

MADRAS RECORD OFFICE.

Government of Madras.

Political **DEPARTMENT.**

G.O. No.	/ 3 4	Press ~~Mis.~~
Dated	28 - 2 -	19 1959

Not to be folded or roughly handled

Ans

Fort Saint George, Political Consultation, 1st March 1859.

No. 20. To the Right Honorable GEORGE LORD HARRIS, Governor in Council, Fort Saint George.

The humble Petition of Goolam Hussun Moosa Raza, Goolam Ally Abdul Auzeem, Goolam Valla Hoossain and Goolam Abdul Raza Hoossain, Carnatic Stipendiaries.

HUMBLY SHEWETH,

That your Petitioners in forwarding herewith their appeal in Triplicate beg most respectfully to request your Lordship will be pleased to transmit the same to the Right Honorable Lord Stanley, Secretary of State for India, with such of your recommendation as the merit of the case require.

Your Lordship in Council shall find no objection in acting as above solicited inasmuch as no appeal regarding the subject under allusion was ever made to the Home Authorities by your Petitioners and that this is the first attempt of the kind in their part.

Your Petitioners hope that the necessity of forwarding the appeal to the Right Honorable Lord Stanley would be obviated should that justice which they wish to seek from abroad be administered to them by you Lordship's liberal hands.

For which Act of benevolence your Petitioners shall, as in duty bound, ever pray.

8th February 1859.

No. 21. ORDER THEREON, No. 134; dated 28th February 1859.

Three of the Petitioners are the Nickah brothers, and the fourth the Nephew of the late Gholam Abbass Ali Khan, commonly styled Syf Ool Mulk, who was the head of their family and in whose Pension they had certain subordinate shares.

2. In Extract Minutes of Consultation, No. 441, dated 1st December 1840, their several shares were ordered to be deducted from the Stipend of the head of the family, owing to their having left the country, on a joint pilgrimage to Mecca, without the usual license. They returned in 1842, and at the recommendation of the Agent, and strictly as an indulgence, the Pensions forfeited were continued⁹ to them from the date of their arrival. They have subsequently twice petitioned for payment of the arrears accruing between their departure and return, but the prayer has been disallowed; vide Extract Minutes of Consultation,† No. 471, dated 5th December 1845, and Extract Minutes of Consultation,‡ No. 292, dated 29th June 1847.

Diary to Consultation, 1st December 1840, No. 21

* No. 260, dated 17th June 1842.

In Consultation, 21st Idem, No. 142.

† In Consultation, 9th December 1845, Nos. 26 & 27.

‡ In Consultation, 29th June 1847, Nos. 19 & 20.

3. They now prefer an appeal to the Secretary of State, and it is resolved to forward their Memorial, with the remark that their allegation that they were not cognisant of any irregularity in their leaving India without leave, is not borne out by the record.

(Signed) T. PYCROFT,
Chief Secretary.

Exd. J. A. Wilson.

19-20
2. They now prefer an appeal

2
The Right Honble Lord Stanley
Secretary of State for India
Whitehall
Dear Sir
I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 14th inst. in relation to the proposed extension of the jurisdiction of the High Court of Madras to the District of Tanjore. The Government of India have been instructed to consider the matter with a view to the convenience of the people of the said District. I am, Sir, very respectfully,
Yours obedient servant,
Wm. H. Murray, Esq.
Under Secretary to the Secretary of State for India

That your statement relating
the extension of the jurisdiction of the High Court
the Government of India by the Honble
Gracious Majesty the Queen by to submit
your Lordship this extremely hard case
worked with their approval of the arrangement
their standards in consequence of the ill
last not having fully agreed as to whether
any & liability actually rests on your Co
therefore submitting the said memorandum to the
H.C.

relying upon the mislabelling of the
Agents in regard to their case. I have
been the subject of your interest in
their statement to find reasonable that the report
of the Petitioners (three of whom are in receipt of
monthly pensions of 95 P. each, and the other two in
addition to their pension is without any stipend
allowed them for his 20 P.) to whom you
have been so kind to consider.

I have been so kind to consider
to provide for pilgrimage to Mecca and in consequence
thereof they applied to Mr. Highup the
Assistant for allowing them to leave the country
to effect the above object, and which application
was referred to Mr. Highup to the effect. I have
been so kind to consider that the petitioners
had asked for leave to go to Mecca with up to
their eldest brother and the head of their family
on the subject and who in reply to the agent stated
that it is not advisable to grant them leave of absence.
On the submission of these proceedings
to Mr. Highup by the Agent to Mr. Highup to
to comply with the petitioners request. I have been
so kind to consider having visited about the period of
allusion to Mr. Highup the Assistant.

I have been so kind to consider the petitioners
immediately after the occurrence of the above affair
interposed a petition to believe that he as
the head of the family had power to grant them
the indulgence they sought for and that Mr. Highup
had received no interference whatever in matters
relating to his family, and in consequence of your
petitioners having applied to Mr. Highup to
reporting to him he was thrown into confusion
and obliged to offer an opinion adverse to them.
He said he would now grant to your petitioners
leave to the extent they desired and advised them
to proceed on pilgrimage. Your petitioners having then
the young below 20 years of age were obliged to
thereby the order of Governor Highup all
the head of their family and entirely rely
on their starting off on their pilgrimage.
I have been so kind to consider After your petitioners return to Mecca
expiration of the leave granted to them by the head
of their family they were going to Mecca
they were going to Mecca that in consequence
of the fact of the head of the family having

performed, and the satisfaction of the Government as
the Highways desired to accord to your Petitioner's request
and the fact would be proved by the letter of the same
above alluded to to the head of the family the transac-
tion in which the Highways had sent to the agent in
the letter of the 5th October 1842.

5. That your Petitioner having arrived at Madras
on the 17th March 1842 the said head of this family
petitioned the Highways for returning to them their respec-
tive stoppages with money as no blame was attached
to them for he himself had permitted them to proceed to
Madras. The Highways had recommended the said
petition to the Government Agents recommending only
for the restoration of the provisions and not the money
as the Highways himself had previously proposed
for their stoppages and which was accordingly done
and the money was paid by the Government.

6. That your Petitioner supposing that by further
stopping it on their part for the recovery of the money
during the time of the Highways the said Petitioner
would prove fault in the conduct of the writers of
judges return the Highways to the head of this
family, but caused the acquisition of the Madras

in Oct 5. they had renewed their claim by presenting
a petition to the Highways the Madras who refused it
to his Government. This functionary after consulting full
inquiry into the case of your Petitioner through the
head of this family (who had admitted before the Government
that he himself had granted leave of 5 years Petitioner
without applying for the same either to go to or the
Highways the Native Madras) made a report
that there exists no fault whatever on the part of
Petitioner. And they are informed the then Gov. Agent
Major Robertson in submitting the correspondence
made a wrong report to Gov. to say that your
petitioner the Highways upon this subject dated 25th
November 1842 it would appear that the Petitioner
after receiving the order of the Highways the
Native Madras directing them to return to the Petitioner
declined to act up to it. your Petitioner had
already in their opinion of the report of the
Robertson being a wrong one, because the
the Native Madras had joined to them as a
petition, while so how could it be imagined that
Robert Madras would have written to the Government
your Petitioner having been removed to Calcutta the
the said Robert might have written that he

ordered Graham. May 1847. Then the head of your
Ottomani family to desire them to leave the house,
and the order of his High Commission to your Ottomani
they had asked against it. He is a bad & persecuting
man. He has said that the Govt. had ordered
and rejected your Ottomani appeal in 1845. (dated 5th Decr 1845.)

7th That your Ottomani men were removed their
appeal to Govt. in 1847 through his Highness the Sultan
praying for a proper enquiry into their case & that then
they had proceeded to leave without the permission
of the head of their family and contrary to a general
order after receiving a reply from Govt. in 1845. His
Highness the Sultan then they refused to obey
then, but the former reports of all the Ottomani men
in 1845 being rejected the Govt. for the second time
also rejected their appeal in 1847. (dated 29th Jan 1847.)

8th That the Govt. after the finding the former & the
reports of the Ottomani after a full and thorough
enquiry to his Highness the Sultan in 1845 is to your
Ottomani

Ottomani being entirely plain & the satisfaction of
your Ottomani to come an enquiry into their case without
further from your Ottomani taking the Agents report
as the only criterion in their acts.

9th That while the head of your Ottomani family
had at the beginning given his opinion to the Agent
in regard to your Ottomani application to his Highness
and which was referred by his Highness to the Agent,
that the indulgence which by them should be
be granted, and subsequently he himself had given
permission to your Ottomani without expressing the
cause of the change of his mind on being asked,
in the Decree on the 30th August 1844 and admitted in
his letter to the Ottomani in 1845 that he himself
had caused your Ottomani to proceed to leave
without the leave of the Sultan being obtained,
quite strange that your Ottomani should
be subjected to punishment and the head of their
to be left unquestioned.

10th That in conclusion your Ottomani have
which your Lordships in the exercise of your
paramount authority over India would be more
graciously pleased to take the whole of the Ottomani
above urged into your Lordships' benevolent &

Having considered and in the distance
 must to your Orders of the same of the
 accompanied. During the time they were in case
 for pilgrimages to Mecca through the land of
 that justice which they had paid to the
 from the local authority.

To which all of assistance you
 Orders shall as in duty bound.
 (or any).

1397

غلام حسن موصی

علام علی العظیم

غلام والا

غلام عبدالعظیم

1859
 26th 2 to 28th 28th 28th

Political Dept

No. 134
 Enc. 5/28 28th 28th

Read the following Petition
 from Gholam Hussein Moosa Boga,
 Gholam Ali, Abdul Azeez, Gholam
 Valla Hossain & Gholam Abdool
 Boga Hossain.

see entry
 2/8th Feb, 1859

These of the Petitioners are
 the Nicksah brokers, & the family the
 nephew of the late Gholam Abdool
 Ali Khan, commonly styled, ^{the} ~~the~~
 main or Mulla, who was the head
 of his family & in whose pension
 they had certain subordinate shares.
 2. In C.M.C. No 41 d/1st Decr/60,
 their several shares were ordered to be
 deducted from the stipend of the
 head of the Family, owing to their
 having left the country, on a joint
 pilgrimage to Mecca, without the
 usual license. They returned in 42,
 and at the recommendation of the
 Agent, and strictly as an indulgence,
 the pensions forfeited were continued
 to them from the date of their arrival.
 They have subsequently twice petitioned
 for payment of the arrears accruing
 between their departure & return, but
 the prayer has been disallowed; vide
 #
 C.M.C. No 471 d/5th Decr/45 and
 #
 C.M.C. No 292 d/29th June/47.
 3. The same...

24th 28th 28th 28th
 28th 28th 28th 28th

x No 260
 d/17th June/42
 In C.M.C. No 215 d/28th
 28th 28th

In C.M.C. No 29 d/28th June/47
 28th 28th
 # In C.M.C. No 29 d/28th June/47
 28th 28th

the Sec^y of State, ~~that the~~
~~that the~~ ~~that the~~ ~~that the~~
~~that the~~ ~~that the~~ ~~that the~~
~~that the~~ ~~that the~~ ~~that the~~
 it is resolved to
 forward their memorial, with
 the remark that their allegation
 that they were not cognisant
 of any irregularity in being leaving
 India without leave, does
 not appear to come out of

To the Sec^y of State } he recd.
 To the Pres. } Disposed to

J. C. 11/4/59

ordered that the following
 be sent to the President

(To be sent to the
 Sec^y of State)

Ad. A. L. Aug. 20. 1854. No. 104.

Dr. 2269. Richard
Catharine 1857. Johann

Advised 1857. Departs

Admitted by the Court

Wm. A. Fordham 1866

Dec 120 of 1859

82134

Extracts from the

2/20 February 1857.