

Educational (1898) Department.

ORDINARY MS.

G.O., No. 564

Dated 5.9.98

INDEXED.

[Despatch Abstract.]

Inform V. A. Ponnuswami, a candidate at the F. A. examⁿ held last year that the Govt cannot interfere in the matter of his ^{petition} appealing against the decision of the syndicate of the Madras university debarring him from reappearing for the F. A. examⁿ for one year on account of his malpractice in connection therewith.

T
8/2/98

BACK PAPERS.

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

FURTHER PAPERS.

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

[Ed.]
1,000-20-4-95.

Educational (1898) Department.

CURRENT No. 1087

From

V. A. Ponnuswami
(Candidate No. 812 of
7 A. Examn.)
Pudupet
No. Parvathi
S. Arcot.

Order No. 564 of 5-9-98

The pete will be
informed that the Govt.
cannot interfere in the matter.

Dated 16. 8. 98

Received in No. 20. 8. 98

Registered

Enclosures 4

Spare copies.

Note. Please see the Madras
University's letter no. 157 of
29th Nov. 1882 recorded in
G.O. no 412 of 15th Dec. 82.
Flag B. The University has power
to debar candidates from the
University Examn. The Govt. does
not appear to have any power to interfere.

SUBJECT.

Appealing against the deci-
sion of the Syndicate of the
Madras University debar-
him from reappearing for
the 7 A. Examn. on account
of his malpractices at 9
into the same.

To The pete 940
7/9/98

BACK PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.
	223	Ed	14-3-92

FURTHER PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

Dear friend,

I saw the notification in the Times about you. I am sorry. I pity your result. I heard you met this result as certain paper containing notes was found with your answer paper. Somebody told me also that you were asked to explain. Is it a fact? My dear friend, I tell you I saw on the last noon of the examination time certain boy in the room next to brother's, copying out something; when, I warned him about the consequence he said to me that he didn't fear for anything and that he can throw it off. Your case me thinks might be due to this. God is great.

P. Loganathan

(True copy)

V. A. Ponnuswami.

From

The Registrar, University of Madras

To

V.A. Ponnuswami

Dated 25th May 1898.

No. 3165
305

His case was decided after mature consideration of his explanation and other connected papers. The decision is final.

Signed. A. J. Cooper Oakley
Registrar.

(True copy)

No. $\frac{1.189}{634}$ Dated: 6th August 1898.

From
The Registrar, University of Madras.
To
V. A. Ponnuswami

The undersigned is directed by the
Syndicate to inform V. A. Ponnuswami
with reference to his petition dated 7th
July 1898 and his previous petition, that
the decision already communicated to
him is final.

(Signed) A. J. Cooper, Oakley.
Registrar.

(True copy)

V. A. Ponnuswami.

V. A. Ponnuswami
287
Encls. No. 3
To
1087

The Registrar

University of Madras
Madras

Most Respected Sir,

In acknowledging the receipt of your docket dated 25th January 98 calling upon me to explain how a paper containing notes is found along with my answer paper in History I beg to represent that I am at a loss to know how a paper containing notes of which I have no knowledge has been mixed up with my answer paper in History.

I solemnly and sincerely affirm that I did not take any paper whatever into the examination room. If as stated by your honour any paper containing notes has been found along with my answer paper in History the Superintendent Gopala Iyengar would have discovered it as when he received my answer papers, he shook it by the attached corner of the answer book as it is usual

with him.

As to the veracity of my statement I humbly beg to refer your honour to all the Superintendents who watched over the candidates.

I therefore request that your honour will be graciously pleased to exonerate me from the blame unexpectedly & unfortunately imposed upon me & protect me.

I beg to remain

Most honoured Sir,

Your most obedient & humble servant
V. A. Ponnusami.

To

The Government of
Fort St. George
Madras



The humble appeal petition respectfully submitted by V. A. Ponnusami candidate N^o 812 of late F. A. Examination against the decision of the Syndicate of University Madras communicated in the ^{Registrar's} memo dated 25th May 1898 N^o 3165 & in the memo dated 6th August 1898 N^o 305 & 634

Most respectfully sheweth,

That the petitioner appeared for the late F. A. Examination in the Cuddalore Centre. That before the results came out the Petitioner was called upon by the Registrar of University Madras to explain how a paper containing notes was found along with the Petitioner's answer papers in History.

2. That this was to the Petitioner a great surprise and mystery as the Petitioner was sure he had taken no paper containing notes into the Examination room nor put it along with his papers in History. That the Petitioner accordingly submitted to the Registrar in his letter dated 28th January 98, a copy

of which is herein enclosed, his explanation to the effect that he did not take any paper whatever into the Examination room and that as to the veracity of his statements he (the petitioner) referred the Registrar to the Superintendents who watched over the candidates during the Examination.

3. That the Petitioner was very confident of success in the Examination and his teachers were equally so.

4. That to the Petitioner's great misfortune and surprise he was placed in the Examination and from the failure list he learnt that it was in History. This was the more mortifying to the Petitioner as History was a subject in which the Petitioner was well up and from how the Petitioner had answered the questions in it, he had not in the least any idea that he would fail in it.

5. That feeling doubtful that perhaps the Petitioner's failure in the subject might be due to the paper containing notes having been found with his answer papers in History, the Petitioner solicited information from the Registrar as to whether the Petitioner's failure was due to the introduction of the notes into his answer papers or whether the Petitioner had failed to secure the requisite number of marks in the subject.

6. That the Registrar in his memo dated February 98 was pleased to reply that

the query contained in the Petitioner's letter was answered in the affirmative. Thinking the Petitioner's failure was perhaps due to the accident of not getting sufficient number of marks in the subject the Petitioner joined the college and recommenced his studies.

7. That about the close of April last to the Petitioner's utmost surprise and bewilderment he (the Petitioner) saw a notification in the Gazette debarring him for the alleged malpractice for one year from appearing for the Examination. The Petitioner had then painfully to leave the college.

8. That the Petitioner most respectfully begs to submit that the Registrar without making any enquiry whatever of the Principal St. Joseph's College Cuddalore or of the Superintendents in the Examination room or without taking any further evidence on the matter has passed the order referred to in para 7. The explanation called for was so sudden and surprising that the Petitioner was not in a position to offer more than what he had done. The Petitioner had not then any necessary materials with him, and he also fully believed that the Registrar would not pass any order without making full and complete enquiry on the matter.

9. That the Petitioner begs to submit that the action of the Registrar in so summarily passing the order as he has done, has been very highly injurious to the Petitioner. It is not possible for the Petitioner to describe his mental anguish at the circumstances in which the Petitioner is now placed. The Petitioner has not only been plucked in the examination for no fault of his but also been debarred from regaining his lost ground for the present year. It has now become the Petitioner's duty to trace out the offender through whose instrumentality the note should have gone into his papers and prove his innocence; for which the Petitioner humbly solicits opportunities.

10. That during the Petitioner's stay in the college a boarder (of the St. Joseph's College) named Bangaruswamy a fellow candidate for the F. A. Examination had been in inimical terms with him. There are respectable witnesses to prove this, the late Principal of the St. Joseph's college now a parish priest at Panikkankuppam near Punnutti being one of them. The Petitioner now hears from several candidates that the said Bangaruswamy had been telling that he would do some mischief to the Petitioner during the examination. Confirming this the Petitioner also received a post card a copy of which is here-with enclosed from Loganaden

another boarder (of the same college) candidate for the Matriculation examination from which it will be seen that he observed on the last noon of the examination time a candidate a boarder of the same college copying out something and that he warned him of the consequences. The Petitioner has his suspicion that the candidate referred to by Loganaden in his post card and Bangaruswamy referred to by the Petitioner in this para are identical. Loganaden is available for examination as a witness in the matter. The strongest evidence in the affair is the paper containing notes in question. If the Petitioner be only favoured with an opportunity to see the paper he could easily say in whose handwriting it is and this person will form another witness. Besides these additional light may also be forthcoming in any investigation that may be held in the matter. There are fortunately in this case very good facilities and clues to find out the truth.

11. That in the Petitioner's letter dated 23rd May 98 the Petitioner set forth all the above circumstances and requested the Registrar to reconsider the Petitioner's case in the light of the fresh evidences and facts adduced. The Registrar in his memo No. ³¹⁶⁵/₃₀₆ dated 25th May 98 a copy of which is herein enclosed has declined to reconsider the

matter stating that the decision has been arrived at after mature consideration of the Petitioner's explanation and other connected papers. ^{The Petitioner} submitted his appeal to the Syndicate against the decision of the Registrar and in reply the Registrar in his memo ^{Dated 6 August 98} ^{No. 189} ⁶³⁴ states that he has been directed by the Syndicate to inform the Petitioner that the decision already communicated to the Petitioner is final.

12. That this decision of the Registrar as well as the Syndicate is against all equity and highly unjust to the Petitioner. When the Petitioner has solemnly affirmed that he did not take any paper into the Examination room, the Registrar as well as the Syndicate should have called on the persons who were superintendents in the examination room to report on the matter and should also have ordered some enquiry to be held in the matter and offered the Petitioner some opportunities to prove his innocence. The Registrar as well as the Syndicate have not done this; any decision the Registrar as well as the Syndicate may have arrived at cannot therefore be, in justice, called the result of mature consideration. The Petitioner's explanation given off-hand at a time when he had no materials to clear his innocence with him, and when the Petitioner's mind was bewildered by the sudden and surprising character of the

news that a paper containing notes was found along with the Petitioner's answer papers could not be considered as alone furnishing the Registrar sufficient ground to formulate his order thereon. It is also a matter for consideration that if the Petitioner had taken notes into the examination room the Petitioner would not, as a sane man leave the paper with his answer papers so as to ensure the Petitioner's own ruin. The Registrar also says that he has considered the other connected papers. The Petitioner begs to submit that he is not aware of what other connected papers there could have been in the matter.

13. That as this is a most serious affair - one that concerns the Petitioner's reputation and prospects in life, and one that has cast unmerited stigma and slur on the family to which the Petitioner belongs - the Petitioner most respectfully pray that the Honourable Government will after mature consideration of the Petitioner's pitiful case and the unjust orders passed by the Registrar as well as the Syndicate, be graciously pleased to order a full and thorough investigation into the Petitioner's case and mete out justice to the Petitioner, and the Petitioner begs leave to assure the Honourable Government that in case an enquiry is ordered the

Petitioner may even be able to clear the whole mystery and way to prove his innocence in the matter.

For this act of charity & benevolence the Petitioner, as in duty bound, shall ever pray.

V. A. Ponnuswami

cp

Sub-Registrar

Pudupet near Pannurthi

16th August 1898.

(S. A. District)

When given for copying _____
When copied _____
When examined _____
When signed _____

189 .

READ AGAIN G.O., No.
189 ,

DATED

CURRENT No.

ENCLOSURES TO G. 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.