M.R.O. 1—29,000—16-10-29.

MADRAS RECORD OFFICE.

Government of Madras.

Political DEPARTMENT.

G.O. No. 18. 16 Press ~~Mis.~~

Dated 8—1— 1861

Not to be folded or roughly handled

Read the following Petitions:—

No. 28. To T. PYCROFT, Esquire, Chief Secretary to Government, &c., &c., &c.

The humble Petition of SYED ALAOODDEEN KHADRY and SYED SYFOODDEEN KHADRY, sons of the late SYED YASSEEN MEEAH SAHIB, Superintendent of the Household of the Nabob of Kurnool.

MOST RESPECTFULLY SHEWETH,

That the Nabobs of Kurnool had treated the ancestors of your Petitioners with great respect and regard and conferred on them Jagheers, which they have been enjoying from five generations.

That Gholam Russool Khan Bahadoor the late Nabob of Kurnool, had conferred on their father the Jagheer of Narsapoor in perpetuity, to be continued to his heirs, which he enjoyed till Kurnool and its adjacent territory was sequestrated of by the Honorable East India Company.

That, after the assumption of the Jagheer T. L. Blane, Esquire, the then Commissioner of Kurnool gave to their father a pension of Rupees 160 per month in lieu of the said Jagheer, and that Mr. Stokes his successor, resumed one third of the aforesaid pension and settled on him two thirds of it (Rupees 86-11-1) without attaching to it any restrictions whatever.

That, when the said Yasseen Meeah Sahib petitioned him about the said reduction, he gave him an endorsement, which shows, that the said stipend was given him in lieu of Jagheer, which, he and heirs, and descendants would have enjoyed in perpetuity, had it not been taken possession of by Government, a copy of which your Petitioners have herein enclosed for your honor's perusal.

That the father of your Petitioners then petitioned Captain J. Russell thrice, about it, and he too sent an order to the effect "that the said stipend was in lieu of the proceeds of the said perpetual Jagheer, and that the Government will take his case into consideration in future also." The English translation of this order, the Petitioners have also herein enclosed for your honor's perusal.

That the Government has dealt liberally with the following inhabitants of Kurnool, by settling full pensions on their heirs and descendants after their decease, viz., Shah Kamall Peeran Sahib, Nowraud Khan, Goolzar Khan, Khadur Allee Khan, Shaleem Khan, and others, after whose demise their sons and issues have pensions settled on them conditionally and restrictions of any kind being attached to them. Gholam Mohyaddeen Sarbagee, had the entire pension and situation of his father conferred on him.

That the Petitioners also hoped to be similarly treated to be favored with the full pension and situation of their father, but instead of which this Honorable Government has ordered only two thirds of their father's pension to be paid them only for five years not known why this restriction is so rigidly contemplated.

That the Jagheer, out of the proceeds of which their late father's stipend was paid and was a perpetual one, for the Purvanah issued by the late Nabob Ghulam Russool Khan Bahadoor, when he conferred the said Jagheer on their deceased father, plainly says, "that it is to be enjoyed by him and his heirs and descendants after him generation after generation." Had the Government not taken possession of the said Jagheer, it would have descended to them and their heirs and descendants after them.

That the Petitioners pray your honor to take their case into your merciful consideration; that the Jagheer conferred on their late father and assumed by Government was a perpetual one; to see how unjust it is to take away such a Jagheer, and to confer a small pension in lieu of the Jagheer and that too for a period of five years, and have compassion on their utter destitute and helpless condition either to grant them their Jagheer or continue their pensions to them, to their heirs and descendants after them.

For which act of charity and generosity the Petitioners as in duty bound, shall ever pray.

MADRAS,
The 21st November 1860.

Proceedings of the Madras Government, Political Department, 8th January 1861.

POLITICAL DEPARTMENT.

Proceedings of the Madras Government.

Read the following letter from the Honorable D. ARBUTHNOTT, Collector of Kurnool, to T. PYCROFT, Esq., Chief Secretary to Government, Fort Saint George, dated Kurnool, 20th October 1859, No. 29.

1. With reference to the Proceedings of the Madras Government, under date the 19th July last, No. 411, in the Political Department, communicating Extract from the Proceedings of the Government of India, in the Financial Department, dated 17th June 1859, No. 5,109, conferring on the two sons of the late Yaseen Meeah a member of the Mootafarkhat in equal portions two-thirds of his monthly pension of Rupees 86-6-0, *i. e.* Rupees 57-9-4 for 5 years only. I have the honor to report that on the Order being communicated to the parties they importuned me to represent their case again to Government with a veiw to the limit being removed.

2. It would appear from the enclosed petition that Yaseen Meeah had a Jagheer* in perpetuity granted him during the late Government in which service he was for 40 years (till the territory came under British control) that the late Commissioner Mr. Blane granted him a pension of Gudwall Rupees 160-0-0 in lieu thereof, that during the time Mr. Stokes was Commissioner it was reduced to two-thirds, when the other Mootafarkhat pensions were reduced to one-third, that he was told that his pension would be hereditary, and that he held a Sunnud† which is now in the possession of his sons and that Captain Russell gave him a similar reply to his Urzee on the same subject.

* *Village of Nursapoor.*

† *Sunnud is said to have been lost but the sons hold endorsements from Mr. Stokes and Captain Russell shewing that these Officers were of opinion that this family had really possessed the Jagheer in question.*

3. I may here add that the 2 Petitioners are about 40 and 38 years of age respectively, and that their father Yaseen Meeah left a large family with no other means of support than this pension.

To the Honorable D. ARBUTHNOTT, Collector of Kurnool.

MOST RESPECTED SIR,

Most respectfully I beg leave to bring the following circumstances to your favourable consideration, trusting you will kindly excuse the liberty I have taken of intruding upon your most valuable time.

That our family was for years together under the protection of the late Nabob of Kurnool, and in the enjoyment of Jagheers granted by them. Our father Syed Aseen Meeyan was for upwards of 40 years in the service of the late Nabobs. The late Nabob been pleased to leave our father in the possession of the village of Nursapoor and the Sunnud of this grant plainly shews that it was to be enjoyed by our family for ever and ever. My father continued to enjoy this Jagheer until the assumption of the country. When Mr. Blane was appointed Commissioner for the enjoyment of this country, he granted a pension of 160 Gudwal Rupees in lieu of the said Jagheer which was resumed; and again in time of Mr. Stokes who succeeded him, one-third of this pension was resumed confirming the rest, or Company's Rupees 86-11-0 to his family, saying that it will be continued for ever and we hold the Sunnud granted for the purpose; when my father presented a petition to Mr. Stokes regarding the reducement of his pension, that gentleman was pleased to favor him with endorsement to the effect that his pension will be continued to him, and his lineal descendants after him. Also he presented a petition to Captain Russell the late Government Agent and heard from him the same reply. Our father served the Circar during his life time faithfully although the bounty of the Government he enjoyed was too small to maintain himself and the large family he had to protect. Previous to his demise and at the time he was on the point of death he forwarded two petitions to your honor on the subject of our future prospects, leaving us also under your patronage.

Proceedings of the Madras Government, Political Department, 8th Jauuary 1861.

We beg to state that a few months ago while on circuit at Cudmoor we presented to your honor a petition submitting the original endorsement from Mr. Stokes as well as copies of Sunnuds of the late Nabob, and the orders we obtained from Captain Russell the late Government Agent, and you were kind enough to promise that you will write to the Government recommending the continuance of our pension in full, and we were satisfied.

We also beg to state that we have lately received orders from your honor intimating that one-third of the pension now continued will be resumed and the remaining portion will be confirmed for a limited period of 5 years. We are in consequence greatly disappointed in our expectations because we thought that we are taken under the protection of the Government in common with its other faithful servants.

Shah Kamall Sahib, Khader Ally Khan Naghur, wife of Nowraud Khan, Saryage wife of Goolzar Khan Naghur and many others the heirs of the other deceased parties are still in the enjoyment of the Government bounty. After the demise of Oomer Draz Khan Looryazie, his son Goolam Mohaddeen Khan has been appointed in the room of his father. Our father honestly discharged the duties of the Circar for 21 years since the assumption of the countries, and we hold an endorsement to the effect that what is allowed to us as pension will be continued to our family. On this ground we hoped to get our father's step, together with the pension without limited period, and now we are exceedingly sorry to state, that after the expiration of term fixed for the continuance of our pension we shall be left quite destitute.

Further we beg to state that we look to you for our protection being dependants on you for our future views. We humbly therefore entreat you will be good enough to recommend to the Government in the manner, that the pension will be allowed to us, may be continued to our family without limitation, which kindness will ever be remembered by us with gratitude. There are several references in the records of your Office which we humbly hope will be in support of our claim, and if you will be graciously pleased to forward your kind recommendation on the subject of our claim, we will be very thankful for that kindness.

(Signed) SYED ALLAWOODDEEN, and
SYED SYFOODDEEN.

1*st August* 1859.

ORDER THEREON, 4th November 1859, No. 641.

Resolved, that the Petitioners be informed through the Collector of Kurnool, that the pensions lately granted to them cannot be extended beyond the term for which they have been sanctioned by the Government of India.

(True Extract.)

(TRANSLATION.)

From the Office of JOHN RUSSELL, Acting Commissioner of Kurnool.

To Syed Yasseem Mean, the asylum of dignity and honor. May you be safe.—We have perused the Petition which you have sent to us in connection with your Pension and also the endorsement of Mr. Stokes and it appears to us that the salary which you now draw monthly is in the room of your former Jagheer, although you are at present in service, but it does not appear only to be a monthly stipend, consequently the Government will take your case into consideration after your death, and it is not according to its Regulations to change it in your life-time according to your request. I have returned to you the endorsements which you have sent me.

5th December 1857 *corresponding with the*
17 *Rabeesanee* 1274 *Higrie.*

(Signed) THOMAS RUSSELL.

From Syed Aseen of Kurnool, dated 21st Ramzan 1257 H.
Received 10th November 1841 by T. with 1 enclosure.

Received from P. S. 2nd December 1841.

Prays that Government may grant him the village which he enjoyed for 12 years under the rule of the Nabob of Kurnool.

No. 2,013 of 1841.

The Petitioner is required to produce an endorsement from the Commissioner at Kurnool.

FORT SAINT GEORGE,
14th December 1841.

By Order,
(Signed) ———
Secretary to Government.

Endorsement on Petition No. 2,013 of 1842.

On the assumption of Kurnool the petitioner was in the enjoyment as Jagheer of the village of Nursapoor of which the Taktah beris is Gudwal Rupees 1,361-4-0, but of which the rent is stated in the Sunnud as Gudwal Rupees 1,920-0-0; the Commissioner in October 1839 commuted the Jagheer for a monthly salary in the Mootfarkhat of Gudwal Rupees 160-0-0 which he still receives, the Sunnud dated Shaban 22nd Hegira 1250 makes the Jagheer heriditary and he therefore prays that it may be so considered by the Government. This course seems to have been considered objectionable in the case of Lalkhatum. See letter from the Secretary to Government of India dated 17th May 1841, paragraph 9. The claims of the petitioner will again be brought under the notice of Government in reporting on the revision of the Sawars and Mootfarkhat.

KURNOOL, COMMISSIONER'S OFFICE,
On Circuit Naemoor, 14th February 1842.

(Signed) H. STOKES,
Assistant Commissioner in charge.

———

A true copy of a Purwanah issued with the seal of Nabob Goolam Russool Khan Bahadoor.

Be it known to the present and future Magaddins and Putwaries of the Mouza of Nursapoor of the Taluqa of Changel Mari of the Purgana of Qamar Nagar alias Kurnool, that the said Mouza has been conferred on Syed Yaseen Meyan the asylum of dignity and honor as an hereditary Attamgha Inám in lieu of 1,920 Rupees. Let all the inhabitants, &c., of the said Mouza be continually engaged in rendering advice to the said Meyan and labour for the increase of agriculture and population. Let (them) not demand a new Sanad yearly and let (them) regard our order as peremptory in this particular and act according to it. 22nd of the month of Shaban 1250 Higrie.

———

No. 29. ORDER THEREON, 8th January 1861, No. 15.

Ordered that the following letter be despatched.

(Signed) T. PYCROFT,
Chief Secretary.

———

No. 30. To the Secretary to the Government of India, dated Fort Saint George, 8th January 1861, No. 16.

To Govt. of India, 17th May 1859, *No.* 302.
From do. 23rd June 1859, *No.* 1,216.
From Collector of Kurnool, 20th Octr. 1859, *No.* 29.
Order of Govt., 4th Novr. 1859, *No.* 641.

I am desired by the Honorable the Governor in Council, to bring again under the consideration of the Government of India the case of Saïd Alla Ud Dín and Saïd Saïf Ud Dín, sons of the late Saïd Yasam Meeya of Kurnool.

2. Saïd Yasam Meeya, a member of the Mootafar-i-Khat, in receipt of Rupees 86 per mensem, died in 1859, and an application was submitted to Government in behalf of the present

Proceedings of the Madras Government, Political Department,
8th January 1861.

Petitioners his sons. The application was strongly supported by the Collector, but it was considered by this Government to be unnecessary to adopt, to its full extent, his proposal, which was that $\frac{3}{4}$rds of the stipend should be continued to the sons *for life*. It was thought that it would be sufficient to continue the pension for 5 years, within which time they might fairly be expected to find some mode of livelihood for themselves. This, under the recommendation of the Madras Government, was sanctioned by a Resolution of the Government of India, dated 17th June 1859, Financial Department, No. 5,109.

3. Petitioners earnestly solicit a re-consideration of this decision, resting their claim mainly on the ground that at the time of the assumption of Kurnool in 1839, their father enjoyed a Jághir village distinctly declared in the Sunnud to be *hereditary*, and that the allowance subsequently granted him and which he enjoyed till his death was *in lieu of* that *hereditary Jághir*. They say, too, that both Mr. Stokes formerly Commissioner at Kurnool, and Captain Russell, formerly Government Agent at Kurnool, assured their father that the pension would be continued to his descendants. On this latter point it will be proper to remark that those Officers had no authority to give any such assurance. Mr. Stokes clearly gave none, as will appear from his endorsement which has been produced by Petitioner among the enclosures to his Petition, and Captain Russell, in an endorsement which he gave to Petitioners' father in 1857, merely expressed his opinion that the allowance in question was in lieu of his former Jághir, and that as it was not to be regarded purely in the light of an ordinary salary for service, the Government would take the case into consideration after his death.

4. The Government have not altered their views in respect to the abstract right of these persons to a pensionary provision. His Excellency the Governor in Council does not consider the State is under any obligation to support these Petitioners, but as from their period of life and past habits they are little fitted to support themselves by their own exertions, while one of them is weak and sickly, and they are stated to have no other means of subsistence, the Government direct me to submit the case for favorable consideration. They would suggest that the amounts which they at present enjoy may be continued to them, as a compassionate allowance, *for their lives*. At their death their shares will, of course, lapse absolutely.

(Signed) T. PYCROFT,
Chief Secretary.

Exd. F. Cartledge.

Petn No 3386. of 1860.

—

Petn is referred to the order of Petn dated 4th Novr No 641. of 1859. which he must consider final. No further communication on the subject will receive notice.

L. J.

W JP

See Memo accompanying.

Department.

Memorandum.

This petitioner's case has been thoroughly considered by the Judges of the Sudr Court

The petitioner is a worthless fellow. His case of succession was settled by the Supreme Court in June 1859 (from Agent, 18th April 1859.) His petition should be returned to the S.J. for record & return

this man's case was settled by the Supreme Court in June 1859 but he has been down at Madras for several months trying to get better terms.—

2.— His father Yacoob Meeyah was a member of the Moota-fa-ri-Kah or Patan Senate received a pension of Rs. 86-6-. per mensem, and served with another as Supt. of the Malabs— on his death 3d Jany. 1859 the Agent said that his place need not be filled up—

See from Agent. 15 August 1831.

up- indeed he had been nearly useless for some years before he died- but recommended that two thirds of his pension should be given in equal proportions to his two sons- aged 40 and 38 respectively for their lives

3 The Govt. however thought that it would be enough to give it them for five years, after which time they might shift for themselves- and to this on their recommendation the Govt. of India agreed.-

To Govt. of India- 17 May 1839. Order of Govt. of India- 17 June 1839.

4 Against this translation the Petitioner remonstrates, mainly on the ground, that on the assumption of Kurmoal, his father had an hereditary Jaghire, and that the allowance which he enjoyed to the time of his death was in lieu of it- He says too that both Capt^n. Russel and M^r. Stokes assured his father that the pension would

See endorsement of Capt^n. Russel and M^r. Stokes at the end of the enclosures to his petition.

would be continued to his descendants. It is, clear that neither of those officers had any authority to give such an assurance. But in point of fact Capt^n. Russel merely says that his salary was in room of a former Jaghire and not simply for service, and that the matter would be considered after his death- and M^r. Stokes in no way favors the idea of the pension being hereditary but rather the contrary.-

5 The Jaghire village held by Gaseem Meeyah was granted by a Sunnud of 1250 Fijhah- or A.D. 1834/5- not 5 years before Kurmoal's accession. It was resumed by M^r. B^d Jane the Commissioner (with some other apparently) ~~of the Collector~~ who gave him a pension of Rs. 130 per mensem. The pensions

of

of such of the Moota-
farikat as would
not or could not serve
in the Kurnool Horse
were subsequently re-
duced by 2/3rds, but
Gaseem Meeyah was
reduced by 1/8th only or
to Rs: 86-6 on the ground
that he was employed
in the Mahals.
6 His former Jaghire
village of Annapoor
~~Lingsugur~~ not belonged in
~~does~~ appear in
the earlier papers about
the settlement of Kur-
nool - but what were
the views of the Govt.
of India on such grants
- even when held by Mem-
bers of the Family -
may be seen from their
letter of 17th May 1811 -
paras 9 & 12, noted by
Mr. Stokes in his en-
dorsement of 14th Feby.
1842 attached to Petition
No. 3386 of 1860.
7 The village is not one
of the 18 - attached but
not

i.e. - that Govt. be in any
way of recognizing any
of them as hereditary

+ and there was a better
case than this main
village which seems
to have been resumed by
Mr Blane at once

From Com.rs 3 Nov 1839 - 1
March 1841 - as point
to the same conclusion that
the stipend as Khan Jee
Yaseen Meyat was meant
to be for life only
C.M.C. 18 March 1842.

Mr. Stokes said that Mr.
Blane had intended to pro-
pose a reduction of 1/3d
Report 26 Feby 1842. Para 11.

not resumed - reported
on by Mr. Bayley 16th
Sept. 1842 and it will
be observed that he re-
commended that these,
except such as were
held for religious services,
should be commuted
for pensions for life -
That the allowance
assigned by Mr. Blane
in lieu of the Jaghire
was not meant to be
hereditary appears
plainly - not only from
the tenor of all the
correspondence about
these grants, - but from
the fact that it was
reduced by Govt. at
the recommendation
of Mr. Stokes by 1/3d
and would have been
reduced by 2/3rds, like
other of the Moota-
farikat who declined,
or were unfit to serve
in the Kurnool Irregu-
lar Horse, had he not
been employed in the
Mahals -

Or

From Agent
19 June 1830.

8 On the death of Oomur Denaz Khan Sooreazyr a Member of the Moota-fa-ri-Kat, who had been the medium of communication with the Newanb's Zemmah, selected by the Nuwanb himself for the duty- a man apparently of more consideration than Yaseem Meeyah, and at whose request Yaseem Meeyah was associated with him for duty in the Cutchahs the Govt. of India positively refused to continue his allowance to his son- they said it must be treated as a lapse- and that if any one was required to succeed him in his former duties, the appointment must be formally made and brought on the Agents fixed establishment. This was done accordingly

From Govt. of India.
16 August 1830.

accordingly and the place so created was given to Gholam Mohideen Khan son of Oomur Denaz Khan Sooreazyr.—

18 April 1860.

9 In the present case the Collector reported that a successor to Yaseem Meeyah was not required- and had this Govt. proposed to pension his two sons for life, it is not improbable that the Supreme Govt. would have rejected the proposal- and refused any pension at all.—

10 Altogether these two sons have got as much as they could expect, and they cannot be quartered upon the State for life- The Petitioners should be referred to the former order and told that Govt. will receive no more

petitions

Petitions from Kino.

Political Dep.

Rec: of the Madras Govt

Petition No 3386 of 1860.

Order thereon 8 January 1861. No 15.

ordered that the Govt letter be despatched

Dispt of Govt

No 16.

To the Sec. of to the Govt of India

Sir -

To Govt of India 7th May /59
From do 23d June /59. No 307
From Collr of Runnad 20th Octr /59 No 1216
Order of Govr 4th Novr /59. No 2641

I am desired by the Hon. the G. in C. to bring again under the consideration of the Govt of India the case of Said Abu Bd Din and Said Saif Bd Din sons of the late Said Jafar Meeya of Kurnool.

2. Said Jafar Meeya, a Member of the Maolafar i Khat, in receipt of Rs 36 p. m. died in 1859, and an application was submitted

C18 dept

to Govt in behalf of the present Petr his sons -
The application was strongly supported by the Collr, but it was ~~thought~~ considered that the principle which had always guided the Govt in dealing with claims derived from, or arising out of, Jaghirs operated to the hereditary, forbad the adoption, to its full extent, of ~~the Collrs~~ his proposal, which was that the Stipend of ⅔ds should be continued to the sons for life -
It was thought that it would be sufficient to continue the pension for 5 years, within which time they might fairly be expected to find some mode of livelihood for

⊕ by the Govt to have ceasing to adopt this full

themselves - This, under the recommendation of the Madras Govt, was sanctioned by a resolution of the Govt of India dated 17th June 1859. Dis. Dept. No. 5109.

3. Petr earnestly solicit a reconsideration of that decision, resting their claim mainly ~~upon~~ on the ground that at the time of the assumption by Kurnool in 1839 their father enjoyed a Jaghir which was distinctly declared in the Sunnud to be hereditary, and that the allowance subsequently granted him and which he enjoyed till his death was in lieu of that hereditary Jaghir - They say, too, that both Capt. Boyd ⊕ Mr Stokes

the case for favorable
consideration. They wd
suggest that the amount
which they at present
enjoy may be continued
to them, as a compassionate
allowance, for their lives.
At their death their claims
will, of course, lapse
absolutely.

Fort St George
8th January 1815

I have the honor &c
(Signed) Hyde Villiers
Secretary

Office on return of these
papers from circulation
with the previous correspondence
in the case is to be sent to
Bengal — The Petition &
its enclosures is to be
preserved in safe custody
Calcutta

The Petition &
Enclosures to be
followed
HV

Pol: 1801 Depart

№ 15

Proceedings of Govt

8/ January 1801

Ordering the dis-
patch of a letter to the
Govt. of India referring
again for their considera-
tion the case of said alla
ud Dien and said Saif
ud Dien sons of the
late said Yasaun-
meeya of Kurnool.

28 @ 31

Ex. No 110

C 15 sheet
1821