Political (1896) Department.

ORDINARY MS.

G.O., No. 356

Dated 5 June 1896

INDEXED.

[Despatch Abstract.]

PETITION.

Declining to comply with the requests of Anwar-un-nisa Begam widow of Ghulam Hussain Khan Bahadur, that she and her daughters may be granted a share out of certain stipends and that orders may be issue for the disbursement of the bonuses granted to herself and her daughters in 1892 which have been irregularly drawn by one Muhammad Ali.

BACK PAPERS.

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

FURTHER PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.	G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.
	915		1896				

CURRENT No. 441 Pol

To

HIS EXCELLENCY

SIR ARTHUR ELIBANK HAVELOCK, G. C. M. G., ~~K.~~ G. C. I. E.

GOVERNOR & PRESIDENT IN COUNCIL,

FORT SAINT GEORGE.

The humble Memorial of Anwarun Nisa Begum, *Second widow of the late* Ghulam Hoosine Khan Bahadur, *great-grandson of Nawab Wallajah, Carnatic Stipendiary No. 341-A and* 348-D, / 1-A

Most Respectfully Showeth,

1. That Ghulam Hoosine Khan Bahadur, your Memorialist's husband, died in October 1891, leaving his first* wife and a son by her; and his second† wife, (your Memorialist), and two daughters by her, as shown in the margin.

*1. *Ammatul Aziz Kutija Begum, 1st wife.*
2. Muhammad Ali, son.
†3. *Anwarun Nisa Begum, 2nd wife.*
4. Muazamun Nisa Begum, daughter.
& 5. Muazazun Nisa Begum, daughter.

2. That your Memorialist's husband, though a very close relative and the 3rd in descent from Nawab Wallajah, as briefly exemplified in the margin, was in receipt of a stipend of Rs. 99-8-0* per mensem, from the office of the Paymaster of Carnatic Stipends.

* *Nawab Wallajah of Carnatic.*
1. Sabbith Jung (1st grantee).
2. Ghulam Murtuza Khan Bahadur (2nd grantee.)
*3. Ghulam Hoosine Khan Bahadur (3rd grantee.)

* Rs.	69	8	0	from his father.
„	30	0	0	do. mother.
Total Rs.	99	8	0	

3. That after his demise on 29th October 1891, all the surviving members of the family named in para. 1, lived together, allowing matters to be managed by Muhammad Ali, the only son and male member of the deceased. While so living, your Excellency's Memorialist perceived certain irregularities which will be found detailed below in paras. 11 *et seq.*

4. That on the death of your Memorialist's husband, one-third of the stipend mentioned in para. 2, lapsed to Government, and as the *first widow had previously relinquished her right to any part of the stipend, she being already in receipt of a pension of Rs. 32* (*vide* her petition submitted to Government, dated 23rd November 1891, the available sum of (Rs. 66-5-3) had to be distributed between your Memorialist and her two daughters and Mahomed Ali, in accordance with precedents shown below, namely, a monthly

8D 707 / 2.12.91

4

---

* With Paymaster's letter No. 861 of 1891.

stipend of Rs. 13-4-3 to your Memorialist and her two daughters each, or, in the aggregate, Rs. 39-12-9; the balance of Rs. 26-8-6 being awardable to Mahammad Ali, the son by the first wife.

PRECEDENTS.

Serial No.	Name of Stipendiary.	No. of Stipendiary.	Amount of Stipend. RS. A. P.	Whether Shadi or Nikha.	REMARKS.
1	Ghulam Abdul Qadir	551-A	45 0 0	Nikha son.	Family of Ansarulla Khan Bahadur.
2	Ghausi Begum	551-B	22 8 0	Do. daughter.	
3	Mahmud Hoosine	550-D	35 0 0	Do. son.	Children of Ameerud Dowlah Bahadur.
4	Faizun Nisa	550-E	17 8 0	Do. daughter.	
5	Muhamed Nasirudin	550-G	25 0 0	Concubine son.	
6	Muhamed Qadir Hoosine ...	550-H	25 0 0	Do.	
7	Inayatun Nisa Begum	1312-A	16 0 0	Shadi widow.	Family of Munirud Dowlah Bahadur.
8	Abdul Vahed Sahib	1312-B	32 0 0	Do. son.	
9	Habibun Nisa Begum	1312-C	16 0 0	Do. daughter.	
10	Abdul Hafiz Sahib	1312-E	16 0 0	Nikha son.	
11	Shah Begum	1312-G	8 0 0	Do. daughter.	
12	Muhamed Khairulla Sahib ...	1312-I	16 0 0	Do. son.	
13	Do. Sarvar Ali Sahib ...	1312-J	16 0 0	Do. do.	
14	Do. Fiaz Husain Sahib ...	1312-K	16 0 0	Do. do.	
15	Abdul Husain Sahib	1312-N	16 0 0	Do. do.	
16	Ghulam Muhiadeen Sahib ...	1312-O	16 0 0	Do. do.	
17	Do. Safiullah Sahib ...	1312-P	16 0 0	Do. do.	
18	Do. Rahmatulla Sahib ...	1312-Q	16 0 0	Do. do	
19	Do. Abdul Ghaffar Sahib ...	1312-R	16 0 0	Do. do.	
20	Yasin Begum	1312-S	8 0 0	Do. daughter.	
21	Farhat Bi	1312-T	8 0 0	Do. widow	
22	Karim Bi...	1312-U	8 0 0	Do. do.	

A similarly equitable distribution was made among the families of Itabarud Dowlah Bahadur, Turab Ali Khan Bahadur, Tahoor Jung Bahadur and Samsamud Dowlah Bahadur and the many others quoted in Government Order, Political, No. 357, dated 22nd May 1885, Nos. 5 and 6 in the above table, though the children of concubine of the late Ameerud Dowlah Bahadur, were given only Rs. 10 less than No. 3, the nikha son of the said Ameerud Dowlah Bahadur.

5. That instead of a distribution being made as indicated above, in your Memorialist's family, the Paymaster, proposed to Government an allowance of Rs. 5-1-9 only to be granted to your Memorialist and each of her daughters or, in the aggregate, Rs. 15-5-3, and the balance, Rs. 51, to be given to the surviving son, Muhamed Ali, although your Memorialist was, like his mother, a nicka wife of her deceased husband whose nicka was performed at Mecca while that of your Memorialist was celebrated in Madras, a fact which is well-known and can be easily proved. The paymaster's proposal alluded to above, was approved by Government *as a temporary arrangement* in G. O. No. 707, dated 2nd December 1891.

6. That your Memorialist in this connection begs respectfully to submit that it is difficult to understand how the Paymaster felt himself justified in proposing the *foregoing small stipends for your Memorialist and her daughters*, an allowance, which when compared with those sanctioned in the cases cited in para. 4, exhibits that a very invidious distinction has been made between your Memorialist's family and the other families referred to, who though possessing

the same degree of relationship, have been awarded more liberal proportions from the stipends of the deceased members. It is therefore respectfully submitted that the circumstances of the award made in your Memorialist's family call for some modification of the *stipends granted to them in 1891*.

7. That in order to illustrate the justice of her remark, your Memorialist begs further to invite attention to the marginal schedule which exhibits at a glance the several stipends which were paid to the descendants of the several sons and daughters of Nawab Wallajah, including your Memorialist's husband.

Serial No.	Names of original grantees.	Amount of original grant.			Amount of second grant.			Amouut of third grant.			REMARKS.
		Rs.	A	P.	Rs.	A.	P.	Rs.	A.	P.	
1	Dilawar Jung, son of Wallajah.	833	0	0	833	0	0	600	0	0	
2	Sabbith Jung Do.	833	0	0	833	0	0	* 139	0	0	* Memorialist's husband Rs. 69-8-0, his two sisters Rs. 34-12-0. each Rs. 69-8-0. Total Rs. 139-0-0.
3	Abdul Hamid Khan Do.	833	0	0	833	0	0	600	0	0	
4	Razia Begum daughter of Do.	416	0	0	416	0	0	356	0	0	
5	Rabia Begum Do.	416	0	0	416	0	0	320	0	0	
6	Fazilatun Nisa Begum Do.	416	0	0	r 250	0	0	...	...	...	r Had no issue amounts continued to servants and retainers.
7	Hafiza Begum.	416	0	0	104	0	0	36	0	0	
8	Dowlatun Nisa Begum.	416	0	0	130	0	0	a 130	0	0	a Khadur Hoosin was the 2nd grantee and his full stipend was continued.

8. That your Memorialist further submits that, because a mistake was originally made in the equitable distribution of her deceased husband's stipend, it would be extremely hard if the benevolent Government adhere to its previous orders. It may be generally stated that in some previous instances when imperfect representations have led to a departure from justice, the Government have been graciously pleased to revise their original orders and to grant enhanced allowances to aggrieved members of the Carnatic family. The cases in point are those of the families of Shujaeth Jung (Government Order, dated 18th May 1847): Azizulla Khan, (Government Order, dated 19th October 1847): Ghulam Mustafa Khan (Government Order, dated 2nd November 1847). Itmadud Dowlah Bahadur was grantad a pension of Rs. 17½ (Government Order, dated 21st June 1878, No. 327) though he had commuted his pension and received an amount of Rs. 17,640 on 20th April 1857. Rabia Begum was granted a pension of Rs. 9 as the 5th grantee from Hafizh Begum (*vide* No. 7 of the foregoing Schedule) in Government Order No. 480, dated 31st August 1878, though she had already commuted her first stipend by Government Order No. 328 of 4th November 1863. Cawder Bee, widow of the late Mirza Sultan Buksh Bahadur was granted a pension of Rs. 5 to 7½ in Government Order, dated 18th February 1889, No. 91, and there are innumerable instances in the records of the Government Office in which the paternal Government was pleased to grant higher rate of pensions on compassionate grounds.

9. Your Memorialist respectfully requests that the Government will kindly take into its generous consideration *your Memorialist's and her daughter's present destitute condition* and will deal with them mercifully and grant them their

① proper share *out of that portion of the stipend of your Memorialist's husband which*
② *lapsed in 1891, or out of that of his father, Ghulam Murtuza Khan Bahadur's lapsed*
③ *stipend who, in his life-time, was in receipt of Rs. 833, or out of the stipend of her step-son, Muhamed Ali, who has been allowed a quite disproportionate amount of Rs. 51 to which he has no title according to the long-established rules, vide remarks against Nos. 341-A &* $\frac{348\text{-}D}{1}$ *referred to in G. O. No. 357, dated 22nd May 1885.* In several instances, the local Government has ordered the continuation of full grants to the descendants of Nawab Wallajah, notwithstanding they were 4th and 5th in descent from the original grantee. Your Excellency's humble Memorialist therefore earnestly craves that herself and her daughter may be treated with greater consideration. Apart from this, the families of Nawab Wallajah's servants have been better provided for by Government than your Memorialist and her daughter, who have a fair and legitimate claim upon the bounty of the benign Government.

10. That your Memorialist having explained in the foregoing paragraphs her relationship to Nawab Wallajah and the insufficiency of the stipend granted to her and her daughters, begs now to represent that her youngest daughter died in October 1892, and on her death, your Memorialist and her surviving daughter
9 should and in accordance with precedents, have received Rs. 19-10-4 each, *i. e.*, Rs. 13-4-3 in their own right each, *plus* a moiety of the stipend of the deceased; but in spite of such long obtaining compassionate course being followed, a deviation from it has been unfairly adopted in your Memorialist's and her daughter's case as mentioned below.

11. That without the knowledge, consent, or permission of your Memorialist and her daughters, their stipends have been commuted and the money to which your Memorialist and her two daughters were rightly entitled, has been delivered to the said Muhamed Ali in April 1892 from the Paymaster's Office on the plea of his having submitted *forged Hindustani Petitions* noted in the margin on your Memorialist's behalf, that the marriages of her daughters were about to take place—*on the condition that Muhamed Ali should stand security for the performance of the marriages in question,* and to this effect a *bond* was taken from him. Your Memorialist begs also to represent that she knew nothing about this transaction for a long time after which, when, on learning from other sources your Memorialist asked Muhamed Ali on the matter, and demanded the money; he first gave her some evasive replies and then to her great surprise he said that the commutation money due to her deceased daughter and to which your Memorialist and her other surviving daughter were entitled to, was in consequence of the death of that daughter, refunded to Government, which statement your Memorialist has reason to believe was a deliberate falsehood—necessitating strict enquiry into the matter—and afterwards he said that *out of the interest derived from the investment of the bonuses,* drawn by him on account of the commuted stipends of your Memoralist and her daughters he was supporting them.

EXHIBITS A, B & C.

EXHIBIT A.

To Colonel Stewart,

I beg to inform you that as the marriages of my daughters are to be celebrated in the month of *Shawal,* I hope you will be good enough to pay the amount of their commutation money.

The ○ Mark of ANWARAN NISA.

Seal of Witness, Ammatul Aziz Katija Begum.
Do. Do. Muhamed Ali.

Madras,
7th April 1892.

EXHIBIT B.

To Colonel Stewart,

We beg to appoint Muhamed Ali Sahib as our Vakil to receive our commutation money, and to request you to hand over the bonds to him.

The ○ Mark of MUAZAMUN NISA BEGUM.
Sealed.
The ○ Mark of MUAZAZUN NISA BEGUM.
Sealed.

Madras,
11th April 1892.

EXHIBIT C.

To Colonel Stewart,

We beg to inform you that Muhamed Ali has received our commutation money.

The Mark ○ of MUAZAMUN NISA BEGUM.
The Mark ○ of MUAZAZUN NISA BEGUM.

Madras,
20th April 1892.

(True Copy.)

(Sd.) H. S. STEWART, Col.,
Paymaster, Carnatic Stipends.

Paymaster's Office, Chepauk,
16th September 1895.

12. That owing to his above misbehaviour and ill-treatment, your Memorialist and her elder surviving daughter were obliged to separate from the family in March 1895, and your Memorialist being anxious to see the girl, then closing her 22nd year married, necessarily raised a loan from her friends and celebrated her *Nikha ceremony only.* It may not be out of place to mention here that though more than 3 years have elapsed since the Paymaster is said to have paid the bonuses of your Memorialist and her daughters to the said Muhamed Ali, the latter failed to pay the amount to them, or to make provision for the marriage expenses, and your Excellency may clearly see that he has thereby rendered himself liable to very serious charges.

13. That after the *Nikha* ceremony of your Memorialist's surviving daughter (Muazamun Nisa Begum), your Memorialist applied, on the 3rd April 1895, to Muhamed Ali to return her the commutation money, through her Solicitor, Mr. James Short, and received reply from Muhamed Ali's Solicitors, Messrs. Wilson and King, on the 6th

EXHIBIT D.

Madras, 6th April 1895.

JAMES SHORT, Esq.,
Solicitor, Madras.

Dear Sir,—Mr. Muhamed Ali Sahib has placed in our hands your letter to him of the 3rd instant written on behalf of Mirza Mohiadin Baig Saib and Mirza Cawder Baig Sahib with instructions to reply thereto.

Our client instructs us to inform you that *he has not been nor is he in receipt of the commutation allowance of the Carnatic Stipends payable to the ladies on behalf of whom your clients profess to act.*

We are, &c.,
(Sd.) WILSON & KING.

EXHIBIT E. No. $\frac{167}{13\text{-}4\text{-}95}$.

Anwarum Nisa is informed with reference to her petition of 6th April 1895 that she informed the Paymaster on the 7th April 1892 to the effect that the marriages of her daughters were about to take place; this letter which was sealed by two respectable Carnatic Stipendiaries as guarantee to the effect of the correctness of the statement contained therein, was sent to her through the office Humamnies to whom she stated that the contents of her said letter were true. On these assurances the Paymaster issued a sum of Rs. 756 to Muhamed Ali Sahib at her daughter's request which is filed in this office.

2. Petitioner now reports (after a silence of 3 years!) that her daughter has not yet been married. This surprises the Paymaster, who was induced to advance money as her daughter's dowry in obedience to Government orders.

3. Muhamed Ali has, however, returned the above amount of Rs. 756 stating at the same time that he has already advanced to the petitioner the above sum for the preparations of the marriage, for which he has satisfactory evidence to prove in a Court of Law. *The above transactions, however, does not concern the Paymaster.*

4. Petitioner is now informed that the amount which is now lodged at the office by Muhamed Ali, will not be paid to the petitioner; but the Paymaster will see the above amount paid to her *daughter* who is capable of giving a receipt for the amount, she being now 22 years old, provided that she gives a surety to the effect that she has not already received that amount directly or indirectly from Muhamed Ali, and also furnishes to this office an extract of her Nikha with Muhiadin Baig Sahib signed and sealed by a Government Qazi.

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

April 1895, to the effect that he has not been, nor is he, in receipt of the commutation allowance. (Exhibit D). Further, when your Memorialist requested the Paymaster to direct Muhamed Ali to return to her the commutation money of your Memorialist and her two daughters, which had been disbursed to him, the Paymaster in his endorsement No. 167, dated 13th April 1895, replied to your Memorialist as marginally noted. (Exhibit E.)

That in reply to this endorsement, your Memorialist, in a Petition dated 17th May 1895, informed the Paymaster that the bonus of Rs. 756 was never received by your Memorialist, that Muhamed Ali never performed the marriage of her two daughters, and on the contrary, your Memorialist had, for the first time learnt, that a Petition was submitted to the Paymaster purporting to have been signed by your Memorialist, and bearing, as alleged, *seals of two respectable Carnatic Stipendiaries, whom your Memorialist in the middle of September 1895, after receipt of (Exhibits A, B and C) furnished by the Paymaster, discovered that Muhamed Ali, and his mother were the witnesses to that important paper*—vide *copy of forged Hindustani letter, dated 7th April 1892, with translation.* (Exhibit A noted in the margin of para. 11.) In the above connection your Memorialist begs respectfully to submit that due and strict inquiries should have been made by the Paymaster as to the authenticity of the letter, prior to the disbursement of the money; and with reference to para. 1 of the Paymaster's reply (Exhibit E) your Memorialist begs to state, that the Humamnies never called at your Memorialist's residence and never had an interview either with her or with her daughters.

EXHIBIT F. No. $\frac{163}{10\text{-}4\text{-}95}$.

A complaint having been lodged by one Anwarun Nisa Begum that Carnatic Stipendiary No. $\frac{341\text{-A}}{1}$ Muhamed Ali Sahib has not returned the bonus (Rs. 756) to her daughter Muazamun Nisa Begum which Muhamed Ali Sahib received from this Office on the 13th April 1892, *on the condition that he would stand security for the performance of the marriage with this amount*, the Paymaster, Carnatic Stipends, directs that he will either at once return the amount of Rs. 756 which he received from the Paymaster for the above specific purpose, or furnish the undersigned with the receipt of Muazamun Nisa Begum in full satisfaction of the claim.

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

(True Copy.)

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

16th September 1895.

EXHIBIT G.

We do hereby testify that Muhamed Ali Sahib, the son of the late Ghulam Hoosine Sahib, did not pay the share of his step-mother Anwarun Nisa Begum nor those of his step-sisters from the estate of the deceased which amounted to about a lakh of Rupees. We are further aware that the said Muhamed Ali has not even paid the commutation amount of his step-mother and her daughters.

(Sealed) ABBASEE BEGUM.
(Signed) MUSTAFA HOOSSAIN.

19th May 1895.

14. That your Memorialist further begs to invite your Excellency's attention to the significant fact that on receipt of her Petition on the subject of the commutation allowances, the Paymaster called upon Muhamed Ali, on the 10th April 1895, either to refund the amouut of the bonus due to her daughter, or to furnish him with a receipt in token of her having received such payment, (Exhibit F) which circumstance, your Excellency may clearly see, proves conclusively that the Paymaster's Office was completely in the dark as to the payment of the amount to the *rightful party*. *On the 13th April 1895*, the Paymaster was pleased to inform your Memorialist (*vide* Exhibit E) that the amount has been refunded by Muhamed Ali and will be paid to her daughter on production of her *marriage certificate* and of a *Surety* that she had not received the sum directly, or indirectly, from Muhamed Ali. (Exhibit G.)

15. That in compliance with the Paymaster's Memorandum (Exhibit E) your Memorialist's daughter applied to him on the 18th May 1895 enclosing an extract (Exhibit H) from the Government Qazis' Nikha register, and in reply she received from the Paymaster an endorsement, dated 20th May 1895, No. 212, (Exhibit J) informing her that the Paymaster's responsibility ceased on payment of her share of bonus, on her behalf, to her step-brother on the 13th

EXHIBIT H.

Nikha of Mirza Mohideen Baig Sahib, son of Mirza Hassen Baig Sahib, celebrated with Ammatul Moiz Moazamun Nisa Begum (matured virgin girl daughter of Ghulam Hoosine Ahsanud Dowlah Bahadur (Maher Rs. 5,000 and 39 tolas pure gold through Vakalet of Mustafa Hoosine, son of Nasirudin Hoosine Khan.

Witnesses.

Ghulam Asiz Hoosine, son of MUSTAFA HOOSINE,
Muhamed Sarvar Ali, son of MUNIRUD DOWLAH BAHADUR,
Nikha performed by Syed Ali, son of SYED ENSUFF,
Dy. Qazi.

27th Ramzan 1312 Hijiri, (corresponding to 23rd March 1895).

(True Copy.)

(Signed) KAZEE OBEIDULLA,
Govt. Qazi.

22nd Shawal 1312 Hijiri.

EXHIBIT I. No. $\frac{194}{18\text{-}5\text{-}94}$.

Anwarum Nisa is informed with reference to her Petition, dated April 1895, that her complaint regarding the distribution of shares of her late husband's stipend is inadmissible.

2. As regards her allegation of non-payment of certain sums paid on her account and that of her daughters to her step-son Muhamed

Ali Sahib, petitioner is informed that it is left to her to establish her right in a Court of Law as she may be advised.

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

EXHIBIT J. No. $\frac{212}{20\text{-}5\text{-}95.}$

In reply to her Petition of the 18th Instant, Ammatul Moiz Moazamun Nisa Begum is informed that from legal opinion recently obtained by the Paymaster the responsibility of this office ceased on payment of her share of bonus on her behalf to Muhamed Ali Sahib her step-brother on the 13th April 1892 as per receipt filed in this office; the endorsement No. 167, dated 13th April 1895, to her mother from the Paymaster is therefore cancelled, and the petitioner is informed that any claim she may have against her half-brother abovenamed, she is left to establish in a Court of Law as she may be advised.

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

April 1892, as per receipt filed in his office (*Exhibit C, forged Petition*); and in an endorsement No. 194, dated 18th May 1895, (Exhibit I) to her mother, (the Memorialist) it was stated that the commutation money having been paid on her account and that of her daughters, to her step-son, it was left to her to establish her right in a Court of Law. These two replies, it will be observed, do not correspond with the language of Exhibit E, and show that there is evidently something requiring explanation.

16. Your Memorialist next begs to point out, that her daughters *invariably sign their Petitions and letters, &c., and never use marks, as in the case of the forged Hindustani letters, dated 11th and 20th April 1892* (Exhibits B and C, para. 11) addressed to Colonel Stewart, copies of which have been furnished to Memorialist, as per Government Order No. 576, Political, dated 30th August 1895. The very fact of Muhamed Ali having refunded Rs. 756 to the Paymaster, conclusively proves that the said sum was never paid to your Memorialist or to her daughters, but that to screen his delinquency he refunded the amount, instead of paying it to your Memorialist or her daughter, as he should have done. It may be further mentioned that neither your Memorialist nor her surviving daughter has received their bonuses up to date. Vide *report of inquiry connected with Memorialist and her daughters made by Mrs. Firth, and submitted to the Paymaster in April 1895.*

As regards the Paymaster's action, as disclosed in the foregoing papers, it will be observed that within the short interval that elapsed between the date of his first letter quoted in para. 13 and his second letter quoted in para. 15, a most marvellous change seems to have come over his desire, as expressed in his Memo. (Exhibit E, para. 13) dated 13th April 1895, to see the amount paid to your Memorialist's daughter. Subsequently, on being informed by the Paymaster that the Memorialist and her daughter should sue Muhamed Ali in a Civil Court (Exhibits I and J) for the payment of the bonuses claimed by them, your Memorialist's daughter next requested the Paymaster, on the 11th June 1895, to inform her whether paras. 3 and 4 of the endorsement No. 167, dated 13th April 1895, (Exhibit E) in which it is said that the amount in question was returned by Muhamed Ali and was lodged in his office, should be taken as cancelled; and if so, what he has done with the money. To this query the Paymaster replied that the endorsement referred to should be considered as cancelled and added that the money was returned to Muhamed Ali. (Exhibit K.)

Exhibit K. No. $\frac{244}{12\text{-}6\text{-}95.}$

Ammatul Moiz Moazamun Nisa Begum is informed with reference to her Petition of 11th Instant that the whole of this office endorsement dated 13th April last must be considered as cancelled.

2. The money deposited by Muhamed Ali Sahib was returned to him.

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

17. Your Memorialist, finding that the Paymaster's action was vacillatory and inconsistent, applied to him on the 17th June last for authenticated copies of *all* the documents and correspondence connected with the fact set out above, in view to taking further steps, and was informed by him (Exhibit L) that the request for grant of copies of documents was inadmissible without the orders of Government. On receipt of this reply, your Memorialist was compelled to trouble Government in the matter, and on the 30th August 1895 she learnt that the Paymaster was directed to furnish her with copies of such of the papers connected with her case as may be forthcoming in his office.

Exhibit L. No. $\frac{256}{18\text{-}6\text{-}96.}$

Anwarum Nisa is informed with reference to her Petition of the 17th Instant that her request for grant of attested copies of documents she applied for is inadmissible without the express orders of Government.

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

18. That in accordance with these instructions, your Memorialist begs to state she has been supplied with some of the documents,* *not all*, and that two important papers, *viz.*, (1) copy of Petition from Muhamed Ali's mother stating that as she was already in receipt of a pension, her own share in her husband's allowances may be distributed among her son, your Memorialist and her children; and (2) copy of security bond given by Muhamed Ali referred to in paras. 4 and 11 respectively, have not been supplied her, although she has reason to believe they are forthcoming in the records of the Paymaster's Office. These documents are of great importance to Memorialist, and in not furnishing her with them, the reason for abstaining to do so has not been explained.

19. In these circumstances your Memorialist humbly begs that your Excellency in Council will issue orders for the disbursement, at an early date, of the *three sums of commutation money* amounting to Rs. 2,300 or thereabouts, according to the terms of the security bond signed by Muhamed Ali which is on the records of the Paymaster's Office, as your Memorialist has yet to perform according to the "Khandan" custom the "Shadi" (marriage) of her daughter, who is about 23 years, and which Memorialist has been obliged to postpone for want of funds.

20. That in regard to the prayer contained in para. 9 your Memorialist begs to state that, it is a matter of very deep regret that while the families of Nos. 1 and 3 referred to in the Schedule quoted in para. 7 *supra*, are enjoying the

* *Vide* her Petition to Chief Secretary, dated 5th August 1895, and Paymaster's reply thereto quoted in Government Order No. 576, dated 30th August 1895.

full pension, the family of Memorialist's husband, *vide* item No. 2 in the said Schedule, should be deprived of the same for these many years *for no fault of their own.* Your Memorialist and her surviving daughter indulge in the confident hope that your Excellency will be benevolently and graciously pleased to consider their claims and to extend to them the benevolence so characteristic of your Excellency's Government, and grant them the boon sought for in this Memorial, *viz.*, the payment of the commutation money referred to above, as well as the grant in future to Memorialist and her surviving daughter of the difference of pension between the rate given in para. 4 and that hitherto paid, *i. e.*, Rs. 8-2-6, such being the difference between Rs. 13-4-3 and Rs. 5-1-9 *plus* a moiety of Rs. 4-1-3 of the deceased daughter's share.

For which act of kindness and benevolence and charity, your Memorialist and her daughter shall, as in duty bound, ever PRAY.

No. 195, TRIPLICANE HIGH ROAD,
MADRAS, 30th *March* 1896.

Mark of ANWARU~~M~~n NISA BEGUM.

PRINTED BY SRINIVASA, VARADACHARI & CO., MOUNT ROAD—MADRAS.

Par
Shilp

2/67 ×
327 ×
1874 280 ✓

RECD 20-4-96

CURRENT No. 441

Ans.
20.iv.96.

Endl. No: 827

From

ANWARUN NISA BEGUM,
Second widow of the late
GHULAM HOOSINE KHAN BAHADUR,
GREAT GRANDSON OF NAWAB,
WALLAJAH OF CARNATIC.

CHIEF SECRETARY
30 MAR. 1896
GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS

To

His Excellency Sir Arthur
ELIBANK HAVELOCK, C.C.M.G., G.C.I.E.,
Governor & President in Council,
FORT SAINT GEORGE.

Referred to the Paymaster, Carnatic Stipends, for report.

It is observed that in Colonel Underwood's letter No. 861 of 23d. November 1891 disposed of by G.O. No. 707 Pl. of 2nd December 1891, Muhammad Ali was stated to be the Shadi son of Ghulam Husain. In para 6 of the present petition, he is alleged to have been a nikahi son.

Chief Secretary

C.S.
16.4.96

Ootacamund
17th April 1896

Recd 20-4-96

DATED 30/3 } 1896
RECEIVED 30/3 }

Regd 31/3

Recd – 20-4-96.

SUBJECT :—

Requesting to issue early orders to the Paymaster of Carnatic Stipends for the disbursement of certain bonuses and soliciting a reconsideration of the order regarding the rate of pension sanctioned to her and to her daughter.

R.O. for papers

Endd
2/9/96

61

Encl

Translation of "A"

I Ammat-ul-aziz Khadija Begam Shadi grand daughter of the late Honorable Sir Sharful umra Bahadur K: C: S: I:, Shadi widow of the late Ghulam Husain do hereby declare that when I was residing in the holy city of Mecca, my marriage was performed there according to the customs prevalent in that city and when I returned to Madras, my mother-in-law spent a large sum of money in the performance of the rites of my Shadi marriage in accordance to the prevalent practice here. Certainly those persons of the Islam Community who existed then would be cognizant of the above facts. I therefore require testimoney to my above statement from the nobility of the Carnatic family and request that they will be good enough to adorn this Round Robin by placing their signatures or seals and oblige me

Dated 22d april 1896.

(Signed) Muhammad Nizam-ud-din Khan Bahad
" Ahmad Muhi-ud-din Khan Bahadur
" Rafat-ul-mulk Bahadur
" Ali Dost Khan Bahadur
(Sealed) Hafiz Khurshid Ahmad Sahib
" Zuhur-ud-din ahmad Khan Bahadur
" Hafiz Ali Mazhar Khan Bahadur
" Nawab Ghausia Begam
" Ammat-ul-qadir Zadari Begam
" Malik-un-nisa Begam
" Mubarak-un-nisa Begam.

(Free Translation)

Paymaster Carnatic Stipends office Chepak 1896 }

A. H. Stuart:
Colonel
Paymaster Carnatic Stipends
Chepak

"B"

No. 178 of 1895. Paymaster Carnatic Stipends'
office, Chepauk, 22d April 1895.

To

The Government Solicitor
Madras.

Sir,

I have the honor to bring to your notice for a legal opinion the following case which I presume I am entitled to trouble you about, and obtain your advise in my capacity of Paymaster Carnatic Stipends.

2. By G: O: No: 109 dated 15th Feby 1892 "Poll": bonuses were sanctioned to two unmarried girls (aged 19 & 13 respectively in 1892) of a deceased Carnatic Stipendiary with instructions that the amount should be paid on their betrothal as dowries.

3. On a report received from these girls' mother of their betrothal certified by 2 respectable Carnatic Stipendiaries drawing Rs 51 & 32 respectively I issued the bonus bonds for the sums due to the girls on their appointing their half brother to receive the same on their behalf, they being "gosha ladies". Their half brother appeared before me and stood security to be responsible for the actual marriage of the girls and due payment to them of the sums disbursed by me to him by bonds on their behalf. The abovementioned girls furnished me with their sealed & stamped receipts (as usual) for the amount paid to them through their accredited agent & half brother who received the bonds* from me for the

* to be cashed.

amount

mount of bonuses for which I took his signature in the office book to the amounts opposite the names of the girls.

4. Now after a silence of 3 years I hear from the mother, for the first time, who writes to me on the 6th Instt. to say that one of her daughters died unmarried and that the other is about to be married now - and applies for the dowry above referred to, which she alleges was never paid by the half brother of the girls, who received it on their behalf.

5. Under the above circumstances I wish to be informed if the responsibility of this office ceased on the payment made in April 1892, as described in para 3, which was in accordance with precedents and practice of this office observed in such cases.

6. As a matter of fact, on calling on the half brother of the girls mentioned above, he voluntarily deposited the sum claimed by the mother on behalf of her surviving daughter (the eldest of the 2 girls) alleged to be only now betrothed.

7. The half brother informs me at the same time that he has already paid to the mother of the girls the sum due to them and begs that I may retain the amount (he now returned) in deposit and inform the mother of the girl that her remedy lies in legal proceedings and if the amount is decreed in her favor, I should then hand over the amount to her, or else return it to him if the Court give it against her.

I.

I have the honor to be
Sir
Your Obedient Servant
(Signed) H. S. Stewart Colonel
Paymaster Carnatic Stipends
Chepauk.

True copy
H. S. Stewart Colonel
Paymaster Carnatic Stipends
Chepauk.

Paymaster Carnatic
Stipends' Office, Chepauk.
April 1896.

6
BRC
Enclos. No. 2
To
C. N. 597

"Confidential"

No: 158 of 1896.

Paymaster Carnatic Stipends'
Office Chepak 1st May 1896.

From

Colonel A: S: Stewart. I: S: C:
Paymaster Carnatic Stipends
Chepak.

To

The Honorable J: F: Price. C: S: I:
Chief Secretary to Government
Fort St. George.

Sir,

With reference to your Endorsement No: 827 dated 17th April 1896, on petition* Current No: 441 from Anwar-un-nisa, I have the honor to report as follows:-

* Herewith returned.

A
GO 707/2-12-91

2. I am unable to find out the authority under which Colonel Underwood based his letter No: 861 dated 23d November 1891 in which he states that Ammat-ul-aziz Khadija Begam (mother of Muhammad ali) is the "Shadi" wife of the late Ghulam Husain, but I presume that he took the Statement of Khadija Begam to be true especially that she being a carnatic Stipendiary of good family and Status, drawing Rs 32/- per mensem as a grand daughter of a notable gentleman the late Honorable Sir Sharf-ul-umra Bahadur K: C: S: I: was likely to be truthful in this matter, moreover the petitioner herself in her letter to Colonel Underwood dated 16th January 1892, translation of which was forwarded to Government with this office letter No: 27 dated 21st January 1892, pronounces Khadija Begam as the "Shadi" wife of her late husband Ghulam Husain.

B+ H
GO 109/15-2-92

3.

3. As regards petitioner's statement in para 5. of her petition under report that Muhammad ali is a "nickahi" son, the nickah of whose mother was performed at Mecca, I have the honor to state that the father of Khadija Begam (Asif Jang Bahadur) was a "wahabi" a sect who strictly adhere to the tenets of the Muhammadan law which prohibits music, beat of drums, tom tom &c. which forms a part of the procession and rite observed in the marriages performed in India. Khadija Begam's marriage being performed at Mecca such superfluous rites as music &c: were of course not allowed owing to the begotedness of the bride's father. The marriages performed at Mecca are of 2 kinds viz:- (1) By reading a sermon (2) By taking a slave girl as wife without reading a sermon. These two sorts of marriages performed at Arabia more or less take the place of a "Shadi" and "Nickah" marriages performed in India respectively, as slavery is prohibited by English law. From this it is apparent that the marriage between Ghulam Husain and Khadija Begam that took place at Mecca was tantamount to what is termed "Shadi" in India as Khadija Begam was anything but a slave girl. Moreover by perusal of the enclosed Hindustani "Mahzar" or Round Robin signed by respectable members of the Carnatic and Arcot Family a translation of which is herewith forwarded marked "A", it will be observed that after the return of the married couple from Arabia, the mother of Ghulam Husain spent a large sum to give publicity to her son's marriage in Madras and invited the relations of the bridegroom and bride to a dinner. The general principles observed in India about the two above mentioned modes of marriages are (1) "Shadi" marriage is consummated with a spinster of equal rank and birth as that of the bridegroom and is expensive whereas a "Nickah" marriage generally takes place amongst Muhammadans of the poorer class or at least on the woman's side and it is not necessary that the bride should be a spinster; she may be a widow.

4. As regards petitioner's allegation that Muhammad Ali is a "Nickahi" son of her late husband, I beg to submit that her statement is untrue, as there is a vast difference between her and Muhammad Ali's mother. Khadija Begam who was a spinster at her marriage is a native lady of rank and position and a cousin of her own husband Ghulam Husain. She is, as stated above to be a "Shadi" grand daughter of the late Honorable Sir Sharf-ul-umra Bahadur K:C:S:I: and much respected by the members of the Carnatic family whereas petitioner was a native woman of low rank (a pariah) converted by her husband to Muhammadanism. Touching the claims urged by the petitioner in paras. 4, 5, 6 & 7 of the petition under report, I have the honor to state that they are in every way inadmissible; as to her grievance about her husband's small pension I will merely remark that it will be seen by G: O: No: 176 dated 7th August 1868 that the late Ghulam Husain's stipend of Rs 139 in which his share was Rs 69-8-0 vide G: O: No: 210 dated 17th June 1869, was merely granted on compassionate grounds and on the express understanding that it was to lapse on his decease, and "in no way was this case to be drawn into a precedent."

+C

D

E

80 37/23.1.91

5. With reference to the petitioner's complaint regarding the non-receipt of bonuses sanctioned to her and her 2 daughters, I have the honor to observe that since the enquiry by Colonel Weldon in 1890 about certain irregularities of this office in the mode of payment of bonuses to the dependants of the late Carnatic Stipendiary No: 1270 Aziz-un-nisa Begam, Colonel Underwood took further precautionary steps for disposing of the bonuses payable to that branch of female stipendiaries who adhere to the prevalent custom of "Gosha" and framed certain rules to be observed by them

for

for receiving their bonuses. In the first instance they were to write to the Paymaster appointing one of their nearest relative as their "vakil" or agent to receive the bonus bond and produce it in the Accountant General's Office for audit and adjustment. On receipt of this document the Paymaster deputes the Government "Hamamnies" attached to his office to find out from the Commuter if the statements contained therein were true, and then the bond is handed over to the "vakil" or the duly constituted agent who takes it to the audit office for payment. The Accountant General passes the amount and in lieu of the bond issues a cheque (if the sum claimed exceeds Rs 100) drawn up in the name of the Commuter and hands it over to the "vakil" or the agent of the Commuter. Secondly the cheque so drawn is presented to this office and sent to the Commuter through the office Hamamnies to obtain on it the mark or the signature of the Commuter and to ascertain the name of the person in whose favor the — Commuter wishes to endorse the cheque. The Commuter sometimes chooses to endorse the cheque in the name of the first "vakil" who was duly constituted to get the bonus bond from this office, and sometimes gives the name of another relation of hers, or person, to get the cheque cashed on her behalf. The cheque is accordingly endorsed in the name of the person as desired by the Commuter — and is countersigned by the Paymaster, and the Bank pays the amount of the cheque to the "endorsee". Thirdly a letter is sent by this office by post to the address of the Commuter informing her that the cheque was passed in the name of the person named by her and requesting her to intimate by post to this office the receipt of the bonus money from her duly constituted agent. A reply is received to the above communication and then the transaction ends.

6. As regards the case under report I have the hono to state that petitioner received her bonus in the time of Colonel Underwood in accordance to the practice laid down in the above para:. After I took charge of the office I receive a petition from Anwar-un-nisa dated 7th April 1892 — (sealed by 2 carnatic stipendiaries as sureties) informin that her two daughters were about to be married, and requesting me to pay the bonuses of the girls for the — purpose. Thereupon I sent the "Hamamnies" to her with the letter to ascertain if the statements contained therein were true. On receipt of the report of "Hamamnies" in the affirmative, I issued the bonds to Muhammad Ali a carnatic stipendiary and half brother of the girls who appointed him as their agent vide their letter 11th April 1892, observing the same principles mentioned in para 5 of this report. Petitioner denies all knowledge of these letters vide para 11. of her petition under report which is — astonishing!

7. After a lapse of 3 years and after separation from Muhammad Ali, I received a petition from Anwar-un-nisa on the 7th April 1895, for the first time complaining of the non receipt of the bonus of her surviving daughter upon which I called upon Muhammad Ali to refund the — same to my office as it seemed to me that he was — responsible for the marriage of the girl which appeared had not taken place. Muhammad Ali brought the amount at my office and handed it over to me first voluntarily in compliance with my request and subsequently under protest alleging that he had already paid it to his step mother towards defraying the expense of the intended marriage of the girl. At this time it — struck me that it was necessary to get legal advice on the subject and I accordingly asked the opinion of the Government Solicitor vide my letter No: 178 dated 22nd April

april 1895, herewith enclosed marked B, and on receipt of his reply, herein enclosed marked C, I returned the amount to Muhammad Ali and informed Anwar-un-nisa and her daughter to establish their rights in a proper Court of justice.

8. I have the honor to observe that the statement contained in para 15. of the petition under report to the effect that the petitioner's daughter forwarded (enclosed to me in her petition dated 18th May 1895) an extract of her "Nickah" marriage Register, is false and with reference to the statement contained in para 16 of the petition representing that the petitioner's daughters always signed their petitions and letters and never "used their marks", all I can say is that both the Government "Hamamnies" testify to the fact that the girls in question made these marks in their presence, so I conclude that the surviving one may possibly have subsequently learnt to write her name and this is now brought as a subtle argument to strengthen their case and claim.

9. In conclusion I have the honor respectfully to remark that I consider Anwar-un-nisa's petition under report a vexatious and improper one, every due precaution was taken by both my Predecessor Colonel Underwood and myself in this matter, her step son Muhammad ali (her only male relative) with whom this office dealt with on her behalf is a wealthy Carnatic Stipendiary with heavy risks at stake and from whom she can obtain remuneration if she proves her claims against him in a Court of law.

I have the honor to be
Sir
your most obedient Servant
H. H. Stewart
Colonel
Paymaster Carnatic Stipends
Chepak

Despt.

a CURRENT N° 597

Political (1896) Department.

"Confidential"

CHIEF SECRETARY
2 MAY 1896
GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS

359 B 22-5-96
1768 7-8-96

From

The Paymaster
Carnatic Stipends
Chepak.

To,

The Chief Secretary
to Government
Fort St. George.

Dated 1st }
Recd 2 } May 1896
Regd 4 }

No: 158 of 1896
5. Enclosures. i.e. C No. 441 rets & 4 Enclo.

Reports on petition C. No: 441 from Anwar-un-nisa and under the circumstances mentioned within, states that her claim is vexatious.

[G./25]
1,000—21-3-96.

Political DEPARTMENT
Cs Nos 441 & 597 of 1896

FOR ORDERS.

Anwar-un-Nisa Begum, the *nikahi* widow of the late Ghulam Husain Khan Bahadur / great-grandson of Nawab Wallajah / Carnatic Stipendiary N° 341. A & $\frac{348\text{-}D}{1-A}$ prays that

para 9 of petition

A - Govt will grant her and her two daughters the proper share

(1) out of that portion of the stipend of her husband which lapsed in 1891,

or (2) out of that of his father, Ghulam Murtuza Khan Bahadur's lapsed stipend, who, in his life time, was in receipt of Rs 833,

or (3) out of the stipend of her step-son, Muhamed Ali, "who has been allowed a quite disproportionate amount of Rs 51"

para 19 of petition

B - Govt will order the disbursement to her of the three sums of commutation money amounting to about Rs 2,300* according to the terms of the security bond, signed by Muhamed Ali, which is on record in the Paymaster's Offic

* Rs 2,119 apparently vide para 3 infra

2. A (1) & (2). – Ghulam Murtiza Khan, the father of memorialist's husband ~~father~~ was originally in receipt of a stipend of Rs 833.5.3. But from E.M.C. No 431× d/11th Nov 1851, it will be seen that this stipend was separated, as shown in the margin×, in accce with ~~according to~~ the scale laid down ~~by~~ in Lord Clive's Minute of 1801, Ghulam Murtiza receiving Rs 417.5.3 per mensem. It was expressly stated that the pension was to lapse on his death, & that all enquiry into past payments or claims was to be distinctly refused.

Ghulam Husain, husband of the memorialist, was in receipt of two pensions, viz.

(a) Rs 69.8.0 out of his father's pension
(b) Rs 30.0.0 – " – mother's "

(a) – G.O. No 176× Polt; d/7.8.1868, granted Ghulam Husain Rs 139 per mensem i.e. one third of the stipends (Rs 417) drawn by his father Ghulam Mahomed Murtuza Khan, notwithstanding that the latter was but a life grant. This was in accordance with the suggestion of the Secy of State to whom Ghulam Husain had appealed against the orders of this Govt. discontinuing ~~of~~ the stipend on his father's death. The pension was however continued only on the express understanding that it would lapse on Ghulam Husain's death & that the case was not to be drawn into a precedent.

As however Ghulam Husain did not provide for his two sisters this sum of Rs 139 was (vide G.O. 210× Polt d/17.6.1869) divided under Lord Clive's scale among the three, Ghulam receiving Rs 69-8-0.

(b

× slip F

FOR ORDERS.

×

Ghulam Mahomed Murtuza Khan	Rs 417.5.3
Padsha Begum mother of do	" 208.0.0
Two Nephews " "	" 208.0.0
	Rs 833.5.3

~~H. M.~~

× slip C

× slip D

(b) The pension of Rs 30 he obt. in virtue of his mother's descent from Karia Begum, nikahi daughter of the Nawab Wallajah. From G.O. No 293× Polt d/30.4.18 it will be seen that his mother, Azum-un-nisa Begum's pension of Rs 69 was a life grant. Nevertheless it was continued to her children,

× slip G

3. On the death of Ghulam Husain the Paymaster, Carnatic Stipends, recommended that, as both the above stipends were returned as "Continuable" in Appendix× G.O. No 359 d/22.5.85, two-thirds of the lapsed stipends should be continued to the heirs in accordance with Lord Clive's Scale as follows:—

× Col. Baynes' list of 1866 Slip 1.

Shadi son	348 A/1	Muhamed Ali×	5 shares	= Rs 51. " . "
Nikahi wife	348 A/2	Anwar-un-nisa	½ share	= " 5. 1. 10
" daughter	348 A/3	Muzzaz-un-nisa Begum	½ "	= " 5. 1. 9
" daughter	348 A/4	Muazzam-un-nisa Begum	½ "	= " 5. 1. 9
		Total	6½ shares	= Rs 66.5.4

(Ghulam Husain's wife Khadija Begum had waived her claim).

This was approved temporarily & subsequently confirmed in G.O. No 109× Polt d/15.2.92. Para 2 of this G.O. further sanctioned the commutation of the allowances to the memorialist & her daughters. The bonuses were Rs 633, 730, & 756 respectively, & the last two were to be paid to the girls, as dowries, on their betrothal.

× slip H

Total Rs 2,119. see para 1 supra

The above facts dispose of A (1) & (2) & show that memorialist and her family have been treated liberally

inte

With reference to A (3) it is observed that under G.O. 778 Polt d/ 29. 11. 80 a Shadi son receives two times as much as a Nikahi widow or daughter. Mahomed Ali being treated as a Shadi son by Khadija Begum, was accordingly under G.O. No. 707 d/ 2.12.91 granted ~~given~~ Rs 51. If, as the memorialist states, Khadija Begum was not Ghulam Husain's Shadi wife, then the above distribution was ~~is~~ wrong. But as explained by the Paymaster, Carnatic Stipends, the marriage ~~ceremony~~ of Khadija Begum at Mecca was tantamount to a shadi marriage, & was minus the usual tamash only because her father belonged to the strict "Wahabi" sect. Again the memorialist herself in a letter to Col. Underwood d/ 16.1.92 (vide G.O. 169 Polt d/ 15.2.92) speaks of Khadija Begum as Ghulam Husain's Shadi wife. Further the P.C.S. explains that the ceremony obtaining at Mecca, which corresponds to the Nikahi marriage here consists in "taking a slave girl as a wife without reading a sermon". Now Khadija Begum was anything but a slave girl, being in fact her husband's cousin. The P.C.S. also draws attention to

× slip J

× slip A

× slip H

× slip M

to the ~~Round Robin~~ Mahzar signed by respectable members of the Carnatic & Arcot family to the Effect that Khadija Begum was considered a Shadi wife. In any case there is a great difference between the social positions of Khadija & the Memorialist "who was a native woman of low rank (a pariah), converted by her husband to Muhammadanism".

It is submitted therefore that there was good reason for the distribution made in G.O. No. 707 Polt d/ 2.12.91

× slip A

5. As to the complaint about the non receipt of the bonuses, it will be noted that there must always be great risk in the matter of paying ~~pensions~~ commutations of pensions to purdah nashin women.

The P.C.S. states

(1) that the petitioner received her bonus in Col. Underwood's time, & that he (Col Stewart) had paid the girls theirs through their half brother Mahomed Ali in 1892

(2) that the complaint of the non-receipt of the bonus of the surviving daughter was made for the first time in April 1895

(3) that, since 1890 when Col. Underwood was censured in connection with certain irregularities in his office,

× slip E para 6 of 37/23-1-91

Col

Col ~~Waldon~~ Underwood + he (Col Stewart) had been particularly careful in observing every precautionary step for disposing of ~~pensions~~ bonuses payable to women who are Gosha.

(4) that Mahomed Ali had, when called upon to do so, returned the bonus, at first voluntarily, later under protest, alleging that he had already paid it to his step-mother towards defraying the expences of the girl's intended marriage.

(5) that he (Col. Stewart) had, after consulting the Govt Solicitor, refunded the money to Mahomed Ali, + had ~~informed~~ invited the petitioner [illegible] her daughter to establish their claims "in a proper court of justice".

+ slip

It is submitted that, although everything in this matter may not have been above board, Govt is not responsible; and that the memorialist may be informed that she has a legal remedy - and can have recourse to it if she so chooses.

C.W.
23.5.95

There can be no doubt, it is sure, that the three prayers under A above should be summarily rejected. As regards B the only course open appears to be to refer the petitioners to the law courts

CS
27.5.96

Ld 28/5/96

Petition from a Carnatic Stipendiary

H. E. the Governor

I agree.
A.S.H.
1.6.96

C 29/5
R 2/6.

[G. / 24.]
500—22-4-96.

Political DEPARTMENT.

Papers to be read in proceedings :—

Again G.O., dated 189 , No.
Again G.O., dated 189 , No.
Current No. 441 of 1896, dated 30/3, from Anwar-un-nisa Begam
" " 597 " 1896, " 1/5 , " The P.C.S.
" " " 189 , " , "

ORDER. No. 356, d 5th June 1896.

In her petition read above Anwar-un-nisa Begam, widow of Ghulam Husain, Khan Bahadur, prays ~~that~~

(i) that Govt. will grant her and her ~~two~~ ~~two~~ daughters a ~~further~~ share out of

(a) that portion of the stipend of her husband which lapsed in 1891,

or (b) ~~that~~ the lapsed portion of the stipend of Ghulam Murtuza, Khan Bahadur, the father of her husband

or (c) the stipend of Muhammad Ali her step-son

and (ii) that Government will issue order for the disbursement of the ~~two~~ bonuses granted to herself + her two daughters in 1892 which are alleged to have been ~~illegally~~ irregularly drawn by Muhammad Ali.

2. H.E. the Gr. in Council has received a report from the Paymaster Carnatic Stipends on the matter deal

with above and, after a perusal of
the same, sees no reason for acceding
to any of the requests made by the
petitioner. The claims under (i)
are altogether inadmissible and
as regards (ii) petitioner has her
remedy in the law-courts if
any ~~[illegible]~~ fraud has
been perpetrated

(From Orders)

CS.
2.6.96

4/6/96

Petitioner (with 2) } Desp 15/6/96
P.C.S. (ditto) } with orgl. enclos. retd.

[illegible]

Begum

CS
[illegible]

From Orders

CS
27.5.96

28/5/96

R 2/6.

---

en given for copying ______ }
hen copied ______ } 189 .
When examined ______ }
When signed ______ }

AD AGAIN G.O., No. DATED
189 .

CURRENT No.

ENCLOSURES TO C. 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.
P = Copy abstract only.
Q = Copy heading only.