

MADRAS RECORD OFFICE.

Government of Madras.

Political DEPARTMENT.

G.O. No.

515

Press

~~Mis~~

Dated

18-11-1921

Not to be folded or roughly handled

*Proceedings of the Madras Government, Political Department,
18th November 1861.*

Read again Petition of GOOLAM RUSSOOL KHAN, GOOLAM AHMED KHAN and GOOLAM MAHOMED GHOUSE, dated 9th and recorded in Proceedings of the 25th September 1861.

No. 49. Read also the following letter from Surgeon Major EDWARD G. BALFOUR, Government Agent at Chepauk, and Paymaster of Carnatic Stipends; to the Chief Secretary to Government, Fort Saint George, dated 5th October 1861, No. 1,233.

I have the honor, in accordance with the instructions conveyed in Order of Government No. 414, dated 25th ultimo, to submit to His Excellency the Governor in Council the following report on the claim made by three of the children* of the late Carnatic Stipendiary No. 257, Khader-un-Nissa Begum, who was in receipt of Rupees 90 per mensem.

2. Petitioners have so clearly stated the ground on which their claim to a recontinuance of their mother's pension is made, that it does not seem necessary in recapitulating the prayer to do more than notice that they lay stress on the concluding portion of the Minute of Government No. 973 of 18th November 1857, issued on their

† It is true their father has a second family by another wife, but this wife is herself in the receipt of a Carnatic Stipend to the amount of Rupees 90 per mensem. father's petition and from its concluding words† Petitioners' declare Government defined that "Petitioners' support should be derived from the allowance of their own mother," and in the following paragraph of their petition they reiterate confidently their opinion that such was the meaning of that Minute.

3. In the fourth paragraph of their petition they dissent from the position in which their mother's name was placed in 1854, when the Stipendiaries were arranged in classes. Her name was so placed in class IV, as a collateral or dependant whose stipend, according to the Honorable Court's Order of 1851, should, unless on some special grounds, lapse on her demise. But in the 5th, 6th, and 7th paragraphs, Petitioners in reviewing the Honorable Court's Orders of 1846 and 1850, recognise the possibility that Government may, notwithstanding, view their mother as a collateral and they submit that it is nevertheless in the discretion of Government to regard Petitioners' case as one eminently deserving their indulgent treatment and worthy of kind and benign consideration. Farther, in paragraph 7, they allude to a subjoined List of individuals to whom pensions have been granted, though their rank in life was lower and relationship to the original grantee more distant than those of Petitioners' mother.

4. With reference to the above, I have the honor to report that during the past 12 months, Petitioners have been addressing the Agency in petitions as per margin,† to each of which, brief replies were given of a character similar to that which they have subjoined as their

† 1. Petition, dated 25th October 1860, No. 4,234.	
2. " " 4th December " " 4,745.	
3. " " 22nd January 1861, " 299.	
4. " " 25th May " " 2,136.	

Appendix B. In that Appendix, it will be observed, mentioned that other reasons existed for the Agency feeling unable to recommend their case, the other reasons therein alluded to being the repeated misconduct of Petitioners' father Kadir Hoossain Ali Khan. This person is the Nickah maternal grandson of Nabob Mahomed Ali Wallajah. His mother was Azeez-un-Nissa Begum one of that Nabob's twelve Nickah daughters to whom in 1801, Rupees 5,000 per annum were granted. On her demise, in 1838, this person, her only child, was allowed a stipend of Rupees 130 per mensem or Rupees 1,560 per annum, and a still larger sum, being Rupees 144 per mensem or Rupees 1,728 per annum, was bestowed as life stipends on his mother's dependants.

But as will be observed in the correspondence as per margin,|| Petitioners' father long refused to submit the names of the surviving dependants and was twice guilty of fraud. For the first case, his stipend was reduced from Rupees 130 to Rupees 87 per mensem and for the next case, though ordered to be fined, Government in paragraph 2 of No. 540 of 20th November 1848, in

|| 1847, Extract Minutes Consultation, 12th June, No. 256, paragraph 1.
1848, Honorable Court, 19th January, paragraph 59, conveyed in Extract Minutes Consultation, dated 4th April 1848, No. 146.
1848, Extract Minutes of Consultation, 7th November, No. 453.

*Proceedings of the Madras Government, Political Department,
18th November 1861.*

consideration that his stipend had only a few days before been reduced by one-third for a previous fraud, forgave the fine but directed him "to be informed that his share in this disreputable transaction has only been overlooked from the above motive, and that any repetition of similar misconduct will be still more severely punished." This detail of these occurrences was necessary in order to explain to His Excellency the Governor in Council what was meant when by the Agency informing these Petitioners, though delicately to avoid unnecessary pain, that other reasons existed, why recommendation of their prayer could not be made, the acts of misconduct of their father being the reasons alluded to.

5. It is also proper to mention, that Petitioners have no right to the title of Khan which they have affixed to their names and that their late mother left also two daughters both of whom are still alive, one of them being married to Etimad-ud-Dowlah Bahadur who lately commuted his stipend, and one married to Gholam Ahmud, son of Carnatic Stipendiary No. 1,311 Fatimah Begum, daughter of Nabob Azeem-ood Dowlah.

6. It is also requisite to mention that Petitioners' father though reduced by one-third of his stipend in 1848, was and is, still, in receipt of another stipend of Rupees 36 per mensem for the expenses of the ceremonial observances of the tomb of his half aunt, and that the total amount drawn by him is Rupees 123 per mensem.

7. Petitioners argue that their mother was not a collateral, or, if a collateral, that they are entitled to great consideration. On these points, I have the honor to mention, that the original Stipendiary in this case was a Nickah son of Nabob Mahomed Ali who demised in 1824 leaving no male heir, but only a widow and three daughters to whom the stipends as

§ 1. Boorhan Oon-Nissa Begum Shadee wife of the late Mahomed Surfraz Khan...	Rs. 90
2. Hoossainy Begum, Shadee daughter of do. ...	90
3. Cadir-Oon-Nissa Begum do. of do. ...	90
4. Hameed-Oon-Nissa Begum do. of do. ...	90
5. Concubines 14	56
Total Rupees	416

per margin\$ amounting to Rupees 416 per mensem were re-granted. They were thus brought under the Honorable Court's Orders of 1846 and 1850, none of the sharers being persons of consequence or capable of being regarded as a principal representative of a branch of the original family. In this view deceased and

her surviving sister were in 1854 arranged in Class IV of the Stipendiaries.

8. The petitioners in support of their prayer, urge seven precedents, and subjoin the names of the individuals whose position, &c., they indicate as of less importance than their own.

9. These cases have all occurred, but they seem to have arisen from the compassion of Government towards helpless people, because, only two* of the seven had the recommendation of the Agency.

10. *Case No. 1 of Umat Ullah Begum.* This lady was reported on by the Agency in letter No. 175 of 8th July 1857 and disposed of by Government in Extract Minutes of Consultation 12th August, No. 629 of 1857. But in para. 12 of my letter, No. 175 of 1857, I particularly recommended that no stipend should be given to Umat Ullah Begum whose case Petitioners quote because her husband was then (and is still) a Stipendiary. In para. 11, I limited my recommendation to two Nickah sons, one of them till his 18th year and the three Nickah widows, total Rupees 38; but Government in para. 5 of Extract Minutes of Consultation, No. 818 of 1857, granted Rupees 45 to two Nickah sons, three Nickah widows and two Shadee daughters, one of whom is the Umat Ullah Begum, that petitioners quote as their precedent, No. 1, and the reason for not recommending whom I stated in para. 12 of my letter No. 175 of 1857.

11. *Precedent No. 2, Mahomed Wahajood Deen's* case was disposed of in Extract Minutes of Consultation 30th July No. 486 of 1858. In my recommendation of the regrant to him, of the little sum of Rupees 4-2-0 per mensem which his wife had drawn, I was guided by the circumstance that her surviving husband was in receipt of only Rupees 6-10-0 per mensem, that his deceased wife left two young daughters aged 10 and 8 years respectively unmarried, and their mother's small stipend of Rupees 4-2-0 was recommended by me to be added to his own Rupees

* 2. Mahomed Wahajood Deen.

4. Gholam Mahomed Ghouse.

*Proceedings of the Madras Government, Political Department,
18th November 1861.*

6-10-0 per mensem "as a special case for life" and while I made the recommendation, I likewise in paragraph 7 duly informed Government that my "recommendation is opposed to the decision of Government in No. 130 of 1847" and in the Order of Government the regrant to him for life of the Rupees 4-2 per mensem which his wife had drawn was made "as a special case."

12. *Precedent No. 3 Fatimah Begum* was disposed of by Extract Minutes of Consultation of 4th January, No. 7 of 1859. It was submitted to Government in Agency letters Nos. 1,610 and 2,028 of 1858, and in paragraph 14 of No. 2,028, I submitted, as my opinion that "the remote collateral relatives of a Nickah wife of Wallajah, who constitute this family, have, in my opinion, no claim on political stipends granted in 1801 to the relations of Nabobs Mahomed Ali and Oomdut-ul-Umra and to the servants of latter Nabob. On these grounds, under existing orders any recommendation on their behalf cannot be made by me," and in paragraph 16 of the same letter, I repeated that view. But Order No. 7 of 1859 granted to this person the Rupees 10 per mensem which she is still drawing and which petitioners make their precedent No. 3.

13. *Precedent No. 4, Gholam Mahomed Ghouse* was granted by Order of 7th February No. 82 of 1859, a small stipend of Rupees 7 per mensem, as a temporary grant, until the 31st January 1862. In paragraphs 6 and 8 of my letter of recommendation, seeing a young man who might, if he chose, fit himself for life, I submitted the case for favorable consideration, for Rupees 7 per mensem for a period of three years to allow him time to acquire some means of livelihood. It was thus a temporary grant for a special purpose and lapses a few months hence.

14. *Precedent No. 5 Ruhmutoo Bee.* This was a case of a petition to Government referred for report, and in paragraph 2 of my letter No. 421 of 1859, I submitted to Government that the Orders of 1811 commended "that pensions shall in no case be continued to children adopted by Members of the Wallajah family;" while Extract Minutes of Consultation dated 8th January 1858 states, "that at the decease of Fuzl-un-Nissa Begum, whose pension was Rupees 20 the same should lapse to Government and that the case of persons who had been supported by the Begum will be duly considered." This view was not taken of the case as one debarring the woman from a pension, and Order of 17th March, No. 173 of 1859, granted her a compassionate allowance of Rupees 7 per mensem.

15. *Precedent No. 6 Budee Bee* arose in Order of 14th July No. 422 of 1859. In paragraph 3 of Agency letter No. 1,025 of 1859, it was submitted that "the petitioners under the Order of the Honorable Court of 11th March 1846 and 22nd May 1850 have no claims on the "lapsed stipends;" but paragraphs 2, 3, and 4 of No. 422 of 1859 granted then the stipend which is now quoted as a precedent.

16. *Precedent No. 7 Nizam-ud-Deen Hoossain Khan* and his brothers, was created by Order No. 394 of 2nd July 1859. In paragraphs 1, 2 and 3 of Agency letter No. 976 of 1859, it was submitted that the express Orders of Government in that special case of 5th March 1842, and the General Orders of 1846 and 1850, had caused the stipend to be lapsed in 1853; but Order No. 394 of 1859, paragraph 6, required the Agency to report what individuals were alive who had depended on the late Hashmut Jung for support, and a subsequent Order No. 448 of 27th July 1859, granted Rupees 7 per mensem to each son.

17. In reporting as required upon the precedents quoted by petitioners, His Excellency the Governor in Council will observe, that they have no relation whatever to petitioners' cases, having been granted not in accordance with any rule, but for special compassionate or political reasons which Government must have had before them.

18. In my opinion, under the Honorable Court's Orders of 1846 and 1850, and under the circumstances that their father long refused obedience to orders and twice committed fraud, for one case of which his stipend was by Orders of Honorable Court reduced by one-third, that he is still alive and in receipt of Rupees 87+36 per mensem, that the petitioners are young men capable of applying themselves to some useful purpose in life, these young men have no claim upon the bounty of Government.

*Proceedings of the Madras Government, Political Department,
18th November 1861.*

19. About the years 1850-51 and 1852, it was very much the practice of petitioners as also of the Nabob of the Carnatic to indicate precedents, as these petitioners have done; but in 1850* and 1851, the Honorable Court commanded that each case should be decided on its own particular merits.

*1850, 22nd May No. 1, Honorable Court, paragraph 51, "Each of these cases should be decided by Government on its own particular merits."
1851, 5th March No. 1, Honorable Court paragraph 11, "Each case should be decided (as we presume this case will be), on its own particular merits."

† Honorable Court No. 1, of 1850, paragraph 19, "You have rightly decided that he should look for support to his father who receives Rupees 15 per mensem from Government."

20. In the same year the Honorable Court commanded† a son to look to his father for support.
21. It was upon these grounds that the Agency declined to recommend the prayer of these petitioners,—their own claims as young men, being nil,—those on their mother's account in my opinion, being insufficient to allow of recommendation to Government and their father's former misconduct and being still alive and a stipendiary, on Rupees 87+36 per mensem, not admitting of recommendation on compassionate grounds.

No. 50.

ORDER THEREON, 18th November 1861, No. 515.

The Governor in Council has carefully considered all the circumstances of the Petitioners' case, the terms of the Order of Government on which they lay so much stress, and the precedents quoted in support of their application, as also the Agent's full report on the subject of their claim; and he sees no grounds whatever for complying with the prayer of the Petitioners for the continuance to them of the stipend of their deceased mother.

(Signed) T. PYCROFT,
Chief Secretary.

Exd. F. Cartledge.

No. 1238 of 1861.

GOVERNMENT AGENT'S OFFICE,

5th October 1861.

From Surgeon Major EDWARD G. BALFOUR,

Government Agent at Chepauk,

and Paymaster of Carnatic Stipends.

To

*The Chief Secretary to Government,
Fort St. George*

SIR,

I have the honor, in accordance with the instructions conveyed in Order of Government N^o 414 dated 25th Ultimo, to submit to His Excellency, The Governor in Council the following report on the claim made by three of the

Gholam Rasool Khan	children of the late Carnatic
Gholam Ahmad Khan	Stipendiary N ^o 257 & Shader un
Gholam Mahomed Ghouse	

Nepa Begum who was in receipt of Rs. 90 per mensem.

2. Petitioners have so clearly stated the ground on which their claim is made, to a recontinuance of their mother's pension is made, that it does not seem necessary in recapitulating the prayer to do more than notice that they lay stress on the concluding portion of the Minute of Government N^o 973 of 18th November 1857 issued on their father's petition

and

and from its concluding words^{*} petitioners declare Government -

defined that "Petitioners support should be derived from the allowance of their own mother", and in the following paragraph of their petition they reiterate confidently their opinion that such was the meaning of that Minute.

3. In the fourth paragraph of their petition they dissent from the position in which their mother's name was placed in 1854, when the Stipendiaries were arranged in Classes. Her name was placed in Class IV, as a collateral or dependant whose stipend, according to the Honorable Courts Order of 1851, should, unless on some special grounds, lapse on her demise. But in the 5th, 6th & 7th paragraphs, petitioners in reviewing the Honorable Courts Orders of 1846 and 1850, recognise the possibility that Government may, notwithstanding, view their mother as a Collateral & they submit

It was not
of the kind
it merely
meant that
Pet father
was in
his position
should be
means
as 20

* It is true their father has a second family by another wife but this wife is hired in the receipt of a Carnatic Stipend to the amount of Rupees 90. per mensem.

that

Jan 1861

that, it is nevertheless in the discretion of Government to regard petitioners' case as one eminently deserving their indulgent treatment and worthy of kind & benign consideration. Farther, in para 7, they allude to a subjoined List of individuals to whom pensions have been granted, though their rank in life was lower and relationship to the original grantor more distant than those of petitioners' mother.

4. With reference to the above, I have the honor to report that during the past 12 months, petitioners have been addressing the Agency in petitions as per margin, to each of which, brief replies were given. of a character similar to

1. Petition dated 25 th October 1860	N ^o 4231.
2. " 4 th December " "	N ^o 4745.
3. " 22 nd January 1861	N ^o 299.
4. " 25 th May " "	N ^o 2136.

that which they have subjoined as their Appendix B. In that Appendix, it will be observed mentioned that other reasons existed for the Agency feeling unable to recommend their case - the other reasons therein alluded to being the repeated misconduct of petitioners

father

father Hadir Hoshain Ali Khan. This person
is the Nephew maternal grandson of
Nabob Mahomed Ali Wallajah. His
mother was Aziz un Nissa Begum
one of that Nabob's twelve Nephew daughters
to whom in 1801 Rupees 5000 per annum
were granted. On her demise, in 1838,
this person, her only child, was allowed
a stipend of Rupees 130 per mensem
or Rupees 1560 per annum; and a still
larger sum, being Rupees 144 per mensem
or Rupees 1728 per annum, was
bestowed as life stipends on his mother's
dependants. But as will be observed
in the correspondence

as per margin

petitioners' father

long refused to submit

the names of the surviving dependants

and was twice guilty of fraud. For

the first case, his stipend was reduced
from Rupees 130 to Rupees 87 per mensem

and for the next case, though ordered to

be

1847. Extract Minutes of Consultation 12th June
N^o 256 para 1.
1848 Honorable Court 19th January
para 59 conveyed in C. & L. C. dated
4th April 1848 N^o 146.
1848 Extract Minutes of Consultation 7th November
N^o 453.

35
be fined, Government in para 2 of N^o 54
of 20th November 1848, in consideration
that his stipend had only a few days
before been reduced by one third for
previous fraud, forgave the fine but
directed him "to be informed that he
"share in this disreputable transaction
"has only been overlooked from the
"motive, and that any repetition of
"similar misconduct will be still more
"severely punished." This detail of the
occurrences was necessary in order to
explain to His Excellency The Governor
in Council what was meant when
the Agency informing these petitioners,
though delicately to avoid unnecessary
pain, ^{that} other reasons existed why recom-
-mendation of their prayer could not
made. The ^{acts of} misconduct of their father
being the reasons alluded to.

5 It is also proper to mention
that petitioners have no right to the
title of Khan which they have affixed
to their names & that their late mother

left

left also two daughters both of whom are still alive, one of them being married to Stimad ud Dowlah Bahadur who lately commuted his stipend, and one married to Gholam Ahmud son of Carnatic Stipendiary N^o 1311 Fatimah Begum, daughter of Nabob Azemood Dowlah.

6. It is also requisite to mention that petitioners' father though reduced by one third of his stipend in 1848, was and is still in receipt of another stipend of Rupees 36 per mensem for the expences of the ceremonial observances of the tomb of his half aunt, and that the total amount drawn by him is Rs 123 per mensem.

7. Petitioners argue that their mother was not a collateral, or, if a collateral, that they are entitled to great consideration. On these points I have the honor to mention, that the original Stipendiary in this case was a Nickah son of Nabob Mahomed Ali who died in 1824, leaving no male heir, but only a widow and three daughters to whom the Stipends

as

of Rupees 14 Nov

46

as per margin amounting to Rupees 416

1. Boorhan-oon-Nissa Begum Shadai wife of the late Mahomed Surpaz Khan. Rs 90	per mensem were
2. Hoosainy Begum Shada daughter of D ^o " 90	re granted. They
3. Cadir-oon-Nissa Begum D ^o of D ^o " 90	were thus brought
4. Ahmed-oon-Nissa Begum D ^o of D ^o " 90	
5. Concubines 14 36	
Total Rupees 416	under the Honorable

Court's Orders of 1846 & 1850, none of the sharers being persons of consequence or capable of being regarded as a principal representative of a branch of the original family. In this view deceased and her surviving sister were in 1854 arranged in Class IV of the Stipendiaries.

8. The petitioners in support of their prayer urge 7 Precedents, and subjoin the names of the individuals whose position & ^{as} they indicate as of less importance than their own.

9. These cases have all occurred, but they seem to have arisen from the compassion of Government towards helpless people, because, only two^x of the seven had the recommendation of the Agency.

Case

- * 2. Mahomed Mahajid Deen.
- 4. Gholam Mahomed Ghous.

+ in the son-in-law Mahomed Ali who died 1795

10. Case N° 1 of Umat Ullah Begum -

This lady was reported on by the Agency in letter N° 175 of 8th July 1857 and disposed of by Government in Extract Minutes of Consultation 12th August N° 629 of 1857. But in para 12 of my letter N° 175 of 1857, I particularly recommended that no stipend should be given to Umat Ullah Begum whose case petitioners quote - because her husband was then (and is still) a stipendiary. In para 11, I limited my recommendation to two Nickah sons, one of them till his 18th year and the three Nickah widows, total Rupees 38; but Government in para 5 of Extract Minutes of Consultation N° 818 of 1857 granted Rupees 45 to two Nickah sons, three Nickah widows and two Shadee daughters, one of whom is the Umat Ullah Begum, that petitioners quote as their precedent N° 1 and the reason for not recommending whom I stated in para 12 of my letter N° 175 of 1857.

Precedent

11. Precedent N° 2 Mahomed Wahajood Durrani
case was disposed of in Extract Minutes of Consultation 30th July N° 486 of 1858. In my recommendation of the regrant to him, of the little sum of Rupees 4.2, per mensem which his wife had drawn, I was guided by the circumstance that her surviving husband was in receipt of only Rupees 6.10 per mensem - that his deceased wife left two young daughters aged 10 & 8 years respectively unmarried, and their mother's small stipend of Rs. 4.2 was recommended by me to be added to his own Rupees 6.10 - per mensem "as a special case for life" and while I made the recommendation, I likewise in para 7 duly informed Government that my "recommendation is opposed to the decision of Government in N° 130 of 1847" and in the Order of Government the regrant to him for life of the Rupees 4.2 per mensem which his wife had drawn was made "as a special case."

Precedent

15 Nov

12. Precedent N^o 3 Fatimah Begum
was disposed of by Extract Minutes of
Consultation of 4th January N^o 7 of 1859.

It was submitted to Government in
Agency Letters N^o 1610 & 2028 of 1858 and
in para 14 of N^o 2028; I submitted, as

my opinion that "The remote collateral
"relatives of a Nizam wife of Wallajah,

"who constitute these family, have, in my
"opinion, no claim on political stipends

"granted in 1801 to the relations of Nizam
"Mahomed Ali and Comdut ul Umra

"and to the servants of latter Nizam."

"On these grounds, under existing orders
"any recommendation on their behalf can-

"not be made by me." and in para 16 of the
same letter, I repeated that view. But

Order N^o 7 of 1859 granted to this person
the Rupees 10 per mensem which she is

still drawing, and which petitioners
make their precedent N^o 3.

13. Precedent N^o 4 Ghulam Mahomed Ghouse
was granted by Order of 7th February N^o 82 of 1859.

a

a small stipend of Rupees 7 per mensem,
as a temporary grant, until the 31st January
1862. In paras 6 & 8 of my letter of recom-
mendation, seeing a young man who might,
if he chose, fit himself for life, I sub-
mitted the case for favorable consideration,
for Rupees 7 per mensem for a period
of three years to allow him time to
acquire some means of livelihood. It
was thus a temporary grant for a
special purpose and lapses a few
months hence.

14. Precedent N^o 5 Rahmatul Bee

This was a case of a petition to Govern-
ment referred for report, and in para 2

of my letter N^o 421 of 1859, I submitted
to Government that the orders of 1811

commanded "that pensions shall in no
"case be continued to ^{children adopted by Members of} the Wallajah family,"

while Extract Minutes of Consultation
dated 8th January 1858 states, "that at the

"decease of Fuzl un Nissa Begum, whose
"pension was Rupees 20, the same should

lapse

Lapse to Government and that the case of persons who had been supported by the Begum will be duly considered."

This view was not taken of the case as one debarring the woman from a pension and Order of 17th March N^o 173 of 1859, granted her a compassionate allowance of Rupees 7 per mensem.

15. Precedent N^o 6 Budee Bee arose in Order of 14th July N^o 422 of 1859. In para 3 of Agency Letter N^o 1025 of 1859, it was submitted that "the petitioners under the order of the Honorable Court of 11th March 1846 and 22nd May 1850 have no claims on the lapsed stipends; but paras 2, 3, & 4 of N^o 422 of 1859 granted them the stipend which is now quoted as a precedent."

16. Precedent N^o 7 Nizam ud Deen Hoosain Khan and his brothers, was created by Order N^o 394 of 2nd July 1859. In paras 1, 2, & 3 of Agency Letter N^o 976 of 1859, it was submitted that the express orders

9
orders of Government in that special case of 5th March 1842, and the General Orders of 1846 and 1850, had caused the stipend to be lapsed in 1853. But Order N^o 394 of 1859 para 6, required the Agency to report what individuals were alive who had depended on the late Hashmat Jung for support, and a subsequent order N^o 448 of 27th July 1859, granted Rupees 7 per mensem to each son.

17. In reporting as required upon the precedents quoted by petitioners His Excellency The Governor in Council will observe, that they have no relation whatever to petitioners' cases, having been granted not in accordance with any rule, but for special compassionate or political reasons which Government must have had before them.

18. In my opinion, under the Honorable Court's Orders of 1846 and 1850 and under the circumstances that

their

their father long refused obedience to orders and twice committed fraud, for one case of which his stipend was by orders of Honorable Court reduced by one third, that he is still alive and in receipt of Rupees 87 + 36 per mensem, that the petitioners are young men capable of applying themselves to some useful purpose in life, these young men have no claim upon the bounty of Government

19 About the years 1850-51 & 1852 it was very much the practice of petitioners as also of the Natsob of the Carnatic to indicate precedents, as these petitioners have done - But in 1850 & 1851 the

Honorable Court commanded that each case should be decided on its own particular merits.

1850, 22nd May N^o 1 Honorable Court para 51. "Each of these cases should be decided by Government on its own particular merits."
1851, 5th March N^o 1 Honorable Court para 11 - "Each case should be decided (as we presume this case will be), on its own particular merits."

20 In the same year the Honorable Court commanded a son to look to his father for support.

Honorable Court N^o 1 of 1850 para 19 - "you have rightly decided that he should look for support to his father who receives Rupees 15 per mensem from Government."

At

21 It was upon these grounds that the Agency declined to recommend the prayer of these petitioners, - their own claims as young men, being nil, - those on their mother's account in my opinion, being insufficient to allow of recommendation to Government and their father's former misconduct and being still alive and a stipendiary, on Rupees 87 + 36 per mensem not admitting of recommendation on compassionate grounds.

Govt. Agents Office,
5th October 1861

I have the honor to be,
Sir,

Your most Obedt. Servant

Y^{rs} A^t
Government Agent

To
The Chief Secretary
to Government
Fort St. George.

Enc. 2

The reasons given by the Agent
for refusing to Petitioners their
request to have continued
to their three Mothers petition
seem correct - if placing their
Mothers in claim - as being a
whitened or defaced out - is
right - I am not however
quite satisfied that it ~~was~~^{is} so -
she was the grand daughter
of the Nahochahoued Ah -
who died in 1824 -
on this point it would be well
I think to get Mr. G. West's opinion

W. M.
G. M.

Political Dept 8

Proceedings of the Grand Court

Read again Petition
of Goolam Russool Khan,
Goolam Ahmed Khan &
Goolam Mahomed Ghoul,
dated 7th and recorded in
Proceedings of the 25th Sep.
tember 1861.

Read the following
report of the Grand Agent
at Chepauk.

Dated 5th Oct. 1861. No. 515.

Order thereon. 18 November 1861. No. 515.

The Governor in
Council has carefully
considered all the cir-
cumstances of the Peti-
tioners' case - the terms
of the Order of Court on
which they lay so much
stress - and the prece-
dents quoted in sup-
port of their application
as

W. M.

G. M.

as also the Agents full
report on the subject of
their claim; and he
sees no grounds what-
ever for complying with
the prayer of the Petitioners
for the continuance to
them of the stipend of
their deceased brother.

L.D.S.

To the Good Agent at Chapank
for communication to the
Petitioners.

E.H.S.

It seems to me that the name of Petitioner's
mother was rightly included in the list
of 1854 as one whose pension should
lapse on her death.

The branch of W. H. Wright's family branch
extinct in the male line by the death of her
father in 1824. He left no male representation
but only three daughters - and pensioners paid to
it is in the female descendant line not, I
think, usually continued beyond three gene-
rations.

Mr. Washburn observes that the brother Mahmood
Ali died in 1824 - but this is a mistake
arising probably from the incorrect use of
the relation - who - in Dr. Hurler's letter. The
brother Mahmood Ali - Wallajah - died in
1795 - His son it was - petitioner's maternal
grandfather who died in 1824 - The pension
was paid in 1861 so that petitioner's
mother & grandfather have been in the enjoyment
of them for 60 years - Wallajah left eleven
rich daughters besides Petitioner's grandmother

last of whom was imprisoned in 1807. It seems
now intended that all their descendants to the
third generation should continue to be
imprisoned.

Petitioner's mother was also a friend
- daughter of Wallyah but on her death in 1857
her prison was resumed. He can read that
of Petitioner's mother seen to her prison by
parade. The inference attempted to be
drawn by the Petitioner from the working of the
prison on that occasion appears to me as it
does to that from the facts mentioned.

There is nothing peculiar in the circumstances
of this case. Petitioner's father is still alive. He
has a pension of £123 per month and it is his
duty to put his children out in life. If Petitioner
in other respects was divided between them &
their sisters it would only give each a pension
and keep them idle & useless men for
the rest of their lives.

On the whole I am clearly of opinion that the
reform should not be continued. It would
be opposed to former practice & the general
policy of the Government - & it is contrary to the
expectations of the public. It is also contrary to the
policy of the Government.

13
chance of getting something out of me, rather
than attempt to support themselves by their
own exertions.

26 Oct

J.P.

nothing for republishing them allows me - would

De Fremet

29/15

Political Dept. Sept 4
No. 515.
Proceedings of Court.
27/10/1881

16
Petition of Goolam Ras.
Sool Khan, Goolam Ah.
med Khan, & Goolam
Mahomed Ghouse

49150