

(1) பக்கங்களின் எண்ணிக்கை _____

(2) புதுக்கித் திருப்பிய நாள். _____

(3) ஆதாரங் குறிப்பவர் சுருக்கொப்பம் _____

தமிழ்நாடு ஆவணக் காப்பகம்.

தமிழ்நாடு அரசு.

Political துறை

அரசாணை எண்.

மு. கோப்புத் தாள் எண்.

அச்சகம்

பலவகை

G.O. No 87.

நாள் :

5-2-1895

199

மடிக்கலோ கண்டபடி கையாளவோ கூடாது.

Political (1895) Department.

ORDINARY MS.

G.O., No. 87

Dated 5th Feb. 1895.

INDEXED.

[Despatch Abstract.]

MEMORIAL

Declining to forward to the Government of India a -- from Koos or Zamane Begum, Nathim Zamane Begum, Malika Zamane Begum and Sec under Zamane Begum appealing against the orders of this Government, referring memorialists to previous orders passed in their case, and stating that further petitions from them on the subject will remain unnoticed.

 * சென்னைப் பெயர் *
 * K. 2800 *
 * செப்பனிடார்க்காக *
 * எடுத்துக்கொள்ளப்பட்ட தபால் 12/07 *
 * செப்பனிடா முத்திரை 1/08 *
 * சிறப்பாக்குக *
 * மு. நி. பா. யாளர் *
 * கையொப்பம். கையொப்பம் *

BACK PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	G.O.	No.	Department.	Date

FURTHER PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.	G.O.	No.	Department.	Date
	720		1895				
	1383						
	1310	Lodged	1895				
	1373						
	192	Lodged	1896				
	343						
	369/98						

1313/98

10130/01

8/3

His Excellency the Right Honorable
the Viceroy & Governor General of
India in Council

The humble appeal Memorials

1. Kooroo Jananee Begum
 2. Hathim Jananee Begum
 3. Malika Jananee Begum
 4. Secunder Jananee Begum
- residing respectively at No 5
Soleit Khan Bahadur street
behind the Wallagee cinema
Liplicane Madras

Sheweth

Having been dissatisfied with the Proceedings
of the Madras Government dated 7th December 1895
No 596 (which is herein enclosed) Memorials to beg
to appeal to Your Lordship under the following facts

That Memorials are respectively the
daughters of the late Mirza Mahmood Bakht
Bahadur Prince of Delhi Grand son of Mirza
Ejazt Aza Begum Grand daughter of late Aurangzeb
Bahadur Emperor of Delhi

That the said Memorials father, Mirza
Mahmood Khan Bakht Bahadur and his brother
Mirza Shooja-ud-Din Bahadur arrived
at

Ghouse Khan Bahadur.

That after the death of the said Nasir
the Honorable Government of Madras granted a pension
of Rupees 60 to Memorah's father and Rupees 50 to his
said brother.

That after the death of Memorah's father
they presented several petitions to the Honorable Govt
of Madras for the continuation of a portion of his
stipend in their names but to no effect.

That in consequence of the death of their Mothers
who enjoyed each at the rate of Rupees 5 per mensem
in right of their late husband (Memorah's father)
the said stipend of Rs 20 is lapsed to Government.

That it is extraordinary that the Honorable
Government of Madras, after the death of the said
Mirza Shooja-ud-Daula, brother of Memorah's
father, granted his pension to his wives sons and
daughters.

Under the aforesaid Circumstances
Memorah's father says that your Lordship
Continuation of their late father's stipend in their
names as granted to the wives sons and daughters
of the late Mirza Shooja-ud-Daula Bahadur.

Memorah's father shall be obliged

26th December
1891

Ever Obedient
Mark of Hossain Begum
Mark of Hossain Begum
- mune Begum
Mark of Hossain Begum
- mune Begum
Mark of Hossain Begum
- mune Begum

8/5

His Excellency the Right Honorable the
Viceroy & Governor General of India
in Council

8/1

The humble appeal Memorial of

- 1 Kooroo Jamanee Begum
 - 2 Waitham Jamanee Begum
 - 3 Malika Jamanee Begum
 - 4 Secunder Jamanee Begum
- Residing respectively at No 5
Lalait Khan Bahadur
street behind the Wallaja
Mooque Kipland Mudda

Sheweth

868 Having been dissatisfied with the
Proceedings of the ^{Government} dated
7th December 1894 No 596 (which is herein sub-
-sed) Memorialists beg to appeal to your Lordship
under the following facts.

That Memorialists are respectively the
daughters of the late Mirza Mahomed Bakhsh
Bahadur, Police of Delhi, Grand son of Nawab
Lafat Ali Beg Grand daughter of late
Aulungeed Awarungzaid Emperor of Delhi
The said Memorialists are the daughters of the late
Mirza Mahomed B. B. B. Bahadur and his
brother Mirza Shooze Bakhsh Bahadur
arrived at Madras and honored
- solely by His Highness the last of
Gulam

No. 4

Polk

8. 250: 20. 4. 92 ✓
8. 188: 15. 3. 92 ✓
8. 223: 8. 5. 89 ✓

300 Zamance Begum &
Triplicane.

I want full explanation from all in
on this matter. As to why the 9th of
1894 was put up last October. I am
still more certain now that there were
petitions from these people in 1893 or
in 1894. ^{Let Refuse last} ~~Let Refuse last~~ again. Also let me
know if the Nominal Petition since
is kept up to date in the Reference
by whom. One that names it in
the report, why not? Let me see the Report
with reference to this. Ch

For Refuse Ch
10/1/95
WH
(For further reference vide
Slips)

ject.
The enclosed memorial
sent to H. E. the Viceroy
& communicated to

10

His Excellency the Right Hon
Governor of Fort Saint George
in Council
Madras

8/7

CHIEF SECRETARY
29 DEC 1894
GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS
The humble
Kosar
Hathim
Malika
See enclosed
Respectfully
Khan Bahadur

Sheweth

Pray that the accompanying
(under cover) addressed to His Excellency the Right
the Viceroy & Governor General of India
will be forwarded and the result there
communicated to the Memorialists

Memorialists shall as in

Dated
26th December
1894

Concl. Pray
Mark of Kosar
Mark of Hathim
Mark of Malika
Mark of See enclosed

Gr
25
00-26-11-94

Political DEPARTMENT

C. No. 4

57/8

FOR ORDERS.

Memorialists appeal against
of 7th December 1894, No 868. In
the petition disposed of by the
was under disposal, the Refer
Dept. failed, in spite of the file
being returned on more than one
occasion, to put up the
of 1892 which are now in the
file. The responsibility for this
~~piece of confusion~~ ^{omission}, which is
to the fact that the "Memorial
Petition" Index had not been
up in the Reference, cannot
be ^{frayed}. Steps have, however,
taken to prevent a recurrence
of such confusion.

+ Vide slips in file

Though the petition
request cannot be
dealt with by this Govt
of in 1889, the present
cannot be withheld under
6(5) of the D Memorial
Section I, as it is an appeal
against an order of Decembe
There seems to be no
however, why Memorial

would be given the advantage
the march they have shown
won Govt. owing to their suppression
any mention of previous
actions & to the carelessness
the office. The following order
will, in the circumstances be
quite justifiable.

Order of 5 Feb. 95 No. 87 W

Petitioners will be again
referred to G.O. of 20. April 1892,
No. 250. Further petitions from
them on the subject will receive
no notice

I think that this is a proper
disposal of the petition to the Govt.

of India on the same matter as was
brought forward last time. It is
1892. The petitioners are not
allusion of this came up again
to this Govt.

1894 and owing to carelessness on the
part of the Reference Dept. orders
were in Dec. last passed on what
was already a disjudicate. And
what had occurred in 1892 was brought
to notice the pet. disposes of in Dec
1894 would have been merely brought.

The mistake which occurred does not
create a right to appeal in

207/195

The C.S.'s
will, & have therefore
draft order. I trust
will be no further mistakes
in the dept. W

Petition from Cairn

FOR ORDERS.

C.S. 1904
Mis

When given for copying
When copied
When examined
When signed

189

READ AGAIN G.O. No.
189

DATED

CURRENT No.

RECORDED TO G. No

OF GOVERNMENT.

OF GOVERNMENT.

STATEMENT WITH DITTO.

PAPERS NOT FILLED UP, BRING M T FOR DESPATCH
IN ORIGINAL.

N.B.

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

87/9