

Political (1895) Department.

ORDINARY MS.

G.O., No. 298

Dated 8th May 1895.

INDEXED.

[Despatch Abstract.]

OFFICE OF PAYMASTER, CARNATIC STIPENDS.

Passing orders on the charges preferred by Zahra Bi against the
Manager, --.

BACK PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.	G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.
	297		8-5-95				

FURTHER PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.	G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.
	323		15-5-95				

[G
9
200-24-7-04.

Current No. 516

DEPARTMENT.

From

Zahra Bi
Widow of the late Bagji Hussain,
Madras.

No.

Dated 16th
Received 18th
Regd 18th
Enclosures one - } April 1895.

SUBJECT.

Complaining against the
Manager of Paymaster Carnatic
Stipendi office.

223: 9.4.95
620: 19.10.91.
562: 14.9.91.

CS.

Order.

Let it will be informed that
Govt declines to interfere.

CS.

For Orders

Note. Zahra's case is one of the specific
instances of corruption which were addressed
against the Manager, P.C.S. Office, by
certain Carnatic Stipendiaries (Cm. 348 in G.O. 223
9.4.95)
Para. 3 of the Paymaster's letter (Cm. 394 in the
same G.O.) embodies a full report on her
case, from which it clearly appears
that she has no claim whatever, on
Govt. It is between three
and four years since G.O. No.
562-20 dated 14th 1891
was passed and up to
now notwithstanding no complaints
of any malpractice on the part
of the Manager has been made by
this woman or anyone connected with
her. This raises a doubt as to the
truth of the charge now laid. There
is in the petitions marked with red paper

Department.



PROCEEDINGS OF THE MADRAS GOVERNMENT.

READ the following paper:—

I think we should get to the bottom of all this business more satisfactorily if we allow him to prosecute the parties he mentions. Care must be taken that Zehra Bai's suit is not kept separate from the others. It is a very specific charge - & if he cannot refute it, he will get into trouble.

W
30 Apr.

25 4/5
31/5/95

a general kind of allegation that Zehra Bai committed her pension under persuasion from others who took the major share of it but see plain in English pencil note in the margin of the portion of the petition marked with blue pencil. Her story now is that she gave 225 Rupees to the Manager as a bribe of Rs. 150/- which she received as commutation. This is a different story from that told in the petition in 30.12.20. It was an unmarked by her Dangle really with Govt. that the idea of commutation of Zehra Bai's pension originated.

LD
29/4/95

Order.

Petitioner will be informed that as the Manager of the office of the Paymaster, Carnatic Districts, has been permitted to prosecute her for defamation she will have an opportunity of proving the charges which she brings against him.

(Dr. Orders)

Pet. (9)

CS.
1/5/95

TRANSLATION OF THE 1st PETITION.

To COLONEL H. S. STEWART, Paymaster Carnatic Stipends, Chepauk.

After respectful compliments, I beg to represent that for nearly four years the Manager of your Office has been holding out false hopes to me, in the matter of my stipend and that as I could no more trust in what he says, I place the matter before you. It is this:—

On the death of my husband Mahomed Baqir Husain in 1891. Mir Gulam Abbas Saheb, your Manager, called at my house and said that if I acted upon his advice I would get a stipend of rupees 25, otherwise not. I was alarmed and agreed to do as he may lead. Then, he said I will have to give him rupees 225 for it and that one-third of that sum, rupees 75, should be paid in advance. As I had no money with me at the time, I asked him to wait for two or three days. Accordingly he called again, when I paid him rupees 75. As I was a *gosha* female, my brother-in-law, Ahmad Husain Saheb, acted as the medium of conversation between me and the Manager. After taking the money the Manager explained the manner in which I should petition the Paymaster. Following his directions, I sent a petition to Colonel Underwood. A few days later, the Manager called again and said the time had approached for the Paymaster to forward a report to Government in my case, and that I should give him more money for getting a favourable report submitted. The following day, I paid him more rupee 50 through the said Ahmad Husain Saheb. After sometime, I heard that an order of Government was passed sanctioning only rupees 12-8-0 for my support, and the Manager also called at my house at this junction and demanded the remaining rupees 100. I said that as instead of rupees 25 promised by him, rupees 12-8-0 only had been ordered, I may be allowed to pay him the rupees 100 by an instalment of rupees 5 monthly. Then he advised that the best way would be to commute the then sanctioned stipend and out of the proceeds to pay him the rupees 100 in a lump; and said that if I did so, he would ask Colonel Underwood to obtain another rupees 12-8-0 sanctioned by Government, as my late husband was the recipient of rupees 50, I was entitled to rupees 25. Having said this, he went away and that same evening a *Hammami* brought a letter to my address from the Paymaster's Office, a copy of which is herewith. In reply to this, following the Manager's advice, I wrote asking for commutation; and on the very day I obtained a bonus in lieu of the stipend, the Manager called and received from me rupees 100 out of it. Then he went on giving me hopes about the other rupees 12-8-0, till Colonel Underwood was in Office; and when you were appointed in his place, the Manager told me that as you were new I must wait till he is taken into your confidence. In this way a further period of about a year and half passed away. In the beginning of last year, when I pressed him, he told me that you were going home on leave and after your return he would positively get my business done. Three or four months ago, hearing that the Manager was suspended, I sent for him and told him that as I had no more hope of obtaining any further stipend, it would be only reasonable, for him to return one-half of the sum he received from me in the transaction. To this he replied that he was not afraid of the suspension, and that you had written him a letter informing that you will shortly return and get him re-instated in his Office, and as soon as this is done, said he, he would necessarily take steps so as to get my object attained. He also said that when I obtain the other rupees 12-8-0, I must make him a further present of rupees 100, in case I required to commute this stipend also; but if I wished to retain it, I may give him rupees 5 monthly till rupees 100 are paid. I now beg to state that it is some months since your return and that he has also been re-instated as he expected. Thinking that there was no use in asking the Manager again, I bring to your notice all that has passed. Therefore, with much respect and humbleness I solicit that you will be pleased to report to Government recommending that the other rupees 12-8-0 may be sanctioned in my name, and should there be no hope of this being done, you will be good enough to cause the Manager to return me at least one-half of the sum he obtained from me, as it would be of great assistance to me in this time of need, for which obliging act I shall offer prayers for you.

34, ANDY STREET, ROYAPETTA }
MADRAS, 22nd March 1895. }

(Encl.) No. 737 of 1891.

(Signed) ZAHRA BE.
Widow of the late Baqir Husain.

PAYMASTER, CARNATIC STIPENDS OFFICE,
Chepauk, 24th September 1891.

Adverting to her petition dated 22nd July 1891, Zahra Be, is informed that Government have sanctioned a life pension of rupees 12-8-0 per mensem for her, and should she desire to commute it the enclosed health certificate must be returned to this Office duly sealed by some respectable Carnatic Stipendiary.

(Signed) T. O. UNDERWOOD, COLONEL,
Paymaster Carnatic Stipends.

No. 135 of 1825.

PAYMASTER CARNATIC STIPENDS OFFICE,
Chepauk, 23rd March 1895.

With reference to her petition dated 22nd March 1895, Zahra Bi is informed that her claim to a further continuation from the lapsed stipend of the late Carnatic Stipendiary No. 299 C. Muhammad Baqir Husain is frivolous and inadmissible. The allowance of rupees 12-8-0 which she was granted and which was paid to her in a lump sum was not as a matter of right but was recommended as an arbitrary grant on purely compassionate grounds.

40 298 8/5775

30/4 03/5

2. As regards the disgraceful charges of bribery preferred by her against the Manager of this office, after a silence of 4 years! She is informed that it seems clear that in the face of the strict notices posted at the time of recommending claims (similar to those now referred to) to obviate any charges of foul play or bribery, the Paymaster cannot entertain these grave charges against any of his subordinates, under such peculiar circumstances as those described by the petitioner.

To ZAHRA BI.

(Signed) H. S. STEWART, COLONEL,
Paymaster Carnatic Stipends.

TRANSLATION OF THE 2ND PETITION.

To COLONEL H. S. STEWART, Paymaster, Carnatic Stipends, Chepauk.

After respectful compliments I beg humbly to state that I received your reply, No. 135 of 23rd March last, to my petition of 22nd of the same month. In it you are pleased to observe that my claim to a further continuation from the lapsed stipend of my late husband is "frivolous," and that the allowance of rupees 12-8-0 which I was already granted was "not as a matter of right" but was a grant "on purely compassionate grounds." I beg permission to say that when the grant was sanctioned, the only communication I received was an Official Memorandum No. 737 dated 24th September 1891 in which Colonel Underwood simply informs me that "a life pension of rupees 12-8-0" has been granted by Government. Further as my late husband was a great grandson of Nawab Walajah, there could be nothing "frivolous" if I aspired to a grant of one-half of the stipend he was in receipt of. Moreover, hopes were held out to me by your Manager to that effect, and on this understanding he induced me to give him rupees 225, as I have said in my petition of 22nd March 1895.

2. You further seem to be surprised under the impression that I brought the matter to your notice "after a silence of 4 years!" I could hardly understand how you have arrived at such a conclusion, in the face of my explanation in the said petition as to how the Manager kept shifting his promises during the period of 3½ years, and not 4 years, as you would have it, from the date the sanction of rupees 12-8-0 was made. And when his last and strictest promise to the effect that after your return from leave he would get my case recommended was not fulfilled, I was obliged to appeal to you direct.

3. As to the "posting of the strict notices at the time of recommending claims," "you speak of, allow me to submit that in the first place, being a *gosha* woman, I scarcely knew anything about it; and in the second, the peculiar circumstance under which the Manager practices the art of exaction, the applicants for continuation of pensions cannot help falling into the trap. When the Manager of the Office itself, in the face of such "strict notices" is so daring as to prey upon the petitioners, what could the poor wretches do, especially when only upon the pensions, they long for, depends their future living? So they are obliged, tho' much against their will, to throw a morsel before him to save their claims from suffering the reverse. Thus I beg your pardon to submit that primarily it is the duty of the subordinates in your Office to respect the terms of any notices posted there.

4. It is too uncharitable, Sir, that you should think fit to decline entertaining my complaint because as you say "in the face of the strict notice" I happened to pay your Manager. This resembles the conclusion of a Magistrate who would refuse to entertain a bribery case on the plea that the bribe was given knowing that the legislature had enacted against such a practice. I beg to be pardoned to say that such an attitude on your part would go much to encourage the Manager to extend his maladroitness, and your decision in my case would serve him as a charter of immunity, to the great loss of the whole body of the Stipendiaries.

In conclusion, I respectfully urge that you will be pleased to reconsider my case, for the sake of justice. My charge against the Manager of your Office is two-fold, namely, that he prompted me to give him a bribe and obtained it, and that he exacted money from me by showing me fears that if I did not pay him my claim to a pension out of my late husband's stipend will be thrown out. I am not in well-to-do circumstances to bear the expenses of prosecution if permission to that effect be granted; but if the Government be pleased to instruct the Crown Prosecutor I shall be at his service with my witnesses to prove as much I have stated in my petition of the 22nd March 1895. I trust therefore that you, will in the name of justice submit my prayer to Government for their favorable consideration. As the interests of many are concerned in the conduct of your Office management, you will agree that for this sake, if not for me alone, it is all the more necessary that my complaint against your Manager may be thoroughly inquired into. With these solicitation I close this my humble petition.

Madras, 1st April 1895.

(Signed) ZAHRA BE.

No. 154 of 1895.

PAYMASTER, CARNATIC STIPENDS OFFICE,
Chepauk, 2nd April 1895.

Petitioner is referred to former endorsements No. 135 dated March 1895.

2. Future petitions on the subject will be lodged.

To ZAHRA BI

(Signed) H. S. STEWART, COLONEL,
Paymaster, Carnatic Stipends.

With reference to her petition of 1st April 1895.

CHIEF SECRETARY
18 APR. 1895
GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS

His Excellency, the Right Honourable
the Governor in Council,
Coatacamund.

Most humbly sheweth
That Petitioner most
differentially begs to place before your Excellency
her grievances in the hope that justice may be
rendered to her by your Excellency who is
the protector of the powerless subjects
of His Most Gracious Majesty the Emperor
of India. Petitioner is a poor and helpless
widow and her late husband was a great
grandson of Kabat Wallajah who was the
staunch ally of the British Raj in India.
Petitioner addressed a petition to the Pay-
master on 22nd March 1895 bringing to his
notice in what manner the managers of
his office deceived her. To this she received
a reply dated 23rd March 1895, which
only added to her disappointment and
grief. Copies of both are annexed to this
petition together with the Copies of Petitioner's

As
Co. B. upated recently
Lahna is in case I think in
on 7 the complaint was made
against her in an over-
Arch S. Cl
18/4

1895
Encls. No. 1
To Dept.
O. No. 576

Papers to be read in Proceedings: —

Again G. O., dated

189 , No.

Again G. O., dated

189 , No.

Current No. 516

of 1895, dated 15 Apr. from Zahra Bi

Current No.

of 189 , dated from

ORDER. 8 May 1895, No. 298

Petitioner will be informed that as the Manager of the office of the Paymaster, Carnatic Shipends, has been permitted to prosecute her for defamation, she will have an opportunity of proving the charges which she brings against him

(2. Orders)

CS. 95
7.5

27/5/95

CS. 10/5

Petr. (4) } Dept
P.C.S. (1) } from Madras
1895

CS. 6.5

22/10/5

subsequent petition to the Government and his reply there to a perusal of these with convince your Excellency of the full particulars of Petitioner's case.

2. Petitioner most humbly begs leave to submit that at a time to know why should the Paymaster be partial to his manager in the place of the charge so plainly preferred by Petitioner and which she is prepared to prove should an investigation be ordered by the Government or other quarters for report then your Excellency's March held, Petitioner appears hereby before it and most earnestly solicits that the wrong done to her by one of the subordinates of the Paymaster may be mended in the name of justice and in the interests of all who have to deal with his office, for which charitable act Petitioner as it duty binds

shall ever pray
Signature of Zahra Bi
Widow of the late B. K. K. K.
Great Grandson of N. K. K.

Zuhra Bi

When given for copying _____
When copied _____ } 189
When examined _____
When signed _____

READ AGAIN G.O., No.
189

DATED

CURRENT No.

ENCLOSURES TO G. No

ORDER OF GOVERNMENT

A A A A A A A

LETTER OF GOVERNMENT.

STATEMENT WITH DITTO.

PAPERS NOT FILED UP, BEING MEANT FOR DESPATCH
IN ORIGINAL.

N.B.—

A = Copy in full.
B = Not to be copied.
F = Copy abstract only.
Q = Copy heading only.