

1897
Political (1897) Department.

ORDINARY MS.

G.O., No. 225

Dated 1-4-97

INDEXED.

[Despatch Abstract.]

Referring, with remarks, Fatima Bi, widow
of the late Asim Jung Bahadur, to the
orders already passed on the claim put
forward by her husband for some allow-
ance on account of an office he held
under the last name of the Carnatic

BACK PAPERS.

[Poll. 7]
1,000-25-11-96.

Political (189) Department.

CURRENT No.

FURTHER PAPERS.

From Jathma Bi

Widow of the late Assam
Lang Bahadur, Mif. Sag.
Master in the service of H.H.
the last Nawab of the
No. Carnatic.

Order No. 225 of 1-4-97

Petitioner will be
referred to the orders already
passed on the claim put
forward by her late husband
and informed that further
petitions on the subject will
not be noticed

Dated 20/3

Received 22/3

Registered 23/3

Enclosures

Spare copies

SUBJECT.

Praying that a
stipend of Rs 40 may be
given her ~~being~~ a moiety
of the allowance to her
husband was entitled in
virtue of the office he
held under the last
Nawab of the Carnatic.

Curb
29.3.97

28/3/97

Petitioner (21/3) des/20
P.C.B. (21/3) 7/4/97

Note This is the wife of the
petitioner in C. No. 297 (A)
She prays for a moiety of the
amount (Rs 80) to which her
late husband was alleged to be
entitled.

The claim is granted

29.3.97

an exact copy of
C. No. 297/97

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.
135-	1-3-97		836 6-2-87
Cuo 297/197	do	25/3/97	18759-287
Cuo 1688994	do	18/12/94	3595 22-5-88
" 1201954	do	10/9/94	
" 17696	do	11/1/96	
" 1607/96	do	72/12/96	
80188994	do	17-3-94	

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

Honorable H. L. Bliss,

1st Member in Council

*Chief Secretary
Government of Madras*

22 MAR 1897

*Minister of External Affairs
and
Military Paymaster in the Service of H. H.
the Late Nawab of Carnatic*

Most respectfully Shewell

That your petitioner's husband was the Paymaster
in the Bukhodgiri Department on a Salary of Rs 80 until the death of
the said Nawab

That after the death of the said Nawab the Government requested Dr Balfour the then Government Agent at Chhapra to submit a list showing the names of the Chief Officers and subordinate servants of the said Nawab for their favorable consideration, on receipt of such a order Dr Balfour intimated the same to the Dewan of the Durbar and requested the same him to submit the list, where upon the Dewan submitted a list of Chief Officers on 15 September 1857, in which your petitioner's husband's name was also returned as Chief Officer in charge the Head of his Department Called Military Paymaster's Office and 5th Seat in the Durbar around the Throne, but Dr Balfour excluded the name of your petitioner's husband from the revised list of Chief Officers which he submitted for approval of Government who inadvertently sanctioned as per Report

That the Dewan of the Durbar wrote to Dr. Balfour on 13th February 1858 in reply to Extract of Minutes of Consultation No. 93 dated 3rd February 1858 in which he says that Genl. Gekker's two - bands and 1000 - and - 1000 - should be granted full - service to 80 - and being the Chief Officers of the Nawab, but no other power taken by them - &c.

That subsequently your petitioner's husband submitted his claim to Mr. Balfour praying that it may be recommended to Government for their favorable consideration but he declined to do so without showing proper reasons.

That your petitioner begs to point out to your Honor that Mr. Balfour states in his endorsement dated 5 February 1857 that owing to your petitioner's husband having a service of 12 years on a salary of Rs 80 he cannot be considered as Chief Officer in respect to the same your petitioner begs to state that though her husband's salary was small but he was only head of his Department and the Outposts had nothing to do with the said Department, the limit of the service was not observed in granting full pension as alleged by the said Mr. Balfour in his said endorsement.

That after the death of the Dewan (petitioner's husband's father) your petitioner's husband was granted a pension of Rs 40 as a subordinate instead of Rs 80 as Chief Officer to which he was duly entitled under Rules and Examples.

That your petitioner begs to cite the following cases in support of her husband's claim who were first granted half rate of pension as granted to your petitioner's husband but subsequently they were admitted as Chief Officers and full pensions were granted to them viz. Mottharmin - ud - Dowlah, Sakfaraz - ud - Dowlah, Gousaf Ally Khan Syed Hakeemulla Khan, Amin - ud - Dowlah, Rajah Sewan Doff, Sherazisin Khan Bahadur Bahadur Baig Jamadar and Mohamed Karamulla Subadar though the latter two held for less rank by your petitioner's husband.

Further your petitioner begs to submit that Shittasham - ud - Dowlah one of the two for whom the Dewan of the Durbar as Mr. Balfour in his aforesaid letter dated 13 February 1858 is he treated as Chief Officer and who had 9th Seat in the Durbar was granted full pension by Extract Minutes of Consultation No 379 dated 14 June 1857.

Polkeah and the other your petitioner's husband whose mention was made in the said letter and who had the 5th Seat in the Durbar is deprived of his due right for full pension of Rs 80.

That your petitioner's husband submitted several petitions to the Government but the liberal Government unfortunately did not cast a sight on the same up to his death on 2nd March 1897.

Under the aforesaid circumstances your petitioner requests your Honor will be graciously pleased to refer her above petition to the Paymaster of the Carnatic accounts and verify her above statement and if found correct your Honor will continue a stipend of Rs 40 by your petitioner being a widow of Rs 80 to which your petitioner's husband was duly entitled as the Chief Officer of the last Nawab Simin - ud - Dowlah and cases cited in Para 7 of this petition in support of her claim, and your petitioner begs to support a large family of 20 souls.

And for which act of Charity and benevolence your petitioner will be as in duty bound.

I shall Ever pray

O
Signature


Madam Begum
Mowbrays Road
21st March 1897

Political (1897) Department.

CURRENT No.

Curr
24
f.O. No. 225 PM 8 1.4.97 - disposal on
C. No. 401/97 - was available
only today. The present file
is an exact copy of the one disposed
of by that f.O.
H. 5/4/97
Order

From *H. A. Sim et al*
Appellate Secretary
to the Governor.



Dated 25th March '97

Received

Registered

Enclosures

Spare copies

SUBJECT.

*Transfers a petition of 20th March
1897 from Hathura Bai, widow of
the late Vallim Jung Bahadur,
praying that half of her late
husband's pension of Rs 80,
may be allowed to her.*

(1897 order)

H. A. Sim

Appellate Secretary

BACK PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.
	401	197	25/1/07
	186	22-3-97	
	135	1-3-97	
	357	2-5-85	

FURTHER PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

His Excellency the Right Honorable

The Governor,
Fort St. George

The humble petition of Patma Bai
widow of the late Cassim Jung Bahadur
Military Paymaster in the service of
H. H. the Late Nawab of Carnatic

Most respectfully sheweth

That your petitioner's husband was the Paymaster
in the Bukhagiri Department on a salary of Rs 8000 until the death
of the said Nawab

That after the death of the said Nawab the Government requested
Mr Balfour the then Government Agent at Chhapra to sub-
mit a list showing the names of the Chief Officers and Subordinate
servants of the said Nawab for their favorable consideration, on
receipt of such an order Mr Balfour intimated the same to the
Dewan of the Durbar and requested him to submit the list where-
upon the Dewan submitted a list of Chief Officers on 15 September
1857 in which your petitioner's husband's name was also returned
as Chief Officer he being the head of his Department called Military
Paymaster's Office and 5th Seat in the Durbar around the Throne but
Mr Balfour the said Government Agent excluded the name of your
petitioner's husband from the revised list of Chief Officers which he
submitted for approval of Government who inadvertently sanc-
tioned as per Report

That the Dewan of the Durbar wrote to Mr Balfour on
15 January 1858 in reply to his letter of 15 September 1857

dated 3rd February 1858 in which he says that your petitioner's two
-hand and Shethacham - ud - Dowlah should be granted full pension
of Rs 80 they being the Chief Officers of the Nawab, but no steps were taken
by that Officer

That subsequently your petitioner's husband submitted
his claim to Dr Balfour praying that it may be recommended to
Government for their favorable consideration, but he declined to do so
without showing any proper reason

That your petitioner begs to point out to your Excellency
that Dr Balfour states in his endorsement dated 5th February 1857 that
owing to your petitioner's husband having a service of 12 years on a salary
of Rs 80 he cannot be considered to be Chief Officer in reply to the same your
petitioner begs to state that though her husband's salary was small
but he was only head of his Department and the Britishers had nothing
to do with the said Department, the limit of the service was not observed in
in granting full pension as alleged by the said Dr Balfour in his said reply

That after the death of the Dewan (petitioner husband's father)
your petitioner's husband was granted a pension of Rs 40 as a Subordinate
instead of Rs 80 as Chief Officer to which he was duly entitled under Rules

That your petitioner begs to cite the following cases in
support of her husband's claim who were first granted half rate of pension
as granted to your petitioner's husband but subsequently they were
admitted as Chief Officers and full pensions were granted to them
viz. Mookthamm - ud - Dowlah, Sahyuraz - ud - Dowlah, Gousuf
ally Khan, Abd Wahidulla Khan, Jinn - ud - Dowlah, Razia
Lawar Doff, Sherazish Khan Bahadur Bahadur Bazar Jannar
- dar and Mohamed Karamulla Subadar though the latter two
held for less rank than your petitioner's husband

Further your petitioner begs to submit that Ikh
- sham - ud - Dowlah one of the two for whom the Dewan of the Durbar as Dr
Balfour in his aforesaid letter dated 13th February 1858 to be treated as
Chief Officers and who had the 9th Seat in the Durbar was granted full
pension by Extract Minutes of Consultation No. 379 dated 14th June 1858
'Collocat' and the other your petitioner's husband whose mention was
made in the said letter and who had the 5th Seat in the said Durbar
is deprived of his due right for full pension of Rs 80

That your petitioner's husband submitted several pi
- etions to the Government but the liberal Government unfortunately
did not last a right on the same up to his death on 2nd March 1897

Under the aforesaid circumstances your petitioner
request your Lordship will be graciously pleased to refer her peti
- tions to the Paymaster of the Carnatic stipends and verify her in
above statement and if found correct your Lordship will continue
a stipend of Rs 40 to your petitioner being a moiety of Rs 80 to which
your petitioner's husband is duly entitled as the Chief Officer of the
last Nawab similar to Shethacham - ud - Dowlah and the cases
cited in Para 7 of this petition in support of her claim and your peti
- tioner have to support a large family of 20 souls

And for which act of Charity and benevolence
your petitioner will be as in duty bound

I shall Ever Pray

Madras. Royapettha
Mowbray Road
20th March 1897

21/3/97
S. S. S. S.

Then given for copying
Then copied 5/14
When examined 6/18
When signed

189

READ AGAIN G.O., No.
189

DATED

QUERENT No.

ENCLOSURES TO O. No

ORDER OF GOVERNMENT

A A A A A A A

LETTER OF GOVERNMENT

STATEMENT WITH DITTO

PAPERS NOT FILED UP, BRING MEANT FOR DESPATCH
IN ORIGINAL

N.B.—

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