

MADRAS RECORD OFFICE.

Government of Madras.

Political DEPARTMENT.

G.O. No. 21

~~Press~~

~~Mis.~~

Dated

8 - 1 - 1861

Not to be folded or roughly handled

Dr
21

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

Read the following papers:—

No. 38. From MIR ZULFAKAR ALLY KHAN and MIR AKBER ALLY KHAN of Madras, to T. PYCROFT, Esq., Chief Secretary to Government, Fort Saint George, dated 17th December 1859.

Under the Orders of Government, dated 26th May 1859, No. 328, Brigadier White the Officer Commanding Vellore was directed to institute an enquiry as to the truth of our statement that we were related to the family of the late Tippoo Sultan. Instead of resorting for the required information to the records of his own Office and to the Commissioners of Mysore, the only authority that has the means to establish the fact in question, Brigadier White deemed it expedient to make that reference to Dr. Balfour, Government Agent at Chepauk and Paymaster of Carnatic Stipends, who possessed no means whatever to authenticate or contradict the truth of our statement, and forwarded a report upon the statement of Dr. Balfour.

We now crave permission to annex herewith an original document in our possession, being a letter addressed by Lieutenant Colonel G. M. Stewart, Commanding Vellore, to Colonel Cubbon, Commissioner of Mysore, under date the 8th May 1835, with its enclosure attested by Colonel Napier, then Commanding Vellore, shewing the connexion of our father with Tippoo Sultan, and authenticating his service under the Sultan, and to which also is annexed a copy of the letter from the Prince Sultan Mahomed Yaseen Saheb son of the late Tippoo Sultan to the address of Captain H. Logan, soliciting that Officer strongly to recommend the case of our father, and which was delivered to him by Colonel G. M. Stewart attested by his own signature—the perusal of which at once establish beyond any doubt the fact of our relationship to the late Sultan's family. And thus falsify the statements laid before Government by Dr. Balfour and Captain Batten.

We cannot conjecture what motive could have influenced the two last named gentlemen to place the statement made by us in our memorials to the Home Authorities in such an *unfavorable light* to the Government. Unless that object was to bring discredit on our character for integrity and to hold us up as impostors and endeavouring to practice an imposition on Government by fraudulent means. We trust however, the present documents will satisfy the Government that we were not influenced by such unworthy and dishonest motives, and that that redress which we have long been seeking will now be accorded to us agreeably to the humane views of the Right Honorable the Secretary of State for India in their recent Despatch.

We beg to enclose a most respectful Appeal to the address of His Excellency the Governor, offering certain observations upon the statements contained in the Brigadier's report—we humbly beseech your honor will submit the same for the consideration of His Excellency the Governor in Council together with the original documents now forwarded to your honor, and pray to receive your indulgent consideration to our humble prayer.

TO THE RIGHT HONORABLE SIR CHARLES TREVELYAN, K. C. B., GOVERNOR IN COUNCIL,
FORT SAINT GEORGE.

The Humble Petition of MEER ZOOLFAKAR ALLY KHAN and MEER AKBUR ALLY KHAN, sons of the late MEER AMMEENNOODDEEN ALLY KHAN a relative of His Highness the late TIPPOO SULTAN of Mysore.

MOST HUMBLY SHEWETH,

1. Adverting to the Orders of the Madras Government dated 23rd September 1859, No. 554, passed upon the report of Brigadier White, Commanding Vellore, framed upon one from Mr.

A

May be sent that appearance from

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

Balfour the Government Agent at Chepauk, your Petitioners most deferentially beg to submit once more their extremely hard case before your Lordship, and to beseech towards it your Lordship's humane and benevolent consideration.

2. Your Petitioners are prepared and have every means to establish the fact of their relationship, that the maternal grandmother of their father, and the maternal grandmother of Tippoo Sultan, were uterine sisters, as well as of the service of your petitioners' father in the Government of Mysore, as narrated in your petitioners' memorial to the Home Authorities, who in consideration of the said two circumstances, have in their letter of 13th March 1859, No. 4, paragraphs 37 to 41 conveyed their order to allow pensions to your petitioners, but before your petitioners were afforded the opportunity to prove the above facts, they feel it bound now to offer certain observations upon the remarks of Mr. Balfour.

3. In the 2nd paragraph of Mr. Balfour's letter to Brigadier White conveyed in his above report, he alludes to the fact of your petitioners' mother being a Carnatic Stipendiary of Rupees 10 a month. Your petitioners have in reference thereto to enquire, how the above circumstance could have prejudiced their claim by the right of their father founded upon his connection with Tippoo Sultan, and that although your Petitioners' mother had a small pension, yet she was the granddaughter of Hakeem Meer Mahomed Hoossain who enjoyed an allowance of Rupees 250 a month, under the Nabob Wallajah, who esteemed him very highly.

4. In the 3rd paragraph he affirms that your petitioners' father was in the service of Syfood Dowlah and latterly of his sons, which was nevertheless the case; but your petitioners' father on arriving here from Arrengabaud in 1827, with the intention of submitting his claim on the bounty of Government, he was on account of his respectability, but being in very limited circumstance, was desired by the said Dowlah with pecuniary assistance, and after his death, he stood in the same position to his sons, who afforded the same assistance as he received from their father, which circumstance would be elucidated by the accompanying document from the eldest son. It is therefore evident from this that your petitioners' father was never a servant, even should it be otherwise, your petitioners cannot perceive how that could damage their claim on the bounty of Government.

5. In the 4th paragraph Doctor Balfour refers to the letter of Lieutenant Campbell as affording information that his office records do not contain any mention of your petitioners. Your petitioners have to state that should a search be made into the records of the office of the Commissioner of Mysore, he will there find a letter from Colonel Stewart under date the 8th May 1835, and its enclosures, which will at once shew the connection of your petitioners' father with Tippoo Sultan, and his service under him was fully authenticated. Your petitioners regret from the latter part of the above para. that when enquiries were made regarding your petitioners, only one man could state that when he saw their father about 15 years ago, he had heard him state that he (their father) was a relative of Tippoo Sultan. Whatever it may be, whether it may be true or to the contrary, your petitioners beg to state that when enquiries were made at Vellore, regarding your petitioners' connection, it was brought to the notice of Captain Batten by Mahomed Badeeyooddeen Khan and Moulvee Mohyooddeen Saib that your petitioners' father's grandmother was the own sister of the grandmother of Tippoo Sultan.

6. In reference to the 5th paragraph, your petitioners beg to state that your Excellency will perceive from the letter therein alluded to and its enclosures, that the connection of your petitioners' father with Tippoo Sultan both by relationship and service was fully established and not merely alleged.

7. With regard to the 7th paragraph, your petitioners have to state that your petitioners' statement in their petition to the Brigadier of Vellore that their father as a brother of Tippoo Sultan is perfectly consistent with the Mahomedan view of relationship. The descendants of two sisters or two brothers, since the grandmother of your petitioners' father and the grandmother of Tippoo Sultan, were sisters of the same womb, consequently their father and Tippoo Sultan were cousins, and among Mahomedans they are styled brothers to each other. It is true that their father did not at the time, when the other relatives of Tippoo Sultan were pensioned, submit his claim for pension, and that he should have then done so, there would not have

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

existed the present necessity or difficulty on the part of your petitioners and their father to establish their claim for pension.

8. In the 8th paragraph Doctor Balfour introduces certain facts alleged to have been stated by your petitioners in answer to a question from Captain Batten, your petitioners beg to observe that those answers, were nevertheless the literal interpretation of what your petitioners had stated in Hindoostanee at the time when the enquiry was held. It would be nothing but unreasonable and absurd to suppose, that your petitioners could have stated, that none of their ancestors were ever Mysore pensioners, inasmuch that it is a fact apparent that their connection with the Mysore family commenced from the time of their father by his grandmother who was the sister of the grandmother of Tippoo Sultan, so that their father was the only person who could have any claim for a Mysore pension, and that after him, your petitioners. Your petitioners have not stated that the monthly stipends of 10 Rupees of their mother was the only means of their support, but the sale proceeds of their father's property and by borrowing money from Soucars. Your petitioners' father was not ignorant of pensions being allotted to the relatives of Tippoo Sultan, but he was unable to submit his claim from so distant a country as Arrengabad, where he having fled at the capture of Serungaputnum remained there with his brother until 1827, and in which year he came down to Madras on the demise of his brother. The records of Mysore Commission will contain only the names of such of the relatives and dependants &c., of Tippoo Sultan, as have set forth their claims on the bounty of Government and pensioned—consequently it was needless to expect that your petitioners' father's name could be traced in the above records as he was not one of them at the time, but if a reference be made to the old Persian records of Tippoo Sultan's Durbar, your petitioners' father's name would doubtlessly be traced out as the Buckshee of Infantry and the cousin of Tippoo Sultan.

9. With regard to the 10th para., your petitioners have to state that they never claimed to have descended from Tippoo Sultan, but they asserted to have been related to him by the side of his father's grandmother, as the grandmother of your petitioners' father and the grandmother of Tippoo Sultan were own sisters. Petitioners were not ignorant of their lineage or descent or asserted any thing to the contrary; their father in his Memorial to the Supreme Government dated 19th September 1851, which was attached to the Memorial to the Home Authorities had distinctly narrated his said connection with Tippoo Sultan, and subsequently your petitioners have in their several communications to the Local and Home Government, urged their said relationship, and the circumstance of your petitioners' admission that they were not descended from Tippoo Sultan, and the establishment of their relationship with him in their several communications, as well as of their late father to the Local and Home Authorities, would your petitioners consider sufficient to justify the statements made in the above para.

10. With reference to the 11th para., your petitioners beg to state that the fact of your petitioners' father's service in the Mysore state, was not only proved by the document of Mahomed Badeeyooddeen Khan Bahadoor, but his respectability and the above service has been fully authenticated before Brigadier F. P. Stuart in 1829, who intimated the same to the Private Secretary to Government in his letter of the 3rd October 1829. The copy of which was submitted by Colonel G. M. Stuart to the Commissioner of Mysore in his letter of the 8th May 1853. Mr. Balfour states that your Petitioners' father had died about 2 years ago, but the case is not so, he died on the 19th October 1851. About 8 years ago as stated in your petitioners' memorial to the late Honorable Court of the 22nd March 1852. Their father at his death was about 87 years of age, consequently at the close of the Tippoo Sultan's dynasty, he might have been 35 years old, your petitioners beg to add that their great grandfather Nabaub Begler Bege Khan was first appointed by Mohomed Shaw the King of Delhi, to the Suba of Bijapoor and afterwards, his son your petitioners' great grandfather Nabaub Meer Mohomed Ally Khan succeeded his father to the said Subah, and after him your petitioners' grandfather Nabob Meer Assadully Khan succeeded him, and the Subah was lost by conquest, the same having been taken by the Mahrattas. Your petitioners' father while about 12 years of age, Tippoo Sultan in consideration of his ancestral respectability and his family connection with him, bestowed the appointment of Buckshee

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

of Asham, and Bubbur Jung was nominated by Tippoo Sultan to conduct his duties during his minority and putting him in the way of business. The above facts are too well known among petitioners' family and they have been urged in the several applications of your petitioners as well as that of their father.

11. In reference to the other paragraphs from 12 to 16, your petitioners beg to state that they are not blood relatives of Tippoo Sultan and that they never claimed to be such in any of their petitions, but Mr. Balfour states that *your petitioners have failed even to prove any collateral connection*, is a mis-statement, as from circumstances urged above and detailed below, your petitioners have not failed to establish their claim submitted in their petitions to the Supreme Government and Home Authorities, as the grandmother of their father and the grandmother of Tippoo Sultan were uterine sisters. Although your petitioners' father's petition was rejected by the Supreme Government in 1851, yet on your petitioners appealing in 1852, to higher Authority in England, they in consideration of the same claim issued a favourable order, the claims of only those persons connected with the Mysore family which were then preferred were investigated in 1799, and of the others whenever they had occurred. As the claim of Meer Mohamed Ally Khan who came from Nagpore about 4 years before your petitioners' father's arrival from Arrungabad in 1827, was admitted during the Government of Sir Thomas Monro, and a pension of Rupees 875 a month, was granted to him on account of his collateral relationship with Tippoo Sultan by the side of his mother.

12. In taking the above circumstance into your Excellency's favorable consideration, your Excellency would perceive that the opinion of Mr. Balfour as to your petitioners' ineligibility for pension is without any real foundation.

13. It is extremely to be regretted that Brigadier White should have stated that the ladies of the Mahal now in existence have distinctly denied all knowledge of relationship of your petitioners with Tippoo Sultan, while the own brother (Hafiz Assadoola Khan Syed) of Moona-ver Bagum alluded to by the Brigadier, has written a letter to your petitioners on their asking to certify their relationship and the service of their father under Tippoo Sultan's Government, as also Colonel F. P. Stuart, having instituted full enquiries reported in his letter to Government of the 3rd October 1829, that their relationship with Tippoo Sultan has been authenticated before him, and that the Bagums of the Mahal style your petitioners' father a rather near relative.

14. In submitting the above observations on the report of Mr. Balfour and of Brigadier White, your Petitioners would for the elucidation of the fact of their father's connection with Tippoo Sultan, and that of his service under him, beg to refer your Excellency to the following documents herewith accompanying.

Letter of Brigadier F. P. Stuart, Commanding Vellore, to the Private Secretary to Government, dated 3rd October 1829,—marked A.

Original copies of enclosures of A, B and C, attested by Collector Napier and Colonel G. M. Stuart, are enclosed in the letter addressed to the Chief Secretary.

Letter from the Prince Sultan Mohamed Yasseem Saib the son of Tippoo Sultan, to Captain H. Logan, Paymaster of stipends at Vellore, dated 16th January 1835,—marked B.

Letter of Colonel G. M. Stuart, Commanding Vellore, to Colonel Cubbon, Commissioner of Mysore, dated 8th May 1835, enclosing the copy of the document A, as well as a Certificate which might have been lodged either in the Mysore or Vellore records,—marked C.

Letter from Hafiz Assoodoolah Khan Syed, a Mysore pensioner, to your petitioners' address, dated 9th October 1859,—marked D.

Letter from Baddeyooden Khan, Mysore pensioner, to your petitioners' address, dated 9th October 1859,—marked E.

Letter from Molvie Moheyooden Saib, dated 9th October 1859,—marked F.

Letter from Syed Goolam Hussain Khan, Mysore pensioner, dated 23rd October 1859,—marked G.

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

A Mahazur sealed and signed by many people of Arcot, some of them Mysore pensioners—marked H.

15. To prove the fact that they had never claimed than this, that the grandmother of their father and the grandmother of Tippoo Sultan were own sisters, and that your petitioners' father served under him as Bukshee of Asham—your petitioners beg to enclose the copies of petitions of their father to the Government of India and to the Court of Directors—marked I and J, respectively.

16. By the submission of the above, your petitioners earnestly request your Excellency will be pleased to call for the originals of the appendices marked A, B and C, with the Certificates and the copy of the letter from Colonel G. M. Stuart to the Commissioner of Mysore, dated 15th April 1835, recommending upon the Prince's letter to the address of Brigadier Logan, and by the perusal of the report of Brigadier Logan to Government upon the petition of your petitioners to him dated 18th February 1858, as well as other accompaniments, and after a full satisfaction that your petitioners are related to Mysore family, bestow upon them a suitable pension agreeably to the order of the Right Honorable the Secretary of State, dated 31st March 1859, No. 4.

No. 4,891 of 1859.

Forwarded to the Acting Collector of North Arcot who will report, with reference to former correspondence, upon the subject, whether the papers petitioners refer to, and the arguments they adduce, which certainly deserve consideration, bear out their assertion that they are related to Tippoo.

FORT SAINT GEORGE,
29th March 1860.

By Order,
(Signed) L. FORBES,
Dy. Secy. to Government.

No. 39. From J. D. ROBINSON, Esq., Acting Collector of North Arcot, to T. PYCROFT, Esq., Chief Secretary to Government, Fort Saint George, dated Chittur, 23rd July 1860, No. 35.

On receipt of the endorsement on petition, No. 4,891 of 1859, and the papers which accompanied it, I wrote to Mr. Elliott, the Acting Sub-Collector, who is in charge of the Stipend Pay Office and records, requesting him to draw up a report on the subject for submission to Government.

That report I have now the honor to enclose together with copy of the Certificate which accompanied it. From these papers, Government will gather that petitioners are merely remotely connected with Tippoo Sultan by marriage on the female side, and that no blood relationship existed between the two families. By old precedent in such cases, petitioners would, Mr. Elliott observes, be entitled to a pension of Rupees 437-8 per mensem, but at this distance of time, and under the peculiar circumstances of the case which render it very questionable whether petitioners have any claim whatsoever on the liberality of the Government, this is a scale of allowance which is not to be thought of. I have myself so poor an estimate of that claim, that I hesitate to make any recommendation and would merely suggest that if Government should be pleased to take a favorable view of the case, an allowance of $\frac{1}{4}$ th of the pension formerly granted, *viz.*, Rupees 109-6 per mensem be made to petitioners.

B

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

From E. F. ELIOTT, Esq., Acting Sub Collector and Joint Magistrate of North Arcot, in charge of Stipend Pay Office, to J. D. ROBINSON, Esq., Acting Collector of North Arcot, dated Vellore, 14th July 1860, No. 176.

Paragraph 1. With reference to my letter to your address, dated 7th instant, No. 166,

* From Hawfiz Assadoollah Khan Saeed, brother-in-law of the late Prince Sultan Moizuddeen, son of Tippoo Sultan, dated 9th October 1859.
From Mahomed Buddeyaddeen Khan, Nephew of the late Padshaw Beigum, widow of Tippoo Sultan, dated 9th October 1859.
From Syed Goolam Hoossein Khan, son of the late Novilabsur Khan, brother-in-law of the late Tippoo Sultan, dated 23rd October 1859.
From Moheddeen, Moulvie of Vellore, dated 9th October 1859.

I have the honor to forward copy of the Certificate alluded to in Lieutenant Colonel Stuart's letter of the 8th May 1835, received from the Commissioner's Office, Mysore, this day, from which and the four* letters to the address of the petitioners, it would appear that a relationship by marriage between Memorialists' and the late Sultan's family, has been fully established, by the maternal Aunt of the late Tippoo Sultan and the mother of Memorialists' father, the late

Meer Ahmeenooddeen Ally Khan, being sisters, by which connection, Memorialists' father becomes a cousin of Tippoo Sultan by marriage.

2. With reference to paragraph 3 of your letter to my address dated 3rd instant, No. 94, I have the honor to state that there are only two Beigums now in the Mahals who are Nickah wives of the late Tippoo Sultan, who have denied all knowledge of the relationship between Memorialists' father and Tippoo Sultan's family, but the Beigums referred to in Brigadier Napier's letter to James Lushington, Esq., dated 3rd October 1839, who styled Memorialists' father "a rather close relation" must have since died.

3. As Memorialists' father's relationship with the late Sultan and the manner of his employment under the late Government of Mysore as Buckshee, have been fully established, according to precedent, they would be entitled to Rupees 437-8-0 per month, being equal to the amount granted by Order of Government, dated respectively 21st February 1815, and 10th April 1819, to the families of the late Ally Rezah Khan and Goolam Ally Sadoor, who were, the former a Vakeel, and the latter a Buckshee under Tippoo Sultan.

4. The Memorial of Meer Zoolfakar Ally Khan and Meer Akbur Ally Khan with enclosures, received with your letter dated 3rd instant, No. 94, are herewith returned.

We have herein written what we know concerning of Meer Ameen Addeen Aly Khan.

That the wife of the maternal Uncle of the late Tippoo Sultan and the mother of Meer Ameen Addeen Aly Khan were sisters, by this connection he becomes a brother to Tippoo Sultan.

The Seal of AHOMED BEG, and his signature.

The Seal and Signature of HAUFIZ SIED MOORTZAH,

The Seal and Signature of GOOLAM MOORTZAH KHAN,

The Seal and Signature of REZAH BEG,

(Signed) SHAIK AHOMED, Pensioned Subidar.
(") MIRJAH ESMOIL BEG,
(True Copy.)

(Signed) ROBERT COLE,
for Officiating Secretary.

(True Copy.)
(Signed) E. F. ELIOTT,
Ag. Sub Collr. and Joint Magte., of North
Arcot in charge of Stipend Pay Office.

(True Copy.)
(Signed) J. D. ROBINSON,
Acting Collector.

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

No. 40.

ORDER THEREON, 8th January 1861, No. 21.

The Government have carefully considered all that Petitioners have urged in their petition, and have come to the conclusion that their claim is altogether inadmissible. Even accepting as true the account they give of their connection with Tippoo, it only amounts to this, that they are very remote collateral relations in the female line, and are distantly connected by marriage. This would, under any circumstances have constituted a very doubtful ground on which to base a claim on the British Government; but, as the case stands, Petitioners' father having allowed his claim—if he ever possessed any—to lie over for 27 years, and a period of more than half a century having elapsed since the events out of which this claim arose occurred, it is clearly out of the question to entertain any application of the nature of that put forward. Petitioner must consider his claim definitively settled and the Government will receive no more applications from him.

(Signed) T. PYCROFT,
Chief Secretary.

Exd. F. Cartledge.

Memo for orders.

In paras 37 to 41. of ^{his} ~~the~~ Despatch dated 31st March 1859. The Secy of State authorized this Govt to grant Pet^{rs} an allowance for their lives, if on enquiry it should be found that their relationship to Tippoo was such as to give them a claim.

The Pet^{rs}' statement was that their maternal great grandmothers and Tippoo's grandmothers were sisters, also that Tippoo's uncle married the sister of Pet^{rs}' grandmothers, thus making them collateral relatives, and connections by marriage.

Their father, they say, was Major Aksham Bakshi a Brigadier of Infantry by Tippoo. Immediately after the ~~the~~ fall of Seringapatam at which he was present, he fled to Aurungabad, where he remained with a brother, who supported him until about 1827: on the brother dying, ~~he~~ and leaving him unprovided for, he came down to Madras to seek that assistance from

The memo was submitted & submitted to the Secy of State on 28 Decr. - Mr. on 28 Decr. it was his own

68
Gadā which he knew had already been
afforded to other Mysore families.
The records show that from 1827
to 1835 he repeatedly preferred his
claim, and that correspondence
passed upon the subject between
the Commissioner of Mysore, the
Governor of Madras through his Private Secretary,
and the Brig. Commanding
Vellore. No decision appears to have
been come to, at least none can
be found ^{on the Govt. records, & careful search has been made.} The father died in 1851
at the age of 87, and since that
time Pet^{rs} have been unceasing in
their endeavours to prove their
claim. They memorialized the
Ct. of Directors in 1852, but without
any definite result until 1859. When
the Enquiry referred to above was
ordered. The Brigadier Commanding
Vellore and the Chepāk Agent reported
upon the case, and Gd^{rs}, in pro-
ceedings dated 23rd Sept. 1859. h. 554.
disallowed the claim on the ground
that Pet^{rs} had failed to prove their
relationship.

In a Petⁿ (h. 4891) subsequently

received, Pet^{rs} referred to documents
& put forward additional state-
ments which made it desirable
to obtain further information,
and the result seems to show
that ~~the~~ the Chepāk Agent's report
is defective, and that Pet^{rs} state-
ments, whatever may be thought
of the claim thereby conferred, are
truthful.

The claim is supported by
the Col^l of R. Arcot.

It will be convenient to
note against each of G^d Balfour's
statements, the Pet^{rs} reply -

P. 3. Pet^{rs} father in
Madras "about 35
years ago as a re-
stainer of Saif to
Daula.

Pet^{rs} admit that
their father came
to Madras about
that time, but state
that he was dependent
on, not a servant
of, the person named,
and that even sup-
posing he were, it
would not affect
the present claim.

p. 4. The Mysore Cam-
missioners records
contain no mention
of these people.

Id. Enquiries were
made, the sole
result obtained
being that a man
heard Pet^r's father
say some 15 years
ago that he was re-
lated to Tippoo.

father regarding his employment
as Aksham Bakshi by Tippoo
was correct. - The Mysore Begums
looked upon him as "rather a
close relation" (in letter dated
1829 from the Paymaster
of Stipends at Velore to the Private
Secretary).

p. 5. Pet^r's father appar-
ently alleged his
relationships in 1835

- Yes. There are
public letters dating
back to 1829 and
1835, giving details
of this very claim.

- A letter from
Prince Gasim Sultan
(son of Tippoo) ~~dated~~
1829, acknowledging
the relationship
of Pet^r's father to
Tippoo, is enclosed.

It was also satis-
factorily proved in
that year that the
statement of Pet^r's

- He seems to have
made good the
assertion 6 years before.

p. 6.

p. 8. Pet^r's state that
their father was not
aware until his re-
turn from Aurun-
gabad that God^t had
granted pensions.

p. 9. - Pet^r's father re-
sided in Madras 35
years ago, and must
have known of what
that was being done.

p. 10. Pet^r's claim to be
descended from
Tippoo.

p. 11. Their inability
to tell their descent
proves they are not
connected with the
Mysore family.

Corroborates Pet^r's
Statement.

This must be a
mistake. In their
pet^r's dated Jan^y 1854
and Jan^y 1855. and
Dec^r 1859. They have
stated that their father
was aware of this
fact, but have given
reasons to account for his not
having made application before
his return from Aurungabad.

He was aware of
it - He came down,
as D. B. states, about
1827, & immediately
put in his claim.

No. They claim
only to be collateral.

They are most
inconsistent in giving
their genealogy, and
the account they
now give corresponds

with that given by
their father more
than 30 years ago.

p 11. Tippoo died in
1799. Therefore P^{ts}
father, who died only
2 years ago (in 1857)
must have been
pretty near two years
old when he died.

It was stated to have
been made a Brigadier
by Tippoo

consideration of his connection
with Tippoo, and that one Babbar
Jung ^{being} appointed to do the duties
during his minority, and that
he was 87 when he died.

p 14. P^{ts} Ancestors
were not pensioned
at the time. Ergo
it is presumed they
had no claims.

It may be
that the
Commission
had no
claim
in the
same
case
after
the
fall
of
Serilinga.

Their father died
in 1857, as stated
by them in a P^{ts}
submitted in the
year following. They
state that their father
was made Aksham
Bakshi when only
12 years of age (in

On the extinction
of the Carnatic Raj
only such claims
were investigated
as were preferred by
the parties interested.
The same course was probably
after the fall of Serilinga.
This claim was not

brought forward at the time,
but it certainly was made in
1827, and has constantly been
revived during the last 33
years, and no decision upon
the merits of the case appears
to have been passed until
last year.

p 15. The claim
"seems" to have
been rejected about
1835.

No decision either
one way or the
other can be
traced.

Brig. White's report
p 6. There is the
Bigam in the Mahal
deny all knowledge
of P^{ts} relationship
with Tippoo.

See above. The
Bigam in 1829
considered P^{ts}
father a "rather
close relation".

The above has reference
principally to P^{ts} statement
that they are collaterals. The
Acting Sub. Col^l remarks

Encl. in letter
from Col^l
8 23rd July 1860

refer to the alleged connection
by marriage, through Tippoo's
brother having married the
sister of Pitt's grandmother,
and upon this point the
Local Officers seem satis-
fied that the truth has been
told -

d. G.

Supposing all the above - which must
be more or less doubtful - to be admit-
ted, what does it prove?

That Petitioner's great grandmother
and Tippoo's grandmother are sisters -
i.e. that Petitioner is Tippoo's second
cousin once removed with the female
line - also that her grand aunt mar-
ried Tippoo's brother, it may be nearly
one hundred years ago -

Is this a reason for bringing these
men newly on the pension list & burden-
ing the country with their maintenance
more than 60 years after Tippoo's death,
with the exhortations of the Supreme Govt

to the most rigid economy in supplying
our ~~army~~ ^{land}, and a bill is before the Legisla-
-ture (Council for subjecting to taxation
every handicraftsman or artisan who
can contribute one farthing a year toward
the Revenue of the State?

If Petitioner's father chose to absorb
himself for more than a quarter of a
century after the fall of Seringapatam
and thereby to forfeit his claim to pension
whom fault was it but his own, or how
long can such claims be reasonably
expected to be kept open? J.P.

15/12/60

Should not listen to
the claims - For Peters
best known to himself. His
brother Talkee absented him-
self & the Govt now refuse to
give him a pension - He may
seek aid of Dehra's uncle's family
whose were able to afford it - well

Translation of an English letter to the
address of the Paymaster of the Stipends
at Vellore.

Mir Amin ud din aly Khan
is a nearest relation of the King, whose
nobility is well known to the inhabitants
of Bejapore and Burhampore. Colonel
Stewart the late Paymaster of the Stipends
at Vellore made a thorough enquiry into
the rights of the said individual and
sent a report to Government - a reference
to the record on which a copy of the report
was entered would show what kind of man
he is - The relatives and servants of the King
have obtained pensions from Government, but
this person notwithstanding his being a
nearest relative, and a rightful heir, is
suffering much trouble in his old age dis-
waiting for the last 8 or 9 years in hopes of
obtaining a pension from Government; & has
run into debt - He has, it appears, got a
letter from the Calcutta Government to the

address of the Commissioner of Mysore, & will
come shortly to you. I hope you will kindly
favor him with a note of recommendation
to the address of the said Commissioner
as was done by Colonel Stewart.

16th January
1835.

[Signed] Sultan Mohammed
Yasid.

[True Translation]
Syed Shah Ali
Translator.

Political Dept.

Pro. of the Madras Govt.
Recd the following papers 14
From Mir Zulfikar Ally Khan & Mir Akber } H. E. 17 Dec. 1855.
Ally Khan of Madras. } 23rd July 1860. No 53.
From the Asst. Col. of North Arcot.
Order Mercu. 8th Jan. 1861. No 21.

Mr Gd. I have care-
fully considered all
that Petitioners have
urged in their petition,
and have come to
the conclusion that
their claim is alto-
gether inadmissible.
Even accepting as
true the account they
give of their connec-
tion with Tippoo, it
only amounts to this,
that they are very re-
mote collateral rela-
tives in the female
line, and are dis-
tantly connected by
marriage. This would,
under any circumstances
have constituted a

very doubtful ground
on which to base a
claim on the British
Govt; but, as the case
stands, Pet^r's father
having allowed his
claim - if he ever possessed
any - to lie over for
27 years, and a period
of more than half a
century having elapsed
since the events out
of which this claim
arose occurred, it is
clearly out of the ques-
tion to entertain any
application of the na-
ture of that put for-
ward. Pet^r must
consider his claim
definitively settled ^{and}
as the Govt. ~~is~~

Government will receive
no more of
applications from him
J.P.

To Petition dept for comm^{ts}
To Petitioners. { dep^d 15

5. L. Petition - Col^d
16. L. Es & O

Politics 1861. DePaul.

1862

Proceedings of Court

Dec 8 " January 1861.

Full

Old. S. to Court 26th Sept.
Dec 21. 1861.
Full to 23rd Nov 1861
of 1861

38 on 40.

100 from the
Politics 3/1/61

6.22 Dec.