Educational (1896) Department.

ORDINARY MS.

G.O., No. 300

Dated 18th May 1896

INDEXED.

[Despatch Abstract.]

WITHDRAWAL OF A NORMAL CERTIFICATE.

Requesting the Director of Public Instruction to cancel the notification withdrawing the Normal certificate of V. Seshagiri Rao, late Headmaster, Kannur Board School, Kollegal taluk, Coimbatore district.

BACK PAPERS.

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

FURTHER PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.	G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.
	711		of 1896				

TO

The GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS.

MADRAS.

300

The humble petition of V. Seshagiri Rao,
lately Teacher of Board School, Kannur,
Kollegal Taluk, Coimbatore District.

Most Respectfully Showeth,

1. The Petitioner was by ~~your honor's~~ The Director of Public Instruction's order published in the *Fort St. George* Gezette dated 26th June 1894, Page 1014, declared ineligible for employment in any Government School and for grants from Provincial Funds for the next three years and his normal certificate was also withdrawn, on the ground that he had preferred a false charge against his immediate superior, the Inspecting Schoolmaster.

2. The Petitioner here most humbly begs to state that he never preferred any false charge against the Inspecting Schoolmaster referred to above, that he is even now not aware for what reason he was punished as above stated and that he respectfully craves your honor will be pleased to allow him an opportunity to explain any misconduct that might have been reported against him.

3. The Petitioner had been the Headmaster for five years in the Kannur Board School till November 1891 when the school was abolished for short attendance under the Orders of the President of the Taluk Board, Kollegal. During all this period he had given satisfaction to all his superiors. A perusal of the Inspection reports during that time and also his service book wherein nothing will be found against the Petitioner will, it is humbly submitted, convince your honor that the Petitioner had been throughout an honest, diligent and cheerful worker in the school. The school was abolished for reasons beyond the control of the Petitioner, mainly on account of the establishment of a boarding school at Mysore by the Maharajah of Mysore. The Petitioner has been without employment from the time of the abolition of the said school.

4. Towards the middle of 1893, the Petitioner submitted some applications to the Assistant Inspector of Schools to provide him with an employment but was not given any. In January and February of ~~this~~ last year, the Petitioner submitted two applications to the Inspector of Schools for some appointment which were referred to the Assistant Inspector of Schools for report. The second application to the Inspector of Schools contains this statement; "I beg to state that the Sub-Assistant Inspector of Schools made an enquiry during my service about the debt between (me) and the Inspecting Schoolmaster. I found nothing but this for the provocation of the Sub-Assistant Inspector. I have also herewith attached all the correspondence of mine with the Inspecting Schoolmaster about the debt. By those letters written by the own writing of the Inspecting Schoolmaster your honor may (become) well aware of the truth." This statement, the Petitioner understands, was mistaken by the Assistant Inspector of Schools as containing a charge against the Inspecting Schoolmaster. In fact this second application was submitted in continuation of the first application

of 10th January 1894 to the Inspector of Schools solely for the purpose of begging for an appointment. A perusal of the two applications will show that the Petitioner never even dreamt of preferring any charge against the Inspecting Schoolmaster.

5. Here the Petitioner begs to bring to your honor's notice that the mention of debt in the above para refers to a transaction that existed more than three years before the date of the Petitioner's second application to the Inspector of Schools in February 1894. At the period of this application the Petitioner was not a schoolmaster. He refers to a transaction that took place while he was the Headmaster of the Kannur Board School that was abolished in 1891. Till the discontinuance of the Petitioner's services consequent on the abolition of the school, no fault was found against the Petitioner; and it is his misfortune that on account of casual mention of a debt between himself and his Inspecting Schoolmaster some years ago, he should be visited with such extreme punishment as that referred in para 1 of this petition. Even if it should appear that the Petitioner wanted to bring some charge against the Inspecting Schoolmaster which the Petitioner begs to deny, he humbly invites your honor's attention to the two letters that are attached to his second application for employment wherein the Inspecting Schoolmaster admits the debt in his own hand writing. In this particular the Petitioner was not given a fair opportunity to explain himself.

6. Admitting for a moment that the Petitioner wanted to state that there exists some misunderstanding between himself and the Inspecting Schoolmaster on account of a debt that existed more than three years ago, the Petitioner respectfully submits that the mention of it in an application for employment may be viewed as an indiscretion on his part and not taken as a mischeivous tendency to bring false charges, for the very object of the application wherein this occurs was to beg the authorities to provide him with some employment. Also the statement that the Inspecting Schoolmaster owed him something does not amount to any charge against him; and besides that matter was not at all noticed against the Petitioner from the time of the abolition of the school for more than three years till the date of his application for employment in 1894. This matter was enquired into before the abolition of the school by the Sub-Assistant Inspector of Schools who did not deem it fit to refer the matter for your honor's orders.

7. So far as the Petitioner is aware, the Petitioner has done nothing beyond what has been stated above to deserve such a severe treatment ~~at your honor's~~ by the Director of P. Instruction's hands. He might have been guilty of an indiscretion, and if so, he craves your honor's pardon for that. He has served honestly for more than five years in the Department and has no other mode of living than being a schoolmaster. The Petitioner begs to enclose herewith copies of Testimonials as to his good conduct.

Under these circumstances the Petitioner begs to appeal to your honor's mercy and kindness to cancel the order published in the *Gazette* whereby his normal certificate is withdrawn and himself declared ineligible for service in any of the recognised schools.

For which act of kindness, the Petitioner, will ever pray.

~~AUGUST 1894.~~ 1st November 1895

V. Seshagiri Row
Late school master
Kannur
Kollegal

TESTIMONIALS.

1. The Mahazarnama (relating to my conduct to the Inspector of Schools Southern Circle, Coimbatore,) by the decendants of His Highness the Maharaja of Mysore, who reside in the Village of Kannur, Kollegal Taluk.

2. The bearer Seshagiri Rao, is known to me for the last 6 years. He was for some time a student of the District Borad Normal School, Coimbatore. During the period of studentship he conducted himself well.

COIMBATORE,
23rd January 1893.

(SIGNED) P. Y. SAMA RAO,
Assistant Master, Training School,
Coimbatore.

Address

V. Seshagiri Row
Komaralingam
Udumalpet Taluk
Coimbatore District

I herein enclosed all the correspondance of my appointment -

THE "LITERARY SUN" PRESS, COIMBATORE.

1289

Edl

R. No. 15,364/95.

DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC INSTRUCTION
RECEIVED
16 NOV. 95
R. R. No.............
MADRAS.

From

V. Seshagiri Rao

late teacher of Bd. School

Kannur

Endt No. 2734 d/15-11-95

Referred to the Director of Public Instruction for report.

(By order)

W Francis

Ag Under Secretary

Dated 1-11-95

Recd 3-11-95

Regd 5-11-95

72/8/11

Recd 15/11

Encl. - 5

Subject

Reqnd. that the order withdrawing his normal Certificate, be cancelled.

Cal. to D.P.I's letter no. 3136/96

Ed. Cor. 17. 2,000—29-3-94.

CURRENT No. 382

Edul

189 .

Educational Department.

From

THE DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC INSTRUCTION,
Madras,

To

THE HONORABLE THE CHIEF SECRETARY
TO GOVERNMENT,
Fort St. George.

UNDER SECRETARY
18 MAR 96
PUBLIC ETC. DEPT.

852/93

No. 3136

DESPATCHED
17 MAR. 96

Dated 14th
Despatched 17th
Received 18/3
March 1896.

Regd 18/3

No.

ENCLOSURES. 5 ~~with~~ and C. no 1289 with encls

Subject.

Submitting copy of report from the Assistant Inspector, 8th Division and Inspector of Schools, Western circle on the appeal petition of Kaniyur Seshagiri Rao for

[illegible]

OFFICE OF THE ASSTT. INSPECTOR OF SCHOOLS, 7TH DIVISION,
HEAD QUARTERS, COIMBATORE,

Dated 11th May 1894

No. 2071

FROM

THE ASSISTANT INSPECTOR OF SCHOOLS,
7TH DIVISION,

TO

THE INSPECTOR OF SCHOOLS,
SOUTHERN CIRCLE.

SIR,

I have the honor to submit my report on petition for re-entertainment in the Department from V. Seshagiri Rao, late Board Schoolmaster, Kannur, Kollegal Taluk and referred to me in your endorsements No. $\frac{1273}{19.2.94}$ and No. $\frac{3172}{1-5-94}$ herewith returned.

2. On receipt of the former endorsement, I was proposing to go to Kollegal to conduct the Primary School Examination and I decided to avail myself of this opportunity to hold the

the enquiry myself.

3. I accordingly sent for Seshagiri Rao on the 4th March last and questioned him on (1) the circumstances that had led to his dismissal and (2) the alleged money transactions between him and the Inspecting Schoolmaster. I asked him to commit to writing what he had to say and while he was doing it he happened to deny a statement that he had just then made. I took the paper he was writing on, entered within parantheses a note to that effect, initialled it to show that it was my own remark, returned the paper to him and asked him to proceed. I did not know that all this while there was a man outside who was interested in the enquiry. This was no other than his brother who seeing that the answers to my questions took a turn unfavourable to the petitioners cried out in Kanarese: "Brother, Brother: a serpent has bitten mother. Come away". Seshagiri Rao understood the signal and bolted away with the deposition paper he had in his hand. There was of course no ~~sef~~ serpent nor had the brothers any living mother. I sent the peon behind for the deposition paper, but Seshagiri Rao denied his ever having been to me and given any deposition.

4. He subsequently expressed regret for what he had done and wrote to me (vide enclosure F) that he was prepared to give deposition. I wrote to him in reply that if he wished he might go to

not recd.

to Coimbatore and do so. About the end of the last month he appeared before me in office but I asked him to state in writing first the circumstances under which he had so abruptly left me in Kollegal. He said he would do so the next day and left. He had not since returned but has written to me that he is prepared to answer questions if they are put to him by post. I have not done so; nor do I think it worth while to do so.

5. The petitioner was dismissed by the President of the Taluk Board, Kollegal whose servant he was about the close of 1891 and after more than two years he has thought fit to present this petition to you for re-entertainment in the

The peti. appears to have been thrown out of employment by the closure of the School. vide para 7 infra.

the Department. The same has to be said of the alleged money transaction between him and the Inspecting Schoolmaster.

6. From the Sub assistant Inspector's reports made in 1891 (enclosures A and B) submitting papers giving a history of the Kannur School and ~~re~~presenting the circumstances that had led to Seshagiri Rao's dismissal and from the deposition that I took from the Inspecting Schoolmaster and from his late peon Mallan (enclosures D and E) I am able to give you the following information about the man.

not recd –

7. About 4 years ago he was appointed to the newly started Board School at

at Kaunick in the Kollegal Taluk. The village was flourishing and the School began with a good number. Sl Seshagiri Rao however, incurred unpopularity by his immoral conduct and neglected his School which therefore declined. The Inspecting Schoolmaster warned him from time to time; but it was in vain and the School had to be closed. Seshagiri Rao was thus thrown out and the Department was not prepared to recommend him for re-entertainment as opportunity occurred. And independently of the Department on a petition received direct from Seshagiri Rao the President of the Taluk Board endorsed that he was not prepared to appoint the applicant in the Kollegal School which he liked to see in a progressively prosperous condition". Seshagiri Rao's success as a teacher and his character as a man were known to all.

This contradicts the statement in para 5. that Seshagiri was dismissed the service.

8. As to the alleged pecuniary transactions between him and the Inspecting Schoolmaster, I submit that to my belief it is all false. The Inspecting Schoolmaster's warnings, his entries in the Visit book and his report on the unsatisfactory condition of the School stirred Seshagiri Rao I think to concert measures to threaten the Inspecting Schoolmaster into good offices to him and favourable reports. He sent him a registered letter demanding the re-payment of a loan he had taken from him. The Inspecting Schoolmaster

replied that nothing was due from him and the Schoolmaster might go to Court if he wished. He also made a report immediately of the whole matter to the Sub assistant Inspector. The Sub assistant Inspector made enquiries at the grant examination of the same year but Seshagiri Rao behaved with him as he behaved with me. I have no doubt that the letters alleged to have been written to him by the Inspecting Schoolmaster promising to repay are all forged. And indeed from the way in which he behaved with me and the lie he told my peon I am inclined to think that he is not incapable of forgery. Whatever it is, Seshagiri Rao has not these two years gone to Court to establish his claims.

9. The petition, therefore, deserves to be rejected; and indeed the President of the Taluk Board has already rejected the application for re-entertainment. The Inspecting officers can only recommend for appointment as opportunity occurs occurred and Seshagiri Rao does not deserve any recommendation.

10. He is a trained teacher; and if you agree with me in thinking that his conduct towards me, as narrated above, was insulting in the extreme, I would recommend that his teachers' certificate be withdrawn from him for sometime.

I have the honor to be
Sir
Your most obedt Servant
(Sigd) A. C. Pranatarti Haran Iyer
Assistant Inspector
of Schools

(True copy)
Assistant Inspr

From

The Asst. Inspector of Schools,
8th Dn.

Enclosure No. 2. to his
No. 744/7.2.96

1896
Edul Dept.
382

orger

Endorsement of the Inspector of Schools, Southern Circle.

No 3886/4.6.94

Submitted to the Director of Public Instruction for orders.

2. The Assistant Inspector's report is full and hardly needs any comment.

3. The report and its enclosures give a full history of the petitioner's (Seshagiri Raó) career as a Schoolmaster, which, it is to be observed, has been characterized throughout by unfavourable reports from his official Superiors. In consideration of the above facts, I am compelled to recommend that Seshagiri Raó's Normal certificate be withdrawn and that he be declared ineligible for any aid from public funds for the next 3 years.

(Sigd) T. T. Logan
Inspector of Schools,
Western Circle.

(True copy)

From

The Asst. Inspector of Schools,
8th Division.

Enclosure No. 3 to his
No. 744/7.2.96.

Proceedings of the Director of Public Instruction.

Dated 13th June 1894
No. 5678

Read endorsement of the Inspector of Schools, Southern Circle, No. 3886, dated 4th June 1894 on the petition of Seshagiri Row, late School-master, Kannur for re-entertainment in the Department.

? perfunctory

From the exhaustive report submitted by the Assistant Inspector, the acting Director agrees with the Inspector in thinking that Seshagiri Rao's career as a Schoolmaster has throughout been characterized by unfavourable remarks from his official superiors and his conduct in preferring a false charge against his immediate superior, the Inspecting Schoolmaster, is reprehensible.

Apparently this Progs was drafted by the office.

for grant from Provincial Funds for the next three years; and his Normal certificate is withdrawn.

(Sigd) A. Monro
Ag Director of Public Instn.

(True copy)

(Sigd) C. N. Subramaniya Aiyar
Ag 2nd assistant to the D.P.I

(True copy)

Assistant Inspector
of Schools 8th Dn

From

The Assts Inspector of Schools,
8th Dn.

Enclosure to his R. No. 744/7.2.96.

1896
Jul
3
382

Proceedings of the Director of Public Instruction

Dated 5th December 1894

No. 11734

Read endorsement of the Inspector of Schools, Western Circle, No. 7267, dated 2nd November 1894, submitting with remarks the report of the Assistant Inspector of Schools, 8th Division, on review petition made by V. Seshagiri Rao, late Board Schoolmaster, Kannur, Kollegal Taluk, Coimbatore District.

Recorded.

2. For reasons explained by the Assistant Inspector, the Director is not prepared to reconsider the order passed in Proceedings No. 5678, dated 13th June 1894 and to cancel the notification published in the Fort St. George Gazette.

(Sigd) D. Duncan
Director of Public Instn.

(True copy)

Assistant Inspr.

From.

The Assist Inspr of Schools

8th Dn.

Enclosure 5 to his L. No. 744 / 7.2.96

1896
Edul Dept.
No. 2
382

No. 744.

Office of the Assistant
Inspector of schools, 8th D.n
Head Quarters, Coimbatore,
Camp Dharapuram 6th February
1896

Enclosures Five.

From

The Assistant Inspector of
Schools, 8th Division

To

The Inspector of schools
Western Circle.

Sir,

× × ×

2. The petitioner was a school-master in the Board Salary Result school at Kannur in the Kollegal Taluq. He misbehaved in that capacity and incurred unpopularity in that village. His faults were

highly

highly unbecoming a schoolmaster and his services were dispensed with by the President of the Taluq Board in 1891.

3. He applied for re-employment elsewhere but with antecedents like his was not successful.

4. He then appealed to you against the order of dismissal and to show that his dismissal was undeserved brought a complaint against the Inspecting schoolmaster of the Kollegal Taluk, to the effect that the latter had obtained some loan from him that it was not returned and that when he demanded it he was misrepresented to the President of the Taluq Board.

5. I was required to investigate the complaint and submitted my report No. $\frac{2071}{11.5.94}$ × on it of which a copy is enclosed for easy reference. From this report it would appear that the petitioner was a very unworthy man and that his complaint was groundless

× enclosure No. 2

---

6. You forwarded my report to the Director in your No. × $\frac{3886}{4-6-94}$ (copy enclosed for easy reference) and recommended that the petitioner's Normal certificate should be withdrawn from him.

×Enclosure No. 3.

7. This was accordingly done in the Director's Proceedings No. × $\frac{5678}{13-6-94}$ (Copy enclosed)

×Enclosure No. 4.

8. The petitioner thereon prayed for a reconsideration of this order which was refused in the Director's Proceedings No. × $\frac{11734}{5-12-94}$ (Copy enclosed).

×Enclosure No. 5

9. The petitioner has now submitted ~~to Government~~ to Government a copy of his petition to the Director for a reconsideration of the order passed on him with the necessary corrections made in it. It is the last effort made by him in that way and knowing him well, as I do, I submit that he does not deserve better success.

10. He prays that his certificate be given back to him. To give him back his certificate would be to recognize him as a

teacher. But if moral qualifications are a Sine-quo non in a teacher, he is totally undeserving of being recognized as one. The instances of his misbehaviour are many and have been already fully reported by me as would appear from the enclosures.

I have &c.

(Sd) Pranatharthihara Aiyar.
Assistant Inspector of Schools,
8th Division.

(True copy)

No. 1051.

Submitted to the Director of Public Instruction with reference to his Endorsement No. $\frac{12375}{16\text{-}11\text{-}95}$ herewith returned.

2. I adhere to my recommendation in this office No. $\frac{3886}{4\text{-}6\text{-}94}$ as I see no reason to alter it.

20th February 1896 }
Trichinopoly. }

(Sd) I. T. Logan.
Inspector of Schools,
Western Circle.

(True copy)
Exd

2

letter No. 3140/96

1

382

D Duncan
Director of Public Instruction.

CURRENT NO. 382

Office of the Director of
Public Instruction,
Madras, 14th March 1896.

No. 3136.

From

The Honorable Mr. D. DUNCAN, M.A., D.Sc.,
Director of Public Instruction,
Madras,

To

The Honorable The CHIEF SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT,
Fort St. George.

Sir,

With reference to Government Endorsement No. 2734, dated 15th November 1895 (herewith returned) I have the honour to submit copy of a letter from the Assistant Inspector, 8th Division, No. 744, dated 6th February 1896 and of the Inspector's Endorsement thereon together with their enclosures in original, and to state that, in consideration of the petitioner's immoral+ conduct and the grave charges brought against him, I agree with Mr. Monro in thinking that Seshagiri Rau does not deserve to be a schoolmaster and I accordingly hold that he fully deserved the punishment inflicted on him. The Assistant Inspector's reports forming enclosures to his letter referred to above are full and clear and deal

+ not specified & not referred to in the D.P.I's Pro. – $\frac{5678}{13\text{-}6\text{-}94}$ only one?

deal with all the points in the petition under reference. I beg to add that this memorial is only a copy of the petition submitted to this office and on which were issued Proceedings No. 11734, dated 5th December 1894, submitted to Government by Seshagiri Rau as an enclosure to his memorial.

I have the honour to be,
Sir,
Your most obedient servant,
D Duncan
Director of Public Instruction.

[G.
25 A.]
1,000—21-3-96.

Ed DEPARTMENT.

C. No. 1289 of 95 & 382 of 96.

FOR ORDERS.

The petr. V. Seshagiri Rao was the Headmaster of the Kannur Board School, Kollegal Taluk, Coimbatore District. The school was closed in Nov. 1891 for want of pupils and Seshagiri Rao's services were in consequence dispensed with. — vide Pro. of the President, Kollegal Taluk Board d 18th Nov. 1891. copy of which forms an enclosure to the petn — Seshagiri Rao then applied to the Inspecting officers for employment and was informed by the Sub-Astt Inspector of Schools, Nilgiri and N. Coimbatore Range, that he could not be re-entertained in the Ed. dept. Thereupon Seshagiri applied to the Sub-Astt-Inspector for a copy of the order declaring him ineligible for employment in the Ed. dept.

and received a reply to the effect that no other order than that of the Asstt. Inspector contained in the Sub-Asstt's memo. no. $\frac{1200}{1-8-93}$ was available. — vide original forming an enclos. to the petition. Seshagiri then applied to the Asstt Inspector but had his letter returned with the remarks that the Sub-Asstt had not favourably reported of him and that no notice would be taken of his applications in future. — vide original End. no $\frac{5841}{3-10-93}$ of the Asstt Inspector enclosed.

Seshagiri then applied to the Inspector of schools, Southern Circle, for employment and in one of his applications stated that the Inspecting Schoolmaster of the Kollegal Taluk owed him a certain amount of money and enclosed in original the correspondence connected with the debt. The Inspector referred the applications to the Asstt Inspector and he reported in his letter no $\frac{2071}{11-5-94}$, that Seshagiri, while Headmaster of the Kannur School,

incurred.

FOR ORDERS.

H. E. THE GOVERNOR.

THE HON'BLE MR. H. W. BLISS, C.I.E.

THE HON'BLE MR. J. GROSE, C.I.E.

in a proceedings which was apparently drafted by some clerk, as its wording is peculiar,

incurred unpopularity by his im- ~~that~~ moral conduct and neglected the School; that the School therefore declined and had to be closed and that Seshagiri was in consequence thrown out. He also reported that Seshagiri's complaint against the Inspecting Schoolmaster was probably false and that the Correspondence connected with it was possibly forged & recommended that Seshagiri's Teacher's certificate be withdrawn, as a punishment for his insulting conduct towards him (the Asstt. Inspector).

The Inspector submitted the papers to the D.P.I. and recommended that as Seshagiri's career as a Schoolmaster had been characterized throughout by unfavourable reports from his official Superiors his normal certificate be withdrawn and that he be declared ineligible for any aid from public funds for three years. — vide the Inspector's End. no. $\frac{3888}{4-6-94}$.

The Ag Director (Mr. Munro), agreed with the Inspector, withdrew Seshagiri's normal certificate and declared him ineligible

for

for employment in any Govt school and for grant from Prov. funds until the 1st July 1897. — vide the D.P.I's Pro. no 5678/13-6-94 & the notification dated 19th June 94 on page 1074 of the Fort St George Gazette of 26th June 94, Part II. Seshagiri then memorialized the D.P.I. but he declined to reconsider the orders already passed. — vide the D.P.I's Pro. no. 11784/5-12-94. Seshagiri now appeals to Govt and requests ~~that~~ the D.P.I's notification published in the gazette may be cancelled.

The above is a short account of Seshagiri's case. It may be that he misbehaved himself while he was in charge of the Kannur Bd School but the immoral conduct he was then guilty of has not been specified and it seems unnecessary to make enquiries as to what it was, as the punishment inflicted on Seshagiri by the D.P.I. has reference only to the charge brought by him against the Inspecting school master, & his previous bad record

The charge may or may not be true but the D.P.I. has, it is submitted, no power to punish Seshagiri as he has done.

In the first place Seshagiri is not a subordinate of the D.P.I. He was an applicant for an appointment and there was little necessity to investigate the charge brought by him against the Inspecting Schoolmaster; he might have been directed to establish his claim in a civil Court. Again there was no proper inquiry into the charge. The Asst Inspector's opinion that the charge is false and the letters forged does not appear to have been based on any evidence.

Of course to this it may be said that the man's conduct rendered enquiry impossible, but something should anyhow have been attempted. ~~And~~

In the Second place, the D.P.I. has no power to withdraw any one's Teacher's certificate under the Ed. rules. The Grant-in-aid Code of 1885 gave the Director such a power (vide art 27, ch II) but the revised Grant-in-aid code which came into force on the 1st April 1894 does not. All reference to Teachers' certificates in it has been omitted (vide page 4 of G.O. no. 852 Ed. of 20th Nov. 1893)

& the Ed. Rules give no such power - vide Ch - VIII.

Perhaps these facts may be pointed out to the D.P.I. and he may be asked to cancel the notification in question.

It may also be noted that there was no necessity for the D.P.I. to refer this office endt. no. $\frac{2734}{15-11-95}$ to the Inspecting officers for report. The petn. is an appeal against an order of the D.P.I. and all the original reports of the Inspecting officers on Seshagiri's complaint are apparently in the D.P.I's office. He might therefore have replied to the Govt reference - himself.

$\frac{TB}{21/4}$

4.5.96 The petr., judging from the two original letters from him in the file, ought never to have had a teacher's certificate. His English is something too awful. But he has got his certificate and I do not see how it can be taken away. Even if it could be I consider the case against him, such as it is, far too weak a one to warrant the action taken against him. The worst

He is qualified to teach vernacular only
TB

Withdrawal of Seshagiri Rao's Teacher's certificate.

JG
12/5/96

H.M.

(For orders)

G. 25 A.
1,900—21-3-96.

DEPARTMENT

C. No.

FOR ORDERS.

part of the case seems to have been his conduct when the Ass: Insp: attempted to hold an enquiry but I must say that the letter of this Officer looks very much as if he had a strong bias against the man.

The off hand and careless way in which this case was treated by the Officers of the Edn. Dept. from the Ass: Insp: upwards is the reverse of creditable.

I certainly would not re-employ the man if I had anything to do with the matter & the my ground would be not his conduct but the want of education evinced in his letters. He is evidently of very poor educational attainments. If however anyone chooses to take him - the Edn. Dept. need not recommend him and the local

Ed need not take him up if they do not wish – I do not see any grounds for refusing sanction if earned, to the school in which he may be employed as Hd master. As regards his certificate the suspension of it has no warrant. If the Edl. authorities choose to give such an indifferent article as this ~~on~~ a certificate as a teacher they must take the consequences.

[illegible]
9/5/96

CS.

Order. No. 300 d/ 18th May 1896

It is not clear to the Govt. under the circumstances why it was considered necessary to proceed against Seshagiri Rao. The Enquiry which was held was moreover ~~of~~ the reverse of exhaustive, & the ~~punishment awarded~~ order passed appears to have proceeded mainly upon inferences unsupported by evidence. ~~Moreover~~ Finally it does not appear that under the existing Grant in aid Code & Educational Rules it is open to the D.P.I. to cancel a teacher's certificate. (2) Under these circumstances the D.P.I. will be requested to cancel the notification withdrawing Seshagiri Rao's normal certificate.

W 15.5.96

[illegible] (for orders)
16/5/96

To D.P.I. (a.r.o.)
– Petr. (a + para 2 of order only)
5 Encls
X 20/5

Despd 22/5/96

Withdrawal of [illegible] teacher's certificate

FOR ORDERS.

H. M.

C 11/5
R 13/5

When given for copying ______
When copied ______
When examined ______ } 189 .
When signed ______

Read again G.O., No. 189 , Dated

Current No.

Enclosures to C. No

Order of Government .. .. .. A A A A A A A

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.