

Educational (1895) Department.

ORDINARY MS.

G.O., No. 227

Dated 14th Mar. 1895.

INDEXED.

[Despatch Abstract.]

M.R.V. M. PURUSHOTTAMA RAO, TRANSLATOR, DISTRICT AND SESSIONS COURT,
NELLORE.

Informing -- that his contention that he is entitled to a certificate of having passed the complete Revenue Test, Higher Grade, without passing the Account Test in 1895, since he is sure he has passed in the latter test in 1893, cannot be admitted.

BACK PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.	G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.
	123		12-2-95				

FURTHER PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.	G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.
80	493		13-6-95				

[9]

LOCAL AND MUNICIPAL DEPARTMENT.

Local Dep.

From


Mr. Purushottama Rao
Translator. (St. Comt. Station)

Indt dt 1-2-95 No 191

Referred to the Commissioner
for Government Examinations
for remarks.

(By order)

Colonel Davidson
for Under Secretary



No.

Dated 28-1-95

Received 28-1-95

Enclosures

SUBJECT.

Noting that for reasons
stated within, he is entitled
to a certificate of having
passed the Complete Res. Test,
without passing the Account
Test again in 1895

*Draw up a memorandum
setting forth the circumstances
of the case - M.G.
2/2*

TO BE RETURNED
WITH REPLY.

UNDER SECRETARY
PUBLIC DEPT.
28 JAN 95

To

His Excellency the Right Honorable
THE GOVERNOR-IN-COUNCIL,
(EDUCATIONAL),
FORT ST. GEORGE.

The humble and respectful representation of
M. Pooroosothama Rau. (Translator, Dis-
trict and Sessions Court, Nellore.)

MOST HUMBLY & RESPECTFULLY SHEWETH:—

That your Excellency's Petitioner appeared for *all the subjects of the Revenue Test, Higher Grade, except the Account Code*, in October 1892, under the rules then in force, and passed in all those subjects. (Vide No. 3703, page 3, Supplement to the Fort St. George Gazette, dated 7th February 1893).

2. That then he appeared for the *Account Code* in October 1893, and his name did not appear in the list of Candidates declared to have passed the *complete Revenue Test including the Account Code*; nor did his name appear in the list published at page 1 of the Fort St. George Gazette, dated 3rd July 1894, at the top of which was a notification to the effect that the list contained the names of only those that obtained the minimum of $\frac{2}{3}$ prescribed under the Revised Special Test Notifications, and that those whose names did not appear are to regard themselves as having failed entirely.

3. That then on the 20th November 1894, another notification appeared at page 1779 of the Fort St. George Gazette to the effect that those Candidates who passed in *all the subjects of the Revenue Test except the Account Code* at the Special Test Examinations held in 1891 and 1892 and whose names appeared in the Supplements to the Fort St. George Gazettes, dated 23rd February 1892 and 7th and 21st February 1893, will, as a last concession, be permitted to appear for the *Account Test* at the examination to be held in October 1895, and such Candidates as succeed in passing the *Account Test* will be considered to have passed the *complete Test* and certificates will be issued to them accordingly.

4. That the Petitioner, as represented in para 1 supra, passed in all the *Revenue subjects* of 1892 *except the Account Code*, and is, by the notification of the 20th November 1894, deemed to have passed the *Revenue Test* though he did not obtain $\frac{2}{3}$ in it as required by the Revised Special Test rules contemplated in the notification of the 3rd July 1894.

5. That the Petitioner though he obtained—as he is fully confident he must have obtained, since, in the fail list of Revenue Higher of 1893, his number 3588 does not find a place—the revised minimum in the *Account Code* when he appeared for it in October 1893, was still, not declared to have passed the *Full Revenue Test* as he did not, as then required, get $\frac{2}{3}$ in all, putting together the marks obtained in the *Revenue subjects* of 1892 and in the *Account Code* of 1893, as will appear from the remarks at the top of the pass list of Revenue Higher published in the Supplement to the Fort St. George Gazette of the 13th February 1894.

618
18.8.94

90

2

6. That as the notification of the 20th November 1894 virtually removes the restriction of $\frac{2}{3}$ and declares all those whose names appeared in the Supplements to the Fort St. George Gazettes of 7th and 21st of February 1893 to have passed the *Revenue Test*, and enables them to obtain a complete certificate by passing in the *Account Test* alone, and as the Petitioner feels fully confident that he must have obtained the revised minimum in the *Account Code* when he appeared for it in October 1893, and must thus have passed in it though he was not so declared for reasons given in para 5, the Petitioner thinks he is at present, on the strength of the notification of the 20th November 1894, entitled to a certificate of having passed the *complete Revenue Test*, without passing the *Account Test* again in 1895, since he is sure he has passed in the *Account Code* of 1893.

7. That the Petitioner represented all these facts to the Secretary to the Commissioner to the U. C. S. Examinations on the 23rd November 1894 and asked that Officer for a certificate, and has not been favoured with any reply.

8. That therefore the Petitioner respectfully represents all these facts to your Excellency with the hope that your Excellency will be generous enough to enquire into the case and do justice to the Petitioner.

For which act of justice and generosity the Petitioner, as in duty bound

shall ever remain

Your Excellency's most obedient
and humble servant,

NELLORE,
8th January 1895.

28th January 1895. }
M. Pooroosothama Rau. }
M. Pooroosothama Rau. }

No. 505.

239
OFFICE OF THE COMMISSIONER
FOR GOVERNMENT EXAMINATIONS,
Madras, 22nd February 1895.

From

The Honble Mr. D. Duncan, M. A. D.Sc.

COMMISSIONER FOR

GOVERNMENT EXAMINATIONS.

Madras,

To

THE HON'BLE THE CHIEF SECRETARY

TO GOVERNMENT,

Fort St. George.

SIR,

In returning the accompanying petition from
M. Pooroosothama Rau, Translator in the District Court,
Nellore, I have the honour to make the following
remarks:-

Under the old rules, the Civil Account Code was
one of the subjects of the *Revenue Test*, to pass which
a candidate had to obtain not only a minimum
in each subject, but a minimum on the whole, -
the *Account Code* included. Availing himself of the
concession allowed to candidates in Notification of 21st May
1892, No 61, published at page 675 of Part I of the Fort
St. George Gazette of the 31st May 1892, Copies of the *Account
Code* being then difficult to procure, the petitioner appeared
for the *Revenue Test* in October 1892, in all the subjects
except the Account Code. Having obtained the prescribed

Minimum in each of these subjects, his name was included in the list of those declared to have passed the incomplete Revenue Test. To complete the Test, it was necessary for those Candidates to obtain not only the prescribed minimum for the Account Code when they chose to appear in this subject, but also the minimum on the whole under the rules then in force. It is to be observed that the concession referred to, which petitioner availed himself of, merely allowed candidates to bring up the Account Code separately at some subsequent examination, - a great advantage in itself, - but did not exempt them from obtaining the prescribed minimum on the whole. In October 1893, the petitioner appeared for the Account Code alone, but though he obtained the minimum in this subject, his marks in all the subjects were so very low that he failed to obtain the minimum on the whole and was not declared to have passed the Complete Test. The marks he obtained fell short of the aggregate minimum by as many as eight. Strictly speaking, this failure of his should have vitiated his partial success in 1892 and necessitated his reappearing in all the subjects of the Test. Government was pleased, however, in its order of the 18th August 1894, No 618, Educational, to rule that all persons who appeared for the Revenue Tests in all the subjects but Account Code in 1891 and 1892 and passed should be permitted

permitted to appear for the Account Test, Higher or Lower as the case may be, in 1895; such candidates if they passed, were to be considered to have passed the Complete Revenue Test, but it was expressly declared that no further indulgence would be granted. Under this Order, the petitioner can claim to appear for the Account Test, Higher, at the examination of next October, and if he passes, he will be declared to have passed the Complete Revenue Test, Higher Grade. This is ^{the} only concession to which he is entitled under the final orders of Government, and it is a concession, I think, for which he ought to be thankful. The request he makes in his petition appears to me to be a most unreasonable one and I cannot recommend that it be complied with.

I have the honour to be,
Sir,
Your most obedient servant,
J. D. Mear
Commissioner.

Educational (1895) Department
(Examinations)

From,

The Hon'ble Mr. D. Duncan, A.A. D.Sc.,
Commissioner for Government
Examinations,
Madras.

To

The Hon'ble the Chief Secretary,
to Government
Fort St. George.

No. 505.

Dated 22nd }
Received 23rd } February, 1895



Enclosures - one

CHIEF SECRETARY
23 FEB 1895

Subject: GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS

Returning, with remarks, Petition from
Mr. Pooroshothama Rau, Translator,
District Court, Madras and stating
that the request made by the Petitioner
is very unreasonable.

For R

Please put up the
petition referred to -

1/3
27/2/95

Read C.O. 101 & this

H.M.

Order 14 March 1895,
No. 227.

M. R. R. M. Poorshottama

Rao will be informed that
petition cannot be admitted
his request is inadmissible.

9, 355
11/3/95

To

The Petitioner
C. S. E. 940.
Despatch 1/3

The aggregate minimum in the
Note. Because Higher has not been altered

& The petitioner's contention in para 6 of
his petition, that by G.O. 8/18th Aug. 94
no 618 Ed, persons who passed the in-
complete Rec. Tests in 91 & 92 are
exempted from obtaining the aggregate
minimum for is unwarranted.

They could not pass the tests by
getting the minimum prescribed
for each subject.

The petitioner, by his obtaining the
minimum prescribed for the Account Code
in 1893, cannot be considered to have
passed the Account Test Higher under
the new rules according to which the
C.S. Regulations form one of the Subjects
for the test in Account Higher.

en given for copying
en copied
en examined
en signed

189

AGAIN G.O., No.
189

DATED

ERENT No.

ENCLOSURES TO G. No

ORDER OF GOVERNMENT

LETTER OF GOVERNMENT.

STATEMENT WITH DITTO.

PAPERS NOT FILED UP, BEING MEANT FOR DESPATCH
IN ORIGINAL.

N.B.:-

A = Copy in full.
B = Not to be copied.
P = Copy abstract only.
Q = Copy heading only.

A A A A A A A