[Roll 8]

500—15-4-98.

# Political (1898) Department.

ORDINARY MS.

G.O., No. 667

DATED 16-9-98.

INDEXED.

---

[Despatch Abstract.]

Stating that at the request of the [illegible] Yeswant Lele Rao Sahib, [illegible] Pensions, is inadmissible

## BACK PAPERS.

| G.O. | No. | Department. | Date. | G.O. | No. | Department. | Date. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | | | |

## FURTHER PAPERS.

| ~~G.O.~~ C.O | No. | Department. | Date. | G.O. | No. | Department. | Date. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1454/98 | | | | | | | |

# Political (1898) Department.

note

Entered in the Pet.s Regr.

M.O. written to pp 80.185 Ddd 16.3.96. 0 papers

SS 31/8/98

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS *CHIEF SECRETARY* 31. AUG. 1898

G.O. recd & file sent herewith

SS 5/9/98

**CURRENT No.** 1162

***Order***

***From***

H. A. Sim Esquire I.C.S.
Private Secretary to
H.E. the Governor

No.

***Dated*** 29th August 1898.

***Received***

***Registered***

***Enclosures*** "

***Spare copies*** "

## SUBJECT.

Transfers a petition dated 15th August 1898 from V. Ry Yeswanta Rao Sahib Raglay Rao Saheb of the Tanjore Palace, praying for an increase to his pension.

By order

Private Secretary.

## BACK PAPERS.

| G.O. | No. | Department | Date. |
|---|---|---|---|
| 172 | 7 3 98 | Mis | 705 5 12 57 8 |
| 530 | 17 8 97 | " | 332 4 10 56 |
| 185 | 16 3 96 | Mis | 17 22 11 55 |
| 582 | 3 7 | 55c | |
| 123/4 | 5 3 | 90 " | |
| 563 | 24 11 | 99 " | |
| 490 | 2 10 | 79 " | |
| 527 | 4 10 | 78 " | |
| 670 | 18 4 | 54 " | |

## FURTHER PAPERS.

| G.O. | No. | Department. | Date. |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | | |

[G. 25 A. 500—5-98.] c 15/9 a 16/9

Political DEPARTMENT.

C. No. 1162

SUBJECT.

Petition from Tanjore Pensioner Yeswanta Ingle Rao Sahib.

---

## FOR ORDERS.

M.S. Thuraiv.

vide Para.13 of G.O.705,Pol.,dated 5th December 1859. ... H

Vide Letter ~~G.O.~~ No.527,Pol.,d/4-10-78 III

The principles governing the assignment and continuance of pensions to members of the family of the late Raja of Tanjore who died in 1856 and to his relations are generally, that no person of the Raja's family be placed in a worse condition, so far as stipend can secure this, than heretofore - that the pensions to the chief members of the family only shall be heritable -that in case of a man, they may pass on for two generations, a moiety lapsing on each succession; in the case of a woman they are to descend with a like reduction for one generation only. The case of relations not nearly allied to the Raja was considered to be fully met by a life grant.

8. The grand-mother of the present petitioner was Sakavara Bai Ammani Raja Saheb. She was the sister of the Raja Sivaji and daughter of the Rani Dowager of Tanjore, Ahulya Baiy Ayu Saheba; and was in receipt o

pension of Rs.281-10-8 granted her in 1859. In 1877 she petitioned Govt. for an increase to this pension and claimed also a moiety of her mother's stipend (Rs.1400 per mensem) with arrears from the date of Ahulya Baiyi's death, amounting to more than a lakh of rupees. Govt. then granted her a moiety of her mother's pension in addition to her own so that she would have received Rs.700+281-10-8 =Rs.981-10-8 a month.-Her debts were alleged to amount to a lakh [vide para. 3 of Mr.Webster's letter dated 7th September 1878 on page 3 of G.O.490 Pol., dated 2nd October 1879] Subsequently, however, the Govt.of India questioned this arrangement and sanctioned instead of the pension of Rs.700 a lump sum of Rs.30,000 and a monthly pension of Rs.350 "which was obviously merely a personal and life allowance".

3. On Sukavara Baiyi's death in 1889 the Govt. Agent,Tanjore, recommended on the strength of paras. 13 to 15 of G.O. 705,Pol.,dated 5th December 1859, the continuation of the moiety of her stipend of Rs. 281-10-8 to her son Pratapa Rudra Manai Ingle Rao Sahib, who was then drawing a pension of Rs.260 granted him in 1859. The Agent pointed out that the case was analogous to that recorded in G.O. 239,Pol., dated 24-7-62, in which a moiety of his mother's pension was conferred upon Manappa Mohite, a son of another sister of the late Raja, and who held at time a separate pension. The Govt.

Para.2 of G.O.195,Pol.,d/20-4-89 printed on p 1980 123/5/3/90 → before A

vide Paras. 7 & 9 of ~~G.O.~~ letter No.587,Pol., dated 4-10-78. III

The sanctioning G.O. was G.O. No 160 Pol d/13.3.78 vide para 2 of G.O. 563 Pol d/24.11.79 --- II which cancelled it.

G.O.563,Pol.,d/ 24-11-79. II

Para.3 of G.O.195,Pol., d/ 30-4-89. (original of VII) before A

× vide the Agents letter printed on page 1980 123 Pol d/5.3.90 --- A the original is on page 195 of flagged VII

× vide para 3 of G.O. 195/20/4/89 printed on page 1980 123 Pol d/5.3.90 original flagged VII

Para 4 of G.O. 195 Pol 20/4/89 before A

para 5 of G.O.195,Pol.,d/20-4-89. before A original flagged... VII

Para 4 of G.O. 123/4 Pol. 5.3.90 A XV

× Vide Letter No. 641 Pol. G. 28.10.91.

G.O.336,Pol.,d/ 27-5-92. VI

× G.O.332,Pol.,dated 22-9-94. printed on page 2 of G.O. 582 Pol d/ 3.9.95 --- B

however remarked that its order regarding Mannappa Mohite was 16 years later declared to be a "mistake" by the Govt. of India which observed that the principle of conceding a full moiety of the pension of any stipendiary to his, or her, heirs, if they also received separate pensions, ~~secured~~ seemed quite contrary to the instructions conveyed in its letter No.4644, dated 8th September 1856. This Govt. therefore declined to continue any portion of his mother's stipend to Pratapa Rudra Manai Ingle Rao Sahib.

4. Against this decision he appealed. The appeal was rejected by this Govt. [G.O.631,Pol.,d/ 2-12-89] and by the Govt. of India [vide G.O.393, Pol., d/8-8-90] He then went up to the Secretary× of State who on a consideration of all the circumstances of the case was of opinion that, as in the case of the mother, some concession× should be made, and who accordingly sanctioned a life grant of Rs.100 per mensem to Pratapa Rudra Sahib ~~his~~.

5. When Pratapa Rudra Sahib died in 1893 Govt. sanctioned× the continuance of a moiety of his heritable pension of Rs.260 to his two sons, Ramachandra Ingle Rao Sahib and Yeswanta Ingle Rao Sahib, the former being nearly and the latter entirely blind. Each thus got Rs.65 per mensem. Of these, the elder Ramachandra Ingle Rao died in 1894 and a moiety of

(Rs.3[illegible]8) of his ~~pes~~ pension was continued to his heirs [vide G.O.582,Pol.,dated 3rd September 1895.]

XII

6. Yeswanta Ingle Rao Sahib, ~~s~~ the elder son of Pratapsinha Mana Ingle Rao Sahib, now represents that his grand-mother & father were drawing conjointly Rs.892 a month, and that this sum was placed entirely at his disposal as the managing member to meet the wants of the family; whereas he now has but Rs.65 a month.

Rs.281⅓ + 350 + 360 = integers Rs.892

He adds that the late Rani Kamakshi Bai kept him above want during her life time. He alleges that Govt. in 1878 sanctioned arrears of pension amounting to Rs.1,00,000 of which only Rs.30,000 was paid: that his grand mother's and father's debts have descended upon him: and that he would now be solvent had Govt. considered his case when he applied for a grant of Rs. 14,000.* He begs that Govt. will sanction an increase to his pension of Rs.65 "out of Rs.892 which has lapsed" and "the remaining sum of Rs.70,000 (of the unpaid arrears) or a liberal portion thereof."

* no such application traceable but please see G.O. 185 Pol. dy 16.3.96

7. Petitioner's statement that arrears amounting to Rs.1,00,000 was sanctioned in 1878 - is a mere allegation vide G.O. 563 Pol. dy 24.11.1879... II of this note and para. 2 supra. His name does not appear in the list submitted by the Govt. Agent in G.O. 172 Pol.,dated 7-3-98. His application for a money grant to enable him to marry his two daughters was rejected by Govt. in G.O.185 Pol.,dated 16th March 1896. Please see the notes without--

F

G

in that order.

8. Submitted that the petitioner may be told that his request is a inadmissible unless it is considered that para.2 of the G. Petition rules should be first given.

(I)

(II)

C.W.
9.9.98

C.B.

Submitted that suggestion (I) may be adopted. (II) will only cause further correspondence regarding a claim which is obviously inadmissible

C.B.
16/9/98

Please see draft below.

Yes
16/9/98.

(Rs.5/8) 95

Political Dept

C. No 1162

Order No. 667. dt 16th September 1898.

Petitioner's request is inadmissible

Cmdr.
16.9.98

16.9.98

Petitioner (thro the J. A. Tanjore) with petition original Gbc returned by the Govt. Agent

Dempsey
21-9-98.

21/9/98.

*When given for copying*_____
*When copied*_____ } 189 .
*When examined*_____
*When signed*_____

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

CURRENT No.

ENCLOSURES TO U. 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.