that is so, instead of encouraging me to run the school and to expand its scope, it is needless to mention how painful it is to observe the apathy of the authorities in relation to my school.

6. The recognition of the school has not been renewed and I am kept in a state of suspense.

If a year is to lapse and still no order is passed it can be imagined how a public institution can be managed and run. What we pary now is a disposal of our appeal to you and relieve me from the state of suspense and lingering on.

Yours faithfully,

Advance copy sent direct(True Copy)

R.M. Ramasamy

Manager,

182

8

DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC INSTRUCTION
Re 334/B2/49
7-OCT 1949
Re334B2/49
MADRAS

B2

Education & Public Health (C1) dept

Endt No. 73638 - C1/49-1 Edu dated 6-10-49

Transferred to the Director of Public Instruction

To, The Director of
Public Instruction

Asst. Secretary to Govt
4/10/49

4/10/49

9/ ⓐ

EP/H
C1

P.C. to go

14/11

Issued
8/11

63/9-11

T.M dated

From,
The A.S. to Govt. E.P.H dept

To,
The D.P.I

Ref. Your letter No 334 B2/49 dated 29-10-49 regarding the renewal of recognition to the Ramaswamy ~~Ele~~ Elementary School, Mappillaikuppam

Please furnish a copy of your letter No 334 B2/49 dated 16-8-49 as it is not readily available here together with a copy of the petition sent to you with Govt. Endt No 4080-C1/49-1 Edu dt 5-2-49, if possible

7/11/49

8/11/49

10/4 ⑫

EDUCATION DEPARTMENT.

From

The Director of Public Instruction,
Madras.

To

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

Sir,

Roc.No.334-B2/49 dated 11-11-1949.

15 NOV 1949

88959

Sub: Elementary Education - Aided - Ramaswamy Elementary School - Mappillaikuppam - Irregular termination of the services of teachers.

****

Ref: Your Telephone Message dated 8-11-1949. P9 ante

-oOo-

I am herewith submitting copies of my R.C.No.334-B2/49 dated 16-8-1949 and the copy of petition sent with the Government Endorsement No.4080-C1/49-1 Edn dated 5-2-1949 as required in the telephonic message referred to above. P11 infra

Yours faithfully,

14.11.49

for Director of Public Instruction.

BR,11-11.

12-11

11/ (11)

Copy of Letter R.C.No.334-B2/49 dated 16-8-1949 of the Director of Public Instruction, Madras to the Secretary to Government, Education and Public Health Department, Madras.

Sub: Elementary Education - Aided Schools - Ramaswamy Aided School Mappillaikuppam - Tanjore District - Irregular termination of services of teachers - Appeal of the manager against the orders of the Divisional Inspector of Schools, Mathurai.

Ref: Letter dated 17-1-1949 from ~~the~~ Sri R. Vijayaraghavulu Naidu, Member Taluq Congress Committee, Nannilam referred for remarks in Government Endorsement No.4080-C1/49-1 Education dated 5-2-49.

RESUBMITTED.

2. Copies of Letter R.C. No.178 E/48 dated 22-12-48 and Endt. R.C.178-E/48 dated 1-3-1949 of the District Educational Officer, Tanjore and remarks offered in R.C.No.294-E2/49 dated 9-4-1949 of the Divisional Inspector of Schools, Madurai are enclosed herewith for favour of information.

pp14-17 infra
p14 infra
pp17-18 infra

3. In the circumstances explained by the Divisional Inspector there is no case to consider the request of the management in so far as it relates to the discharge of the teachers. Neither the District Educational Officer nor the Divisional Inspector of Schools appear to have pointed out ~~the~~ to the manager, at any stage, that he failed to make an enquiry, ~~that~~ himself or to obtain the teachers' explanation before he gave them, less than the prescribed donation of notice and this vital omission is being pointed out to the District Educational Officer and the Divisional Inspector of Schools. The District Educational Officer has been asked to accord Recognition and aid to the school from 1-1-1949 and the maintenance grant due to the school for 1948-~~49~~ will also be ordered to be paid after the payment of the salaries ~~to~~ due to the teachers whose services were terminated.

Copy of the petition dated 17-1-1949 of R. Vijayagaghavalu Naidu, Member of the Taluk Congress Committee, Nannilam and Member Dt. Congress Committee, Tanjore, Enangudi Post, Nannilam Taluk.

Sub: Elementary Education - Nannilam Taluk - Aided Elementary School Mappillaikuppam.

I have been deputed by the Nannilam Taluk Congress committee at its meeting held on 9-1-1949 resolved as per resolution No.8 to enquire about the appeal of the Manager of the school against the orders of the D.E.O. Tanjore, regarding extension of recognition, payment of grant to the school and payment of salary to three teachers, discharged from service in lieu of three months salary.

As per para five of the petition dated 8-1-1949 of the Manager, of the school was not favoured with any reply of the D.E.O. Tanjore regarding his request for removing the three teachers of his school for writing false petitions against the managements of the school and for their bad conduct.

As per para six the D.E.O. Tanjore enquired into the matter at th school in May 4th 1948. He has not enquired into the matter of the Manager's complaint against the misbehaviour of the three teachers. This encouraged the teachers against the management. The management found it necessary to discharge the teachers immediately from the school as otherwise the manager apprehended some danger and loss to the institution by the continuance of the teachers on the staff any further. He again requested to the D.E.O. Tanjore, to accord reopening of the school. The D.E.O. tanjore was silent on this matter, The Manager relieved the teachers on 10-6-48 the next day of the reopening date 9-6-48. The three teachers left the school on 10-6-48 and they have not yet made any objection to the Manager in having relieved them within three months. The Manager in fact has been good enough to relieve the teachers after the re-opening date as decided by them so that they may be benifitted by the vacation salary and the matter was reported to the D.E.O. Tanjore. The D.E.O. Tanjore thereupon has pointed out to the Management that th that the relief of teachers without three months notice wasirregular and that he should pay the teachers three months salary.

As per para 7 of the D.E.O. Tanjore has evidentally failed in not having passed such orders even before the relief of the teachers. Then the management requested the D.E.O.Tanjore to reconsider this orders and approve of his action in having relieved of the teachers without three months notice in the circumstances stated by him. The D.E.O. Tanjore refused to reconsider the orders. Then an appeal was preferred before the Divisional Inspector of Schools Madura against the orders of the District Educational Officer, Tanjore.

As per para 8 of the D.E.O. Tanjore has stopped the grant from April 1948 and has asked the manager to state the recognition of the school should not with drawn for the failure of the management in the matter from 31.12.1948 and why the teachers should not be paid direct.

As per para No.9 of the manager has not been paid the grant for the school from April 1948, but the Manager has ~~bxxx~~ paid the teachers from private resources and has thus been helped the poor teachess. The manager has explained in detail to the D.E.O. Tanjore that he should be paid grants to enable him to disperse the salries to the teachers deducting the advances paid to them by him and that the continuance of recognition of the school from 1-1-1949 is necessary.

I went on surprise visit to the school on 17-1-1949 all the necessary seven teachers were present, on the number of rools of 202 pupils 162 were present.

I am very much impressed with the working condition of the school.

The school was opened by Sri R.M. Narayanaswami Pillai on an Philantharapid basis in February 1946 with a single teacher on the staff with about 25 pupils. The school has rapidly progresssed during these yers to such an extent that there are now 7 teachers on the staff and 202 pupils on the rools. The school is catterring to the educational needs of the backward children only free of fees and this is the only school in the whole of Mappilkuppam area where Compulsory education is in force. The school deserved every encouragement ~~mixtha~~ as it is run freely for backward children. The encouragement as it is run freely for backward children. The action of the management in having removed the misbehavied teachers within three months notice should be approved by the D.E.O. Tanjore. The mangger has been magnonimus with these bad teachers by allowing them to continue on the staff till the reopening date so as to be henifitted by the vacation salary. The misbehavied teaches do not deserve any encouragement other than the leave salary. In fact they should have been discharged from theschool even on the day of closing of the school, in May 1948 just after the enquiry of the D.E.O. Tanjore.

It is regretted to note that the D.E.O. Tanjore has not enquired the petition writers (the three teaches) when the Manager has complained against them. ~~xxxxxxxx~~ Secondly the District Educational Officer, Tanjore has failed to pass orders and the request of the Manager to leave the teachers immediately but actually passed orders only after the relief of the teachers. This evidently speaks of the prejudice of the D.E.O. Tanjore against the Manager who is on the right line and the siding of the D.E.O.Tanjore with the misbehaved teachess. The D.E.O. Tanjore has punished the Headmaster Sri P. Kandaswami on the ground that he had not maintained records properly. The D.E.O. Tanjore should have also punished the petition writers (three teachers) for their misconduct as pointed out by the manager in his remakrs on the petition written by the three teachers.

I therefore pray that the action of the manager in having removing the three teachers without three months notice be approved that the ma nager should be paid grants to the school from April 48

G.F. 32.

DEPARTMENT.

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

Registered

Received

From (Name)

(Designation)

Post Box ______ (Station) ______

Telegraphic Address

To

The

Sir,

No. ______, dated ______ 19 .

ENCLOSURES.

SPARE COPIES.

April 1949 and that the school be granted further recognition as it is running properly and benefitting children and that petition writers also the three teachers be punished for their misbehaviours.

I am herewith enclosing the appeal of the Manager along with the Taluk Congress Committee Resolutions.

EDUCATION AND PUBLIC HEALTH DEPARTMENT (C.1)

Endorsement: 4080-C1/49-1 Edn dated 5-2-1949.

Referred to the Director of Public Instruction for remarks.

Sd.

Assistant Secretary to Government.

TRUE COPY

14. 11. 49

FOR Director of Public Instruction.

BR, 11-11.

14 ⑭

Copy of letter R.C.No.178-E/48 dated 1-3-1949 of the District Educational Officer, Tanjore to the Divisional Inspector of Schools, Mathurai.

Sub: Elementary Education - Aided Schools - Irregular relief of
teachers - Ramaswami Aided Elementary School, Mappillaikuppam
Nannilam Range - Appeal against the orders of the Divisional
Inspector of Schools, Mathurai remarks - Submitting the.

Ref: 1- Petition dated 30-1-1949 from the manager addressed to the
Director with its enclosures.
2. Petition dated 17-1-49 from Sri R. Vijayaraghavalu Naidu,
District Congress committee Member, Tanjore with its enclosures.
3. Endt. NRC.No.334.B2/49 d/15-2-49 of the Director of Public
Instruction, Madras.

Resubmitted to the Divisional Inspector of Schools, Mathurai.

2. The appeal has been preferred against the orders of the District Educational Officer directing the management to pay the compensation due to the three teachers in question for their irregular relief without adequate notice and against the orders passed the Divisional Inspector of Schools, Mathurai in his Proceedings Dis.87/49 dated 17-1-49.

3. Detailed remarks on the matter have already been offered by the District Educational Officer in this office letter R.C.No.178-E/49 d-12-12-1948 a copy of which is also enclosed herewith. The management h has not brought forward any new grounds for the irregular action adopted in having relieved the teachers without adequate notice as per rules. The main reason put forth in the appeal to justify its action is that the management did not receive the orders from the D.E.O. granting permission to remove the teachers in quetion of disciplinary grounds without adequate notice. Detailed remarks on this point also have been furnished in this office letter mentioned above.

4. The second and third instalments of grants for 1948 which were withheld in accordance with the instructions contained in Rule 24 (c) of the rules relating to elementary schools having since beenpaid ~~the~~ to the management with reference to para 2 of the Proceedings Dis.87/49 dated 17-1-49 of the Divisional Inspector of Schools, Mathurai. The balance of the teaching grant and dearness allowance due to the school for 1948 has also been paid last week in the final instalment. The Management Grant alone is withheld instructed in the Proceedings L.Dis.C.1205-E2/48 dated 8-11-48 of the Divisional Inspector of Schools, Mathurai.

5. The school was enjoying temporary recognition and aid upto 31-12-1948. As the management has violated the Rules for recognition in that it relieved the teachers in question without adequate notice, the question of grant of further recognition and aid from 1-1-49 is kept pending disposal.

Copy of Letter R.C.No.178-E/48 dated 12-12-48 of the District Educational Officer. Tanjore to the Divisional Inspector of Schools, Mathurai.

Sub: Elementary Education - Aided - Irregular relief of teachers -
Ramasami Aided Elementary School, Mappillaikuppam, Nannilam Range
Appeal against the orders of the D.E.O. - remarks - Submitting the.

Ref: 1; Petition dated 20-11-1948 from the Manager of the School
(Copy submitted direct.
2. Your Proceedings Roc.No.1330-E2/48 dated 28-11-48.

I submit the following remarks on the matter.

Three teachers by name (i) N.S. Sundaresan, (ii) M.V. Narayanaswami and (iii) K. Gopalasami of the aided elementary school, Mapillaikuppam sent in a petition dated 21-2-1948 alleging certain irregularities against the Headmaster of the school in regard to the maintenance of certain registers.and against the management of the school. The petition was referred to the Deputy Inspector of Schools, Nannilam for enquiry and report. The Deputy Inspector of schools submitted his findings on the complaint in his letter dated 14-4-48.

G.P. 33.

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

DEPARTMENT.

Received ____ Registered ____

From (Name)
(Designation)
Post Box ____, (Station) ____,
Telegraphic Address ____

To
The

No. ____, dated ____ 19

Sir,

Enclosures
Spare Copies

As it was thought on further petitions received from the teachers that the Deputy Inspector of Schools was not dispassionate in dealing with the case, and in accofdance with the instructions contained in your D.O dated 3-8-48, an enquiry was conducted by me and a detailed report on the results of my enquiry was submitted to you in my letter Rc.No.178 E/48 dated 31-5-48. Final orders were passed by the Director of Public Instruction, Madras in his Proceedings R.C.No.~~1000~~ 1090-C4/48 dated 27-8-48 communicated to me in your Dis.1028/49 d-11-8-48.

The manager of the school while furnishing his explanation in his letter dated 10-4-48 to the Deputy Inspector of Schools, Nannilam for the allegations brought against him, sought for permission in condluding portion of his letter to dispense with the services of the three complianants without three months' Notice. The main reasons attributed for his request were that the teachers had complained against him and the Headmaster and that in case they were given three months' notice they would bring further trouble on ~~by me on 21-4-48.~~ the manager and to the school. This letter was received by me on 21.4.48 along with the report of the Deputy Inspector. Without waiting for the results of the enquiry and in the absence of any instructions to his request for removing the complainants without notice and against his own statement in his letter dated 10-4-48 that the issue of notice would be detrimental to him and to the school, the manager issued notices to the three compalinant teachers on 20-5-48 (Copies of which were not at all received from the manager) as stated to have been sent by him), stating that their services will be terminated by appointing substitutes in their places, the main reason for the discharge being that he did not like their continuance in the school as they have complained against the management and the Headmaster. Two of the complainant teacher sent in a petition on 1-6-48 enclosing copies of the notices issued by the manager and protesting against the action of the manager in having issued a notice contrary to the rules on the subject and seeking redress over his action.

About the same time the Manager again in his letter dated 2-6-48 sought for permission to remove the teachers on 9-6-48 (re-opening day of the summer vacation) inviting attention to his previous letter dated 10-4-48. He did not make any mention in this letter regarding the notices issued by him to the teachers. His statement in his appeal petition that he sent copies of the notices to me is only an after thought to justify his action. The manager dispensed with the services of the three teachers in question on 10-6-48 and reported to this office in his letter dated 10-6-48 received on 11-6-48 that he had discharged them apprehending troublefrom them and as he was not in receipt of any orders from me.

On the appeal preferred by the two teachers againstthe action of the manager in having removed them from service the manager was informed in this office Rc.178-E/48 dated 12-6-48 that his action was not in order and opposed to rules and therefore he should pay them their salary which falls short of three months, as there was no disciplinary grounds to remove the three teachers without adequate notice expecting the fact that they brought to light certain irregularities committed by the Headmastter. The manager preferred a petition against these orders on 27-6-48 and he was informed in this office Rc.178-E48 dated 8-7-48 that in case he produced letters from the three teachers to the effect that they are aggeeable to the relief, the orders passed would be reconsidered. Finding this impossible the manager sent in another petition dn 31-7-48 for reconsideration of the orders. He was informed in this office Rc. No.178-E/48 dated 24-8-48 that there were no grounds for reconsideration of the orders as he did not care to wait for the orders of the authority on the results of the enquiry.

The appeal has been preferred against these orders.

The main reason put forth in his appeal to justify his action in having relieved the teachers without notice is that he did not receive orders from me granting him permission to remove them on disciplinary grounds. In this connection I submit the following:--

1. The mere fact that he applied for and did not carry with it any guarantee that his action will be upheld.

C.F. 32.

..................DEPARTMENT.

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

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

From (Name)

(Designation)

Post Box.........., (Station)..................

Telegraphic Address..................

To

The

No.........., dated..................194 .

Sir,

*

Enclosures..........

....

....

Spare Copies..........

---

2. The manager knew that an enquiry was conducted by me and that therefore he should have awaited orders on the results of the enquiry

3. He also knew, according to his statement, in his appeal that the issue of three months' notice is required by the rules.

4. The manager consulted the Deputy Inspector of Schools, Nannilam in May 1948 (before relieving the teachers) and told him orally that he had decided to relieve the teachers and that the teachers had requested him to relieve them on the re-opening day after summer vacation so that they might be benifitted by the vacation salary. The Deputy Inspector of Schools reports that he advised the manager that he might relieve the teachers only if they agreed to their relief. Please see the letter of the Deputy Inspector of Schools, Nannilam Rc.1-A/48 dated 19-10-48.

Despite all these, and despite the advise of the Deputy Inspecto of Schools the manager presumed matters to suit his own point of view and removed the teahers. The manager who was careful enough to apply for permission to remove the teachers because they sent up a petiton and thereby brought to light certain irregularities, should have also known that he could do so only with their prior approval of the D.E.O

It may kindly be seen from the above facts that the action of th management was opposed to rules and therefore it is submitted that the first request in the appeal petition namely not to insist on the payment of salary to teachers in lieu of notice is not tenable, as th action adopted by the manager was entirely at his own risk.

It may also be questioned why no orders were passed on the request on the manager contained in his letter dated 10-4-48 I submit the following:-

1. The petition of the manager dated 10-4-48 is only an explanation for the allegations against him, which was submitted in origin to you along with my report.

2. As the matters had to go to the Director of Public Instruction, Madras for final decision it was thought that his orders should be awaited on my report.

3. The manager has consulted the Deputy Inspector of Schools, Nannilam on the matter and the Deputy Inspector has advised him that he could relieve the teachers only if they are agreeable to their relief.

Two of the teachers mentioned above complained to you also against their discharge without adequate notice.and the petition was referred to me for remakrs in your NRC No.740E2/48 d/ 30-6-48. The petition was resubmitted to you with my remakrs on 20-7-48 and you have recorded the papers in your L.Dis.No.C.740-E2/48 dated 5-8-48.

The manager reports that the third teacher did not protest against his relief either to him or to the authorities. It is true, that he did not submit any petition to me on the matter. But it cannot be construed that he was agreeable to his discharge. The manager was not also able to produce letters of consent for relief from any of the three teachers, though he was advised to do so.

With regard to second request of the manager viz., payment of grant for the second and third instalment, I invite your kind attention to my letter Rc.178-E2/48 dated 10-10-1948 and your Proceedings L.Dis.C.No.1025-E2/48 dated 8-11-1948. As instructed in para 2 of the Manager has been asked through the Deputy Inspector of Schoo Nannilam to show cause why the recognition of the school should not be withdrawn and his reply is still awaited. As instructed in para 1 the Deputy Inspector was addressed and he has furnished necessary particulars for payment of grant and dearness allowance due to the teachers from 1-4-1948 to 30-9-48 direct to them. The manager of the school objects to the direct payment stating that he has advanced them money from his RiceMill funds on the understanding that the amount would be adjusted in the teacher in the teaching grant due to them, that he has got their signatures therefore, that he would ~~putx~~ be put to monetary loss and humiliation and that he would pay all the teachers serving in the school their dues and produce the acquittance if the amount is paid to him. The Deputy Inspecto of schools reports in the school all the teachers have received ~~pay~~ their pay and allowance upto 31-3-48 only. Though the private transaction of the manager with the teachers having no bearing on the department, ~~Ixxm~~ yet in view of the objections of the manger, I am addressing the Deputy Inspector to ascertain from each teacher if he has received any money from the manager, and if so in what connection and whether the amount may be adjusted in the teaching grant amount due to him. I shall persue further action for the payment of grant to the teachers as instructed by you in para 1 of your Proceedings referred to above and defer the payment till orders are received on the appeal preferred.

With regard to the third request of the manager in his appeal petition read with what is stated in para 3 of the same "the management and its activities" it is submitted that all these are quite out of place to the issue.

In the circumstances stated above, I hold the view that the action of the manager in having removed the three teachers without adequate notice is opposed to rules.

The school enjoys temporary recognition and aid upto 31-12-48. As the manager has violated the conditions of recognition he has been informed through the Deputy Inspector of Schools, Nannilam that the grant of further recognition would be refused if the question was not settled.

I am submitting herewith this office file of papers number 277 pages for favour of your kind perusal and early orders.

Sd. District Educational Officer, Tanjo

Copy of Letter R.C,No.294-E2/49 dated 9-4-49 of the Divisional Inspector of Schools, Mathurai Division. to the Director of Public Instruction, Madras.

Sub: Elementary Education = Aided - Irregular relief of teachers of the Ramasamy Aided Elementary School, Mappillaikuppam - Tanjore Dt. - Appeal against the orders of the Divisional Inspector of Schools.

Ref:
1. Endt. NRC334-B2/49 dated 15-2-49 of the D.P.I.
2. Endt. Rc.No.178-E/48 dated 1-3-49 of the D.E.O. Tanjore.
3. Letters R.C.No.178E/48 dated 10-3-49 and 20-3-49 of the D.E.O.Tanjo

---

Submitted to the Director of Public Instruction, Madras with the remarks of the D.E.O. Tanjore in his endorsement R.C.No.178-E/48 dated 1-3-49.

2. Three teachers of the school under reference complained against the management and the headmaster of the school about certain irregularities and final orders were passed by the Director on the complaint in his Proceedings Roc.No.1090-C4/48 dated 28-7-48. While this complaint was under correspondence and final orders on the same were pending, the Manager of the school relieved the three teachers without 3 months' Notice in contravention of rule 13 (2) of the rules for recognition. He gave a short notice on 20-5-48 and relieved the teachers on 10-6-48. Two of the teachers protested against the action of the manager in having issued notices contrary to rules and wrote to the D.E.O. Tanjore on 1-6-48 seeking redress against the action of the Manager. In the meanwhile the manager of the school reported to the D.E.O. that he had discharged the teachers on 10-6-48. The D.E.O. passed orders directing the manager to pay the teachers their salary for two months and 10 days (i.e., 3 months minus 20 days - period of short notice) as there were no disciplinary grounds to remove the teachers without 3 months notice excepting the fact that they brought to light certain irregularities committed by the Headmaster of the school. The Manager requested reconsideration of orders of the D.E.O. and this was not complied with since there were no grounds. Since the Manager of the school was persistant in not paying the salary to the three teachers relieved without 3 months' notice, the payment of second and third instalment of teaching grant was withheld by the D.E.O. with reference to rule 24 (c) of the rules for aid. But the other teachers of the school represented their difficulties to the D.E.O. on account of non-receipt of teaching grant and dearness allowance for II and III instalments. The D.E.O. suggested to the Divl.

the Divisional Inspector of Schools that the maintenance grant may be withheld and the teachers who were relieved without 3 months' notice can be paid from the maintenance grant and requested orders whether the other teachers serving in the school may be paid direct. The D.E.O. was instructed to pay the teachers who were serving in the school direct and to disallow the maintenance grant with reference to rule 7 (ii) of the rules for aid and to ask the managgement to show cause why recognition should not be withhe for the default of having relieved the teachers without 3 months' notice and for nonpayment of salary in lieu of notice. The manager objected the ~~grant~~ direct payment of grants to teachers stating that he advanced monies to teachers from his own funds and preferred an appeal to the Divisional Inspector against the orders of the D.E.O. ordering payment of compensation to the teachers relieved without 3 months' notice). The appeal was rejected by me but the payment of II and III instalments of teaching grant due to the school was ordered to be paid to the manager of the school since the teache themselves expressed their consent to pay the instalment grants to the manag Now the manager has preferred this appeal to the Director against the orders of the Divisional Inspector rejecting the appeal. The following are the requests of the manager put forth in his appeal.

a) To set aside the orders of the D.E.O. ordering payment of compensation to teachers.
b) To pay the instalment grant and maintenance grant.
c) To debar the teachers from employment under recognised schools and
d) to continue the recognition and aid of his school.

(a) The action of the manager in having discharged the teachers witho 3 months' notice and without specific approval of the D.E.O. is a voilation of Rule 13 (2) of the rules for recognition. The contention of the manager that he applied for approval of the D.E.O. to take action against the teach and there was delay in theD.E.O's Office is not tenable under the circumstances explained by the D.E.O. - Please see his remarks in his R.C.178-E/48 dated 12-12-48. The manager cannot discharge teachers on his own authority on disciplinary grounds without the approval of the D.E.O.

(b) The manager has since been paid the instalment grants sudeto the teachers for 1948. But the maintenance grant is not sanctioned with refere ce to rule 7 (ii) of therules for aid since the action of the manager is irregular in having relieved the teachers without 3 months' notice.

(c) The teachers are not found guilty and this is not acceptable.

(d) For the default of having relieved the teachers without 3 months' notice and for nonpayment of salary in lieu of notice, the D.E.O. was also instructed to ask the manager to show cause as to why recognition of his school should not be withdrawn. The school was enjoying temporary recognition and aid only upto 31-12-48. The question of granting further recognition is kept pending.

I am of opinion that the disallwoance of maintenance grant for 1948 will be an adequate penalty and it should stand. The D.E.O. may be asked to grant further recognition and aid to the school.

TRUE COPY

14. 11. 49

FOR DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC INSTRUCTION.

BR,12-11.

EPH
4

19

19

~~P.C. to Go~~

T.M. dated 22/11/49
From, The A.S. to Govt, E&P.H. dept
To, The D.P.I.

Ref. your letter No. 334-B_2/49 dated 11-11-49 regarding recognition to Ramaswamy Elementary School, Mappillaikuppam

Please ~~state~~ say whether recognition has since been accorded to the Ramaswamy Elementary School, Mappillai kuppam and if so from what date and also state whether the teaching grant due to the school has been paid

BM
22/11/49

21/11/49

21/11/49

8/11

Issued.
23/11/49

23/11

9300 ~~CY~~

POST COPY OF THE TELEPHONIC MESSAGE RC.NO.934 B2/49 dated 24.1

(20)

From
The Director of Public Instruction, Madras.
To
The Assistant Secretary to Government, Education and
Public Health Department.

****

29 NOV 1949

Sub: Elementary Education - Ramaswami Elementary School, Mappilaikkuppam - Renewal of Recognition and payment of Grant.

Ref: Your Telephonic Message dated 23rd November, 1949. p 19 ante

93300

The Divisional Inspector, Mathurai has been instructed to restore the recgonition of the school from 1.1.49. Permission has also been accorded to pay the maintenance grant due to the management. The exact position regarding actual disbursement of grant cannot be reported immediately as the sanctioning officer for teaching grant is the District Educational Officer from whom particulars will be obtained and submitted as early as possible.

for Director of Public Instruction.

Copy to:
The District Educational Officer, Tanjore for necessary action with a copy of telephonic message.

EA $\frac{}{C_1}$

Mayl.O. till 25/12/49

5/12/49

5/12/49

$\frac{\text{ON}}{6/12/49}$

21 C1

(2)

Copy of the Madras Legislature Secretariat u.o. note No.7031/49-2 M.L. dated 6-12-49 to the Education & Public Health Department.

Sub:- Questions - Madras Legislative Assembly - Receipt of answers.

Ref:- This office u.o.note No.7031/49-1 M.L.dated 17-10-49.

In continuation of this office u.o. note cited above, the undermentioned departments of the Secretariat may be requested u.o. to be so good as to expedite the answers to questions noted against them.

Regarding the recognition ... to Ramaswami ...

T. Hanumanthappa,
Assistant Secretary,
Madras Legislature.

Issued

To Edn.& P.H. Dept.

10.905

Please expedite your reply

Question Numbers.

~~111, 148, 153, 164, 165, 167, 168, 169, 182,~~ 189, ~~233, 272,~~
~~298, 325, 326, 338, 341, 346, 347, 349, 350, 387, 388, 394,~~
~~410, 414, 426, 431, 440, 447, 448, 452, 480, 481, 500, 506~~
~~and 508.~~

4/1/50

4/1/50

Government of Madras.
Education & Public Health Department.
U.O.Note No.98733 D3/49-1, P.H. dated 27-12-1949.

Please see the u.o. note from the Legislature Secretariat above. Copies of that note may be given to the Sections concerned for necessary action.

T. Govinda Menon,
Deputy Secretary to Government.

To Sections A, B1, B2, C1, C2, H, I, L, M, T and W.

Forwarded/By order.

K Krishnaswamy
SS. Superintendent.

E & P.H (C1)

L.A.Q.189 referred to above has not been received in this seat.

SR
3/1/49

Thro' M B
3/1/50
D K R.

The question has been received in my seat. A further reply from the D.P.I is still awaited

3/1/50

Please remind the D.P.I

3/1/50

Noted
4/1/50

28/

Edn/c1

P.C. to go

T.M dated 5/1/50 22

From, The A.S. to Govt, Edn. H dept
To, The D.P.I

P20CP. Ref. Your ~~letter No.~~ T.M. No. 334 B2/49 dated 24-11-49 regarding the recognition and payment of grant to Ramaswami Elementary School, Mappillaikuppam

Please expedite your reply

Issued 11/32 7/1
6/1/50

per copy 10/1

4/1/50

4/1/50

5/1/50

~~23~~
~~ASI~~ ~~9~~ (23)

Roc No. 334 B7/49

Office of the
Director of Public Instruction
Madras. 5-1-50

From

The Director of Public Instruction,
Madras.

ASST. SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT
8 - JAN 1950
EDUCATION AND PUBLIC HEALTH DEPT.

To

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

Sir,

1910

Sub:- Elementary Education - aided schools-Ramaswamy Elementary school, Mappillaicuppam- ~~removal~~ Renewal of recognition and payment of arrears of teaching grant -

Ref:-1. Assembly question 189 and Telephonic Message of Government dated 23-11-49 p.ll ante
2. Letter from the District Educational Officer Tanjore, Rc No. 178 E/48 dated 30-11-49 p.ul infra

I have the honour to submit herewith a copy of the District Educational Officer's letter quoted above on the renewal of ~~R~~ 'Recognition' and payment of arrears to the Ramaswamy Elementary School, Mappllaikuppam.

The answers are as follows:-

(a) It is not a fact that the Recognition of the Ramaswamy Aided Elementary school has not been renewed. Recognition was granted on 17th October 1949.

(b) Arrears of Teaching grant and Dearness Allowance have been paid to the school.

(c) Does not arise.

Yours faithfully,

For Director of Public Instruction.

MSR 6/1
6.1.50.

24

24

Copy of the District Educational Officer's letter Rc No.178E/48 dated 30-11-49 addressed to the Director of Public Instruction, Madras

Sir,

Sub:- Elementary Education - Aided schools- Ramasamy Elementary school, Mappilaikuppam-renewal of recognition and payment of arrears of Teaching Grant.
Ref:-Your proceedings Rc 334 B2/49 dated 24-11-49.

I submit that continuance of recognition and aid for the school from 1-1-1949 has already been granted in this office Rc No. 178E/48 dated 17-10-49 with reference to your proceedings Rc 334 B2/49 dated 16-8-49 and that the arrears of Teaching Grant and Dearness allowance due to the school from 1-1-1949 to 30-9-49 have also been paid to the management.

In regard to the payment of arrear maintenance grant for 1948, I submit that the manager of the school who was asked to pay the teachers the salary due to them by way of compensation in lieu of full notice, has reported that the compensation due to the teachers may be paid to them direct out of the amount of the maintenance grant for 1948 and that the balance may be paid to him. Such amount as may be due to the teachers by way of compensation will be paid to them direct as desired by the manager and the balance paid to the manager shortly.

Sd. A.V. Tyagarajan
District Educational Officer
Tanjore

/True Copy/

For Director of Public Instruction

6.1.50

26

B2

Post copy of the Telephonic Message ~~Roc~~ Roc.No. 334 B4/49.

C/

Office of the
Director of Public Instruction,
Madras, Dated 7th January 1950.

From
The Director of Public Instruction, Madras.

To
The Assistant Secretary to Government,
Education and Public Health Department.

ASST. SECRETARY
11 JAN 1950
254

Sub: Elementary Education - Ramaswami Elementary School, Mappillaicuppam - renewal of recognition and payment of grant.

Ref: Your Telephonic Message dated 6th January 1950. p 22 ante

....

A further report has been submitted to Government in this office letter Roc.No.334 B7/49 dated 5th January 1950. pp 23-24 ante

for Director of Public Instruction.

MB 9-1.
9.1.50
9/1/50

C1 (26) R2817

This was returned by CDB stating that the Legn. sectt. refuses to receive these answers

2/2/50

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY QUESTION NO.189 - STARRED.

Sri M.D. Thiagaraja Pillai, M.L.A.

****

STARRED.

Will the Hon'ble the Minister for Education be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that the recognition of the Ramasamy Aided Elementary School, Mappillaikuppam, Nannilam has not been renewed and that yet the institution is allowed to function;

(b) whether it is a fact that the teaching grant due to the school has not been paid and that the teachers are inconvenienced on this account; and

(c) what action is proposed to be taken to ease the situation?

Education and Public Health Department.

Answer.

(a) 'No'. - Recognition has been granted from 17th October 1949.

(b) 'No' - Arrears of teaching grant and Dearness Allowance have been paid to the School.

(c) Does not arise.

for Secretary to Government.

To

The Secretariat of Madras Legislature. (15 Copies)
" Public (Election) Department ~~(copies)~~

The above answer has been approved by the Hon'ble Mr. K. Madhava Menon.

E. &.P.H. U.O.No.74826-C1/49-2. Education

Dated 24th January 1950.

JV.24-1.

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY QUESTION NO.189 - STARRED.

Sri M.D. Thiagaraja Pillai, M.L.A.

****

STARRED.

Will the Hon'ble the Minister for Education be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that the recognition of the Ramasamy Aided Elementary School, Mappillaikuppam, Nannilam has not been renewed and that yet the institution is allowed to function;

(b) whether it is a fact that the teaching grant due to the school has not been paid and that the teachers are inconvenienced on this account; and

(c) what action is proposed to be taken to ease the situation?

Education and Public Health Department.

Answer.

(a) 'No'. - Recognition has been granted from 17th October 1949.

(b) 'No' - Arrears of teaching grant and Dearness Allowance have been paid to the School.

(c) Does not arise.

for Secretary to Government.

To
The Secretariat of Madras Legislature. (15 copies)
" Public (Election) Department ~~(15 copies)~~

The above answer has been approved by the Hon'ble Mr. K. Madhava Menon.

E. &.P.H. U.O.No.74826-C1/49-2, Education

Dated 24th January 1950.

JV.24-1.

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY QUESTION NO.189 - STARRED.

Sri M.D. Thiagaraja Pillai, M.L.A.

****

STARRED.

Will the Hon'ble the Minister for Education be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that the recognition of the Ramasamy Aided Elementary School, Mappillaikuppan, Nannilam has not been renewed and that yet the institution is allowed to function;

(b) whether it is a fact that the teaching grant due to the school has not been paid and that the teachers are inconvenienced on this account; and

(c) what action is proposed to be taken to ease the situation?

Education and Public Health Department.

ANSWER.

(a) 'No'. - Recognition has been granted from 17th October 1949.

(b) 'No'. - Arrears of teaching grant and Dearness Allowance have been paid to the School.

(c) Does not arise.

for Secretary to Government.

To

The Secretariat of Madras Legislature. (15 copies)
" Public (Election) Department (~~15 copies~~)

The above answer has been approved by the Hon'ble Mr. K. Madhava Menon.

E. & P.H. U.O.No.74820-C1/49-2, Education

Dated 24th January 1950.

JV.24-1.

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY QUESTION NO.189 - STARRED.

Sri M.D. Thiagaraja Pillai, M.L.A.

****

STARRED.

Will the Hon'ble the Minister for Education be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that the recognition of the Ramasamy Aided Elementary School, Meppilliadiappan, Nannilam has not been renewed and that yet the institution is allowed to function;

(b) whether it is a fact that the teaching grant due to the school has not been paid and that the teachers are inconvenienced on this account; and

(c) what action is proposed to be taken to ease the situation?

Education and Public Health Department.

ANSWER.

(a) 'No'. - Recognition has been granted from 17th October 1949.

(b) 'No' - Arrears of teaching grant and Dearness Allowance have been paid to the School.

(c) Does not arise.

for Secretary to Government.

To

The Secretariat of Madras Legislature. (5 copies)
" Public (Election) Department (~~15 copies~~)

The above answer has been approved by the Hon'ble Mr. K. Madhava Menon.

E. & P.H. U.O.No.74828-G1/49-2, Education

Dated 24th January 1950.

JV.24-1.

MC

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY QUESTION NO.180 - STARRED.

Sri M.D. Thiagaraja Pillai, M.L.A.

****

STARRED.

Will the Hon'ble the Minister for Education be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that the recognition of the Ramasamy Aided Elementary School, Mappillaikuppam, Nannilam has not been renewed and that yet the institution is allowed to function;

(b) whether it is a fact that the teaching grant due to the school has not been paid and that the teachers are inconvenienced on this account; and

(c) what action is proposed to be taken to ease the situation?

Education and Public Health Department.

ANSWER.

(a) 'No'. - Recognition has been granted from 17th October 1949.

(b) 'No' - Arrears of teaching grant and Dearness Allowance have been paid to the School.

(c) Does not arise.

for Secretary to Government.

To

The Secretariat of Madras Legislature. (5 Copies)
" Public (Election) Department (~~5 Copies~~)

The above answer has been approved by the Hon'ble Mr. K. Madhava Menon.

E. & P.H. U.O.No.76820-C1/49-2, Education

Dated 24th January 1950.

JV.24-1.

Madras Legis. I-3—3,004—23-3-48.

27 SEP 1949

SECRETARIAT OF THE MADRAS LEGISLATURE,
Fort St. George, dated the 26.9. 1949.

74826

QUESTION No. 189 for the next meeting of the Legislative Assembly ~~to be held on the~~ ~~194~~ .

Two copies of this question are forwarded to the E.&P.H. Department.

The question has been admitted.

26/9

26/9.

26/9

To

The E&P.H. Department.

U.O.7509/49-11M.C.
26.9.49.

EPH
C.

The particulars required for answering the Assembly question are not available here. A copy of the question may be sent to the D.P.I for ~~suggesting~~ furnishing the information required for answering the question and any supplementary questions that may arise therefrom. A draft memo is submitted. H.M.(E&L) may see after issue

7/10/49

7/10/49

8/10/49

H.M.(E&L)

Issued as
Memo No 74826-49
6-10-49

17 OCT 1949
GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS

16/10

14/X

74826 C1/49

From the D.P.I. No. 334 B7/49 dated 5-1-50. P23CF

Please see the answers furnished by the D.P.I. to the Legislative Assembly question. A draft answer is ~~accordingly~~ submitted. P23CF on P1CF

May be circulated to H.M.(E&L) for approval.

MB
12/1/50

12/1/50

12/1/50 S

~~Reply to (b) is not complete~~

There will be supplementary questions - Indicate for how long the teaching grant and recognition were suspended and how the delay has been justified

13/1

The history of the case is given in the letter of the D.E.O., Tanjore, on pages 14-17 c.f. According to the rules for recognition and aid to elementary schools the management of a school has to give either a notice of three months or three months salary in lieu thereof before terminating the services of a teacher. In the present case, the Manager of Ramaswamy Aided Elementary School, Mappillaikkuppam, issued notices to the three teachers employed in the school on 20-5-48 regarding the termination of their services. Without waiting for the end of the three months' period, the Manager dispensed with the services of the three teachers on 10-6-48. Consequently the teaching grant due to the school for the third and fourth quarters was withheld and the temporary recognition up to 31-12-48 which the school was enjoying was withdrawn from 1-1-49. The recognition was, however, granted to the school on 17-10-49 with effect from 1-1-49 and the teaching grant and dearness allowance due to the school for 1948 was also paid subsequently. The ~~management~~ maintenance grant for 1948 is being withheld pending the payment of compensation to the three teachers who were dismissed.

15-12-48

p15CF

p15CF

p17CF

SECRETARY, EDN. AND PH. DEPT.
24 JAN 1950
GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS

MB
RTS

20/1/50 S

20/1

H.M.(E&L)

EPH
C1

The Assembly has been prorogued and the question has lapsed. The papers may be

G.O. Ms. No. 301 Edn dated 4-2-50

Recorded

CB
3/2/50

3/2/50

3/2/50