

Public Works (1899) Department.

G.O., No. 930 W

DATED 29 March 1899.

[Despatch Abstract.]

Amir Khan of Khadr Sharief, late person of the
circle

Prisoner for _____, praying
for release in statement, repeated.

109. Priva Secreto

BACK PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.
	862	27	8-2-79
	3792	27	30-8-78
			File

FURTHER PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

To

His Excellency the Right Honourable

Sir Arthur Elibank Havelock,

G. C. M. G., G. C. I. E.,

GOVERNOR OF FORT SAINT GEORGE,

MADRAS.

THE HUMBLE REPRESENTATION OF **Shiek Server, Amerkhan AND Khadar Shareef**
OF BEZWADA:—

MAY IT PLEASE YOUR EXCELLENCY.

Before setting forth our grievances, we most humbly beg to represent that we have been peons in the D. P. W. on permanent establishment for a very long time and that we have been exerting ourselves to do our utmost in the discharge of our duties. We were ordered by Mr. Hannon, Superintending Engineer, to accompany him in camps through Kistna Eastern Division and he used to give us orders concerning more of his domestic business than of Public duties and we hereby beg your Excellency's permission to enumerate some of them.

1 During his trip through Kistna Eastern Division from 6th January to 30th January 1898, by reasons unknown to us he dismissed his syce at Pamarru and engaged no other syce for his big horse in his stead. He began to utilise the services of one of us (viz Shaik Server) in his place. He gave orders to carry the horse by reins from Pamarru to Coutaram on foot a distance of 6 miles which was explicitly obeyed.

2 On arrival at Pamarru Mr. Hannon rode over the horse and ordered that its feet should be rubbed. We were greatly afraid that the horse would kick us down as we have never been accustomed to such a duty either in or out of our capacity both official and social (as Mohammadans of our stamp do never stoop to such a mean profession). Bearing a grudge that we reluctantly attended this business, both the gentleman and his lady used to speak very harsh words of us.

3 Mr. Hannon has since been treating us very cruelly by sending us with letters to places of more than 20 miles and ordering us to return with replies on the same day. He sent one of us (Shaik Server) from Gudivada to Coutaram with a letter to the Lock Superintendent a distance of 15 miles. This order was explicitly obeyed with fear that we would be dismissed from service.

4 On the 29th January 1898 we walked with his camp from Gudivada to Cowntaram a distance of 7 miles. Immediately after our arrival there he sent one of us to Masulipatam to bring 12 bottles of Soda and they were accordingly brought on the shoulders of a single lascar without the assistance of a coolyman at least and the distance travelled on that day was 31 miles including the 7 miles from Gudivada to Cowntaram.

5 On the 29th night at 10 O' clock he sent one of us (Sheik Server) with a letter to Mr. G. T. Walch at Guntur a distance of 42 miles (24 miles on foot and 18 miles by train). This was explicitly obeyed.

6 On the 7th February 98 he again started for tour through Nellore Division; bearing a grudge against us, he used to make us carry his private

saman on our shoulders without engaging any coolies and we solemnly declare that we were carrying his orders to every letter. When travelling on Buckingham Canal he hardly engaged any coolies for the purpose and ordered us to drag his boat; and we were doing accordingly. He placed the dog cart on the top of the staff boat and at Pedaganjam Lock he ordered to pass boat so that the dog cart may not touch the bridge. When we were so towing the boat and giving the other end of the rope to some one on the bank Mr. Hannon threw one of us (Sheik Server) into the Canal and he fortunately escaped and saved his life being a little swimmer.

7 We already represented the several cruel treatments and the vicissitudes into which we were placed by Mr. Hannon in the petition addressed to the Chief Engineer and to Your Excellency on the previous occasion.

8 At Kottapatam in Nellore Division which is nearly 90 miles off from our Headquarters, Mr. Hannon unreasonably dismissed us as we were unable to carry his *saman* on our shoulders from Kottapatam to Singarayakonda a distance of 20 miles as we greatly fatigued with toils of journey on the previous day without food. We beg to submit that we worked in the Department for the periods * noted in the margin and during that period, we worked with the strong hope that our means of livelihood will be as guarded and safe as any thing else and that we will enjoy in the long run our pension in the old age but on the contrary we are now starving for want of food in these hard days of famine speaking every often name of D. P. W. Government. This is really an event unprecedented in the British history of Service. We never thought that we were working on a precarious and every day's threatening means of livelihood; having that hope only, we were working on a small monthly pay of Rs. 6 notwithstanding a cooly demand of 0-8-0 per day. In such a case, we were dismissed with one word of Mr. Hannon and our service was not taken into account. Mr. Hannon says that we resigned our appointments and, notwithstanding the Chief Engineer's No. 1819 C of 24-3-98, he even gave orders that we shall not be re-appointed in the D. P. W. in any capacity. We never resigned our appointments but Mr. Hannon forcibly took our belts and badges. Had we resigned, we would have never begged for re-appointment.

9 Recently on 15-7-98 Mr. Hannon re-appointed one of our set, Bodi Venkatasami. *Sheik Server*

10 After such a long service & hard labour we were endorsed both by the Chief Engineer and by Your Excellency that this case will not be interfered with. Having worked under Your Excellency, we do not know any other to whom we should go for redress of grievances which fell upon us without any reason.

11 As the instance of B. Venkatasamy whom Mr. Hannon re-appointed holds equally reasonable in our case and as we are dying for want of food in these days of famine and consequently reduced to beggary &c and as we hereby tender an apology, we most humbly beg that Your Excellency may be pleased to show us mercy & means of livelihood so that our families may be protected.

12-Of us, Amer Khan is a military pensioned Sepoy.

WE BEG TO REMAIN,
YOUR EXCELLENCY,

YOUR MOST OBEIENT & HUMBLE SERVANTS,

*Bezawada. 2
4-8-99*

*امير خان
کا دیکھی و باقوال*

*Sheik Server 10.
Amerkhan 6.
Khadar Shareef 4.

C No 2390

Mr

I have just seen
your remarks of 20.3.99,
the paper having been
inadvertently sent away
by the office instead
of being sent to me.

Rule 5(3) of the
Petition Rule lays down
that

"Petitions addressed to
Hort. will be liable to
summary rejection when
(3) a previous petition has
been disposed of by the
Madras Hort. x x x x x
& the petition discloses no
new facts or circumstances
which afford grounds for
a reconsideration of the
case.

The petitioners in April
98 submitted a petition
Hort. which was rejected
by G.O. No. 1839 of 20.7.99
Hort. D.