

BACK PAPERS.

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

FURTHER PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.	G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.
		C. no 1279 of 1900					

[Poll.]
7
500-29-7-06.

Political (189) Department.

CURRENT No. 1629

From Ghous-un-nisa Begum
her sons.
Rozapettah
Madras

Order

No.

Dated 12/12
Received 12/12 } 56
Registered 14/12
Enclosures 2
Spare copies.

SUBJECT.

Praying that a
moiety of the stipend drawn
by their late father-in-law
grandfather Quader Mohiuddin
Khan Bahadur may be
granted to them.

(19/12)
Given to me by the Sd/- for Papers
relating to the pensions of persons
listed in paras of the pet.

Sent to R.O. for papers 19/12
Papers sent to R.O. for papers 19/12
Papers sent to R.O. for papers 19/12

BACK PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.
842:	8.12.96		
698:	29.9.96		
654:	18.9.96		
R275:	10.8.96		
528:	14.8.96		
429:	6.7.96		
321:	23.5.96		
150:	6.5.94		
385:	22.6.92		

282 of 92
679 of 88


FURTHER PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

2

Soll. H. S. Stewart.

Paymaster, Carnatic Stipendiary
Chepak.



Most Honoured Sir,

That the humble petitioners, the daughter-in-law and the grandsons of the late Quader Mohideen Khan Bahadur humbly beg to bring into your honor's kind notice that the petitioner's father-in-law and the grandfather the late Quader Mohideen Khan Bahadur departed from this world on the 21st Instant at 10 P. M. and was buried on the 22nd Instant.

The said gentleman was maintaining the petitioners as the petitioners husband and father (the deceased son) Gholam Ghous Sahib was away from Madras from the last 6 years, and none knows even of his existence. The petitioners humbly beg to submit that they have lost their support and there is no body to look after them.

Consequently the humble petitioners beg humbly to request, considering your honor as a stay for them, that your honor would be kind enough to recommend Government to allow them a moderate pension to enable the petitioners to maintain themselves.

In which act of generosity the petitioners shall ever bound to pray for your honor's and your honor's family's health, wealth and prosperity.

Your honor's humble petitioners
Widow Mother Orphan Children
(1) Ghous-un-Nissa Begum
(2) Ghous Mohideen
(3) Ahmed Mohideen

Filed
30th November 1896.

Madras Paymaster
Peter's Road near
Lord Harris School.

No. 502 of 1896.

Paymaster's Office
Chepak 2nd December 1896.

Ghous-un-nisa Begum and others are informed that the Stipend which the late Qadir Muki-ud-din Khan Bahadur was in receipt of being returned as "moiety to widow" in the list of Continuable pensions in 1894, petitioners who allege themselves to be the wife and sons of a deserted son of the deceased have no claim for a continuation under regulations.


/ Signed / H. S. Stewart :

Colonel.
Paymaster's Office
Chepak.

To

Ghous-un-nisa Begum
+ 2 others.

/ Signed /
Messrs Gulam
Abbas.




To

CURRENT NO. 1629

His Excellency the Right Honourable
The Governor in Council.
Fort St. George.

In previous letter
from Ghous-un-nisa Begum
please see fo. 42698824-96
42986-7-96 + 322 of
23-5-96



The humble memorial of
Ghous-un-nisa Begum and
her sons, Ghous Mohieddeen
and Ahmed Mohieddeen.

Most respectfully sheweth,

That your memorialists petitioned the Paymaster
Carnatic Stipends on the 30th November last, the copy of which
and the reply thereto is most respectfully annexed for the
kind perusal of your Excellency in Council.

That the memorialists most respectfully urge
to point out, on grave authorities that the stipends of the late
Dadur Mohieddeen Khan Bahadur is continuable, the claim
being based on substantial grounds. The following are
some of them.

1. The stipends was continued to the great grandsons and
daughters of the late Nawab Azemood. Dewla Bahadur
(the 1st British Nawab of the Carnatic), namely to the grand-
sons of the late Dewla Bahadur, who was the son of the
aforesaid Nawab and also to the grandson of Ahmed
Begum and Rashidud Dewla Bahadur who were also the
children of the said Nawab.

That this being the case, your memorialists beg to say
that they having descended from Fatima Begum, one of
the daughters of the same Nawab, are entitled to get a moi-
ty of the stipend of their grandfather the late Dadur Mohied-
deen Khan Bahadur whose son Ghulam Mohamed Ghous
as will be seen from the accompanying petition to the Paymaster
has left them long ago and who is practically to them in the
light of a dead man.

2. (a) That stipends were continued to the widows, daughters
and daughters-in-law of the servants of the late Titula-
Nawab of the Carnatic, as will be shown by the following
namely, a sum of Rs 185/- per mensem was allowed to the
widow of Bukhari ul. Buluk Bahadur and also a sum

Rs 15/- per mensem was granted to the widowed daughter of the same gentleman.

(b) And also a sum of Rs 15/- per month was allowed for the maintenance of a widowed daughter-in-law of one Moulvi Sirazish Khan Bahadur out of his pay.

Your memorialists beg in conclusion, that your Excellency in Council taking the above facts into consideration would be kind enough to take pity upon them, as they are quite destitute of maintenance and would be glad to continue to them a moiety of the stipends drawn by their father in law and grand father The late Quader Mohiuddin Khan Bahadur.

For which act of charity they shall as in duty bound ever pray.

Your Excellency's humble memorial
Widow mother & orphan children.

- (1) Ghous-un-Nissa Begum +
- (2) Ghous Mohiuddin +
- (3) Ahmed Mohiuddin.

Dated.
12 December
1896.

Muhammad Royapett.
Peter's Road near
Lord Harris School.

148 The Govt -

$$\left[\frac{G_1}{25} \right]$$

SUBJECT.

GARNATIC STIPENDIARIES

THE HON'BLE MR. GROSE, C.I.E.

FOR ORDERS.

N.B.--

A == Copy in
B == Not to be
P == Copy abstra
Q == Copy heading o

In the 1894 list the stipend of Qadir
 muhi-ud-din was shown correctly as
 moiety to widow-vide No. 13 on page 20
 of G.O. No. 150, d/ 6th March 1894. The
 petitioners have therefore no claim
 to any continuance of the stipend and
 it is ^{un}necessary to go ^{behind} beyond the deci-
 sion of 1885 as notified in the list
 of that year of which the petitioners
 must be well aware. The Paymaster
 apparently does not consider that their
 case is worthy of special consideration
 as he has summarily rejected a
 petition presented ~~by them~~ to him. As
 a recent case in support of their claim
 the petitioners quote that dealt with
 in G.O. No. 166, d/ 12th March 1894. A
 reference to the papers in that order
 will show that the grant to Ammat-ul
 Latif, daughter-in-law of Tirazish Khan,
 was sanctioned on the clear understand-
 ing that the concession was not a formal
 precedent. It seems unnecessary to
 trouble H.E. the Governor with this
 paper and it is proposed to say:--

ORDER N^o 44 of 16-1-97

The petitioners will be informed
 that Govt. declines to comply with their
 request.

*Chief
6.1.97*
 The Petitioners have no valid pro-
 claim. The precedent sent
 forward by them was one dealing
 specially with a particular
 case and it was distinctly laid
 down that it was not to be used
 as a precedent.

If it is considered that the order should
 be that the petitioners be not to be at liberty
 to be submitted that before descending finally with
 this petition the Government should be called upon to report

The Petitioners (q)

When given for copying 16/1
 When ~~examined~~
 When examined 3/15/1 } 1897.
 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.
 P == Copy abstract only.
 Q == Copy heading only.