Political (1897) Department.

ORDINARY MS.

G.O., No. 325

Dated 18-5-97

W3/5147

[Despatch Abstract.]

Informing Ahmad Hasan, late of Lucknow, of the ceased Carnatic stipendiary, that no further representation from him will be considered in the subject of the grant of a pension

I 20/5/97

BACK PAPERS.

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

FURTHER PAPERS.

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

Poll. 7]
1,000—25-11-96.

Political (189) Department.

Ry

This paper has not been flagged at all. Read thro' the petition & mark the references

Refers marked & papers flagged 31.3.97

Cwd 30.3.97

CURRENT No.

From Ahmad Hussain
Son of the late Ghulam Sayyid Husain Khan

No.

Order Mr. Commr. Put up a note please on this case & fresh ticket

Cwd 1.4.97

Dated 28/3
Received 28/3
Registered 28/3
} 97

Enclosures -
Spare copies -

SUBJECT.

Praying that he may be given a month's stipend

The petitioner alleges three reasons in support of his claim to a stipend:-

1. His father drew a stipend
2. A first cousin of his with no better claims than himself draws one, and
3. His shadi step-brother has also been recently granted a stipend.

As to the first of these: his father was a stipendholder of the stipend of 6th in descent from Nawab Walajah; consequently on his death the whole stipend lapsed.

Secondly, the reasons for continuing the stipend to the petitioner's cousins, who like himself are children of stipendholders, in a letter was explained to the Govt of India and

and accepted by them.

The third reason, ~~is by~~ does not support the petitioner's his claim for, as he himself states, the pension drawn by his Shadi step-mother had nothing to do with the present one.

The petitioner has already once been informed that ~~no~~ further petitions from him will not be attended to and a subsequent petition from him has been lodged E

A This is true enough but but where is C. No. 342? This will show why the Step brother was granted ~~something~~ a continuation from his mother's stipend. It was doubtless because the pension of the Shadi widow was treated as continuable whilst those of the Nikahi widows were life grants

Cus
5. 4. 97

C. No 342 was available only just now.

The step-mother, Amat-ul-Kadiga, draws a stipend of Rs 15 in her own right as grand-daughter of ~~the original grantee~~ Afsar-ul-Nisa Begum Saif-ul-mulk

Her stipend is returned as continuable

~~M~~ E to Go 359 Pol dy 22-5-'85.

M. 7-4-97

BACK PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.
562	23.8.95	Cus	342/97
Cus 1289/91	Lodged 4.11.91		
633	24.10.91	728	10.10.85
461	24.7.91	359	22.5.85
618	13.9.88	184	17.3.85
551-2	13.8.88	756	30.1.82
926	9.12.87	1202	10.12.81
		205	13.5.80
Sme 2.6.20		461	389: 19.7.78
			566: 10.77
			99: 9.3.74

FURTHER PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

Sirdars Lungs' Garden
Royapettah
Madras.
23rd March 1897.

To
His Excellency the Governer of Madras in Council
Fort St. George

The humble petition of Ahmad Husain son of the late Ghulam Sujjad Husain Khan

CHIEF SECRETARY'S
28 MAR 1897
GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS

humbly sheweth,

That petitioner's father the said Ghulam Sujjad Husain Khan and his brother, the petitioners uncle the late Ghulam Raza Husain Khan were each in receipt of a Govt. Stipend of Rs 75 per month M. allowed to them from the pension of their deceased mother.

That on the death of the said Ghulam Sujjad Husain Khan, his two sons (viz) the petitioner and his half brother Muhamed N. Murtiza Husain were deprived of the right to receive any sum whatever from the stipend of the right of their deceased father. Even Amatul Khadija Begum the shadi wife of the deceased was given nothing simply because she was already in receipt of a government pension of Rs 15 from another source. But Government was pleased to N sanction stipend of only Rs 5 each to each

of the two Nikha wives of the deceased Gentleman one of whome Latifa Begam was the pensioner's mother. Thus out of a sum of Rs 75 the stipend of the pensioner father only Rs 10 were distributed between two of his wives the sons having received nothing. Great was the disappointt of the petitioner, when on the death of his mother the said Latifa Khanum who was in receipt of a stipend of Rs 5 he was deprived of his right to receive his share from this source also.

That the petitioner begs permission to cite at least one instance within the Carnatic family itself which he think very serviceably supports the justness of his case. Ghulam Mohiddin Ahmad Khan the grand son of Nabab Wallah jah was in receipt of a stipend of Rs 50 and odds conferd on him from the pension of his deceased father Hafiz Mohiddin Ahmad Khan as the said Ghulam Mohamed Ahmad Khan has left a very large family the distribution from his stipend was conferred to his three (3) widows (his Nikha wives) each of whom received a sum of Rs 7. But on the death of one of the three widows her son Mohomed Ali saheb was entitled to be in receipt of the whole sum of Rs 7. The amount of his mothers stipend which he is still drawing more than this the pensioner can find his way to another instance in his own family

which bears a close parallel to the case just mentioned on the death of petitioners uncle the said Ghulam Raza Hussain Khan who was like his brother the petitioner father in receipt of a monthly stipends of Rs 75 two-third of this amount Rs 50 was distributed among his family members the discendants of his Nikha wife. Later on Govt was pleased to entitle my cousin the son of the said late Ghulam Raza Hussain Khan to be in receipt of that whole amount of Rs 50 which he is drawing to this day

That the petitioner was being maintained by his step mother the said Amatul Khadija Begum out of her stipend of Rs 15 which she was drawing from another source perfectly unconnected with the stipend in question But on the death of this lady which took place on the 12th February last her son the said Mohamed Murtuza Hussain was recommended by the Pay Master Carnatic stipends to be allowed a monthly sum of Rs ten (10) while the petitioner lost the only source of his maintenance by the occurrence of the lamentable event.

That in conclusion the petitioner begs to state that while his half-brother the said mohomed Murtuza Hussain has been at-last recommended

to draw a sum of Rs 10 from the stipend of his deceased mother the petitioner has been left in utter disappointment and poverty: his right neglected and his claims suppressed for he has received nothing either from the stipend of his deceased father or from that of his mother or from that of his step-mother who maintained him till her death it is with the humblest feelings that the petitioner puts forward his three fold right and begs to draw the attention of the just and benevolent Government to the consideration of the strange circumstances by which the descendant of one brother has come to draw a stipend of Rs 5 while that of the other has been deprived of his rights equally just and strong to perish in helplessness and poverty.

That the petitioner hopes that his case will be duly considered and justice done to his cause for which he shall ever feel grateful to the benevolent government.

Your Excellency's
Most Humble Petitioner
احمد حسین
(S.d). Ahmad Husain

1th from Ahmad Husain deceased Carnatic Stipendiary.

Ist. Ltr. Governor

Nawab Wallajah
↓
Saif-ul-mulk(original 1801 stipend)
↓
Hissam-ud-daulah
↓
Hiddayat-un-nisa Begam
↓
Sujjad Husain Khan

G.O.No.99 Pol.d/9-3-74. N

G.O.No. 551-2,Pol.d/13"August 88 C

C 26/4/97
R 17/5/97

his family, Hafiz Ghulam Muhi-ud-d...

Political Depart... receipt

[redacted]

C.No.406

F O R O R D E R S

Petitioner, Ahmad Husain is a nikahi son of deceased Carnatic Stipendiary Sujjad Husain Khan. The descent of the latter from the Nawab Wallajah is shown in the margin. On the death of Hidayat un-nisa Begam in 1820, Sujjad Husain was granted a stipend of Rs.75 per mensem. Being the fourth holder, the stipend of Sujjad Husain was on his death in 1871 treated as having lapsed. His two nikahi widows, one of whom was Latifa Khanam the mother of the present petitioner, were, however, in view of their distressed circumstances, subsequently granted compassionate life allowances of Rs.5 each per mensem.

2. Ahmed Husain, ~~on the death of his~~ at the time of the passing of this order father in 1871, petitioned Government for an allowance but his claim was rejected.

3. In 1888, Ahmed Husain, with his step-brother, Muhammad Murtuza Husain, appealed to the Government of India, pointing out that allowances had been granted to families of cousins of their father (i.e. children of fourth holders) and had been promised to the children of their uncle Raza Husain. The Madras Government, in forwarding the memorial to the Government of India, stated that it was not disposed to draw the former cases into a precedent. The promise to continue Raza Husain's stipend in the 1885 lists was, it was pointed out, based on

...siderations which did not exist in
...memorialist's case; ... at the ti
...me those lists were published,
...ujjad Husain had been dead for more
...han thirteen whilst nearly eleven years
...ad lapsed since the Madras Government h
...ad rejected the claim of Ahmad Husian
...Husain, the present petitioner, and had
...decided to limit their bounty to the
...grant of compassionate allowances to the
...widows of Sujjad Husain. The Government
...of India declined to interfere (G.O.No.
...618 Political, dated 15th September 1888)
...in the file, but please see
...of the Book of G.O.'s, Political,
...dated the October 1891.

4 Murtuza Husain and Ahmed Husain again petitioned the Madras Government in October and November 1891; they were first told that further petitions would not be noticed and their subsequent petition was lodged.

5. In the present petition Ahmed Husain repeats to a great extent the grounds put forward in his previous petitions for the grant of an allowance and, in addition to the case of Raza Husain (his uncle's) stipend, cites two further cases in support of his claims.

6. The first of these is that of Muhammad Ali, son of Hafiz Ghulam Muhi-ud-din Ahmed Khan, a son of Hafiz Husain Ali Khan, a nikahi son of the Nawab Wallajah. Hafiz Husain Ali was, at the time of the 1801 settlement of Carnatic stipends, allotted a pension of Rs.10,000. He died before the grant was finally settled and a moiety of Rs 10,000 was assigned to his

G.O.No. 633 Pol.d/24" October 91. D
C.No.1289 of 91. E

G.O. No. 389 Pol. of 19th July 1878. G

G.O.389 Pol.d/ 19th July 1878. G

B

No 37 on page 2 B
G.O.No.359 Pol.d/22nd May 1885. A

Ahmad, father of Muhammad Ali, receiving Rs.5 - 9 - 0 as his share. On the death of Hafiz Ghulam Muhi-ud-din Ahmad in 1851, a sum of Rs.21 was continued to his three widows for their support and that of their eight children, this distribution being adopted in consequence of the large number of persons who were entitled to share in the moiety. In 1878, Muhammad Ali was the only survivor with a claim to a share in the moiety and, in view of the facts that the cause which necessitated the unusual distribution of the moiety of the stipend of Hafiz Ghulam Muhi-ud-din Ahmad in 1851 no longer existed, that the stipend of one of the widows had fallen in in 1861, and that Hafiz Ghulam Muhi-ud-din Ahmad, although he nominally derived his stipend as a share of one previously in existence was actually the first holder and therefore the original stipendiary, and the lapsed stipend of the deceased widow (Rs 7) was renewed in favour of Muhammad Ali. Petitioner's standing does not entitle him to similar treatment.

7. The second case cited by the petitioner is that of his own step-brother, Muhammad Murtuza, who in G.O.No.221, Political, dated 31st March 1897, was granted a stipend of Rs.10 out of that of his deceased mother Ammat-ul-Khadija Begam. As petitioner himself states, this stipend had no connection with that granted to his father, Ammat-ul Khadija Begam drew her stipend, not as a widow of petitioner's father Sujjad Husain, but independently as a great-grand daughter of

...e Chairman-Bulk. This precedent can-
...t, it is submitted, be quoted in
support of the petitioner.

8 There are, it is submitted, no
grounds for reopening the petioner's
case and the following order is submitted
for approval.

ORDER No. 325 & 18th May 1897
Secl

The Government has considered the
cases quoted by petitioner in support
of his claim but ~~does not consider~~ is of opinion that
~~they should alter~~ should stand the orders already
passed. The petition will be rejected
and the petitioner informed that further
~~representations~~ on this subject will not be
noticed.

Lo
23/4/97.

Chs
23/4/97

Petitioner (9) Lo 24/5/97

2.9.K
16.5.97

When given for copying 20
When copied 20 / 5
When examined 21 } 189 7
When signed

READ 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 ... ORIGINAL.								

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