

Political (1898) Department.

ORDINARY MS.

G.O., No. 821

DATED 20 - 11 - 98

INDEXED.

[Despatch Abstract.]

Informing Karim Mukhi-ud-din
grandson of the late Taghi-ud-din Khan
Bahadur, that his requests are inadmissible
& that the Govt declines to reconsider
the question of his pension.

T
30/11/98

BACK PAPERS.

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

FURTHER PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.	G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.
<i>104/99 - 82</i> <i>25/98</i>							
<i>560/98 = 139</i> <i>6.5.99</i>							
<i>1619/99.</i>							

[Poll. 7]
500-11-6-97.

12550 of 1898

Political (1898) Department.

CURRENT No. 1303

REC'D. 28-10-98.

1898

18.4.98

From

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

No.

~~Order~~

Endorsement:-No. 2256, dated 26-10-98.

Referred to the Paymaster,
Carnatic Stipends for report.

(By order)

A. Edington
Ag. Asst. Secretary.

Dated

6th

Received

8th

Registered

October 1898.

Enclosures

4

Spare copies

SUBJECT.

Transferring a petition dated 17th
June 1898 from Karim-ud-din, Mirsaib-
pettah, Madras, praying for the restora-
tion of his hereditary Jaghir, &c.

(By order)

(Signed) H. A. Sim,

Private Secretary.

To be returned with reply

26/98

12

BACK PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

FURTHER PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

To,

His Excellency the Right Honourable,

Sir Arthur Elibank Havelock G.C.M.G.G.C.I.E.,

Governor-in-Council,

Fort St. George,
Madras.

The humble petition of Karim-ud-din, Grandson of Muhammad Takhi-ud-din Khan Muzuffir-ud Dowlah Zabith Jung Bahadur, immediate grandson of the late Nawab Muhammad Ali Khan Wallajah.

Most Respectfully sheweth,

That in approaching Your Excellency with this memorial, Your Excellency's petitioner does so with the most humble apologies for this intrusion on Your Excellency's most valuable time and attention, but as petitioner's case is a most lamentable one he has no other resource than to throw himself on Your Excellency's mercy.

2. That H.H. the late Nawab Wallajah granted jaghirs in the Carnatic territory to several members of his family for being enjoyed by them in perpetuity. The Jaghirs of Chakrajpur, Shatur, Aliur and Katri were given to Rabia Begum Sahiba who was petitioner's great grandmother who, in her turn, distributed them amongst her four sons one of whom was Muhammad Takhi-ud-din Khan, petitioner's grandfather to whose lot fell the jaghir of Chakrajpur the annual Revenue of which amounted to 2484 pagodas and 6 annas. The other three jaghirs viz: Shatur, Aliur and Katri which were given by the aforesaid Begum to her three other sons respectively were withheld under the following circumstances by Nawab Umdat-ul Umrah, as was stated to Your Excellency's petitioner by his grandfather the said Muhammad Takhi-ud-din Khan i.e. when Muhammad Takhi-ud-din Khan was deputed to Vengo as Talukdar during the reign of Nawab Umdat-ul Umrah, the said Nawab being displeased with the other three sons of the said Begum in the case of the marriage of Tajiddin Khan Bahadur who was one of her four sons, withheld their jaghirs respectively, but after the marriage was over when the aforesaid withheld jaghirs were about to be restored the Nawab died and consequently those jaghirs remained unrestored.

3. That after the resumption of the state of the Carnatic by the late East India Company in 1801 all the descendants of Nawab Wallajah who held Jaghirs as well as other Jaghirdars became the subjects of the said

said Company, and, in accordance with the principle that no Sovereign encroaches upon the landed property of his subjects, the late East India Company continued in the names of their trustees the several jaghirs granted by the late Nawab Wallajah as endowments to mosques and other religious institutions, inasmuch as even to this day the descendants of the said trustees are in the enjoyment of the said endowments. Accordingly had the late East India Company likewise allowed the jaghirs granted by Nawab Wallajah to the several members of his family for being enjoyed by them in perpetuity to continue to the respective Jaghirdars and to pass uninterruptedly from generation to generation it would have been nothing but fair and just. But on the contrary, notwithstanding the descendants of the late Nawab Wallajah were its subjects, the Company resumed their perpetual jaghirs in contradiction to the usual royal principle and granted allowances to them in lieu thereof out of the incomes of the said jaghirs.

4. That under the above arrangement a monthly stipend of Rs. 416-10-6 was given to Your Excellency's petitioner's great grandmother the said Rabia Begum Sahiba. *vide Chit. Minute 9/29.9.1801 C*

5. That Your Excellency's petitioner most submissively but regretfully begs to state that the above mentioned allowance of Rs. 416-10-6 having undergone lapses from time to time now leaves a balance of Rs. 12-8-0 only. Here Your Excellency's petitioner begs to submit that the allowance fixed in lieu of a perpetual jaghir out of its income ought to have been in justice perpetual so long as the jaghir existed and its revenue collected and should have been remained intact without being reduced from time to time and eventually lapsed. Moreover an allowance settled under the circumstances detailed above cannot be considered a royal grant inasmuch as it was fixed for maintenance in lieu of a jaghir which was given to be held and enjoyed in perpetuity. Even granting that it was a royal grant it is not entitled to lapse, as history makes no mention of any instance of a Sovereign withholding the grant of any of his subjects for no fault whatever.

6. That after the resumption by the late East India Company of the ancestral and perpetual jaghir of his grandfather the said Muhammad Takhi-ud-din Khan, Your Excellency's petitioner's said grandfather presented the sannad (certificate) and other titles of his jaghir with great care and, a year before his death, handed them over to Your Excellency's

petitioner

petitioner in preference to his sons and other grandsons more advanced in years than Your Excellency's petitioner remarking as follows:-

"After the resumption by the East India Company of the jaghir granted by Nawab Wallajah to his decendants conferring allowances in lieu thereof, almost all the other decendants having had no hope of the recovery of their jaghirs did not care to preserve the sannads granted and them lost them and their generation therefore have been deprived of submitting their claims for their respective jaghirs. On the other hand I have preserved my sannad to the jaghir very carefully and now deliver it over to you particularly and advise you to be very careful with it that it may be of use to you and to your decendants in future. If you submit its copy to any just Governor, he, provided he takes into consideration the fact that when a foreign Sovereign conquers a country he does not confiscate or resume the property of the subjects it being repugnant to law and justice, will no doubt render you justice and you will obtain your rights".

7. That no one except Your Excellency's petitioner can now claim to be the rightful heir to the said jaghir of his grandfather Muhammad Takhi-ud-din Khan.

8. That in 1858, when India passed to the Crown from the sway of the East India Company, although it was a lapse of nearly 58 years after the resumption of the Carnatic by the East India Company, a Royal Proclamation dated 1st November of that year was issued by Our Gracious Majesty the Queen assuring amongst other things that the rights and privileges of the people of India (Her Majesty's subjects) will be duly respected. Your Excellency's petitioner respectfully begs to submit for the due consideration of Your Excellency that a shorter period up to date has elapsed from the date of the Royal Proclamation than that of 58 years from the date of the resumption of the Carnatic in 1801 to the date of Proclamation and consequently Your Excellency's petitioner's claim cannot be considered barred by limitation in the face of Her Gracious Majesty's Proclamation.

9. That as advised by his grandfather the said Muhammad Takhi-ud-din Khan who had directed Your Excellency's petitioner during his life-time to lay his humble claim before the Government of Madras together with the sannad of the jaghir handed over by him when a just and considerate

Governor happens to come to this country and the Lord Almighty having through His infinite grace helped us with a just and benevolent ruler in the person of Your Excellency, Petitioner has humbly taken the liberty of addressing this memorial enclosing translation of the said sannad with full confidence of getting redress at Your Excellency's hands.

10. That Your Excellency's petitioner respectfully begs to submit the following two claims for Your Excellency's favourable consideration!

(1) Out of the original grant of Rs.416-10-6 which was issued in the name of his great grandmother Rabia Begum Sahiba in lieu of her jaghir, Your Excellency's petitioner gets a pension of Rs.9-8-0 which is a portion of the existing balance of Rs.12-8-0 as narrated above and the remainder i.e. Rs.404-2-6 have lapsed to Government.

(2) Your Excellency's petitioner's great grandfather Nizam-uddin Ahmad Khan Bahadur was in receipt of an allowance of Rs.77 per mensem which lapsed entirely on his demise.

and craves Your Excellency will be pleased to continue to Your Excellency's petitioner the above two lapsed pensions aggregating to Rs.481-2-6 as the Government were pleased several years after the death of Abdul Hamid Khan Bahadur, brother of petitioner's great grandmother Rabia Begum Sahiba, to continue in the name of his son Turab Ali Khan Bahadur the lapsed portion of the pension of the said Abdul Hamid Khan Bahadur, adding to the said lapsed portion a small sum out of Government funds in the time of the then Government Agent Dr. Balfour, although the said Turab Ali Khan Bahadur had no ~~several~~ ^{Sunnad} of jaghir in his possession; whereas Your Excellency's petitioner who is the grandson of Rabia Begum Sahiba sister of the said Abdul Hamid Khan Bahadur and who holds the sannad of her jaghir is in every respect entitled to her lapsed pension.

11. That Your Excellency's petitioner further begs to assure Your Excellency in Council that no existing member of the Carnatic family is able to establish his claim on documentary evidence or authority excepting petitioner who has the original sannad of the jaghir granted to his great grandmother having received it from his grandfather Muhammad Takhi-uddin Khan Bahadur, and if any such claimant does come forward Your Excellency's petitioner promises to forfeit his claim.

12. That Your Excellency's humble petitioner has a large family to support

support. His stipend of Rs. 2-8-0 is quite inadequate to maintain him and his family even on the poorest scale of living. He has no other source of income or property excepting a house No. 13 situated on the Triplicane High Road. On account of adverse circumstances it was mortgaged to one Fazilan Bi, wife of one Abdul Karim. The period for which it was mortgaged is to expire shortly when it will be disposed of by auction sale, after which Your Excellency's petitioner and his family will be reduced to such straitened circumstances that they will have no place of shelter whatever.

13. That under the foregoing circumstances petitioner craves your benevolent and humane Excellency in Council to take his forlorn condition into consideration and to continue ⁱⁿ his name the full amount of the lapsed stipend of his great grandmother Rabia Begum Sahiba and his late great grandfather Nizamuddin Ahmad Khan Bahadur aggregating to Rs. 481-2-6 per month as shown above.

For this act of Justice and benevolence petitioner, as in duty bound will ever pray.

*For Excellency's humble
petitioner
9/24th March 1898
Excellency's obedient servant*

*For Excellency's humble
petitioner
Excellency's obedient servant*

To

His Excellency the Right Honourable,
Sir Arthur Elibank Havelock G.C.M.G.C.I.F.,
Governor-in-Council,
Madras.

The humble petition of Karim-ud-din, grand
son of Muhammad Talhi-ud-din Khan Muzufir-ud
Dowlah Zabith Jung Bahadur, immediate grandson
of the late Muhammad Ali Khan Wallajah.

Most Respectfully Sheweth,

That, in accordance with Proceedings
of Government Pol. Departt. No. P 117 dated 22nd April 1898, Your Ex-
cellency's petitioner submitted his claim to the Pay-master Carna-
tic Stipends (vide enclosed copy of Hindustani petition dated 1st
May 1898) who, in his endorsement No. 172 dated 6th May last, (copy
herein enclosed) states that Your Excellency's petitioner's prayer
cannot be entertained after a lapse of 27 years.

That, perhaps, the Pay-master did not peruse Your Excellen-
cy's petitioner's petition addressed to him in full, in the con-
cluding portion of which your Excellency's petitioner had brought
to his notice that, Her Gracious Majesty the Queen having after a
lapse of nearly 58 years after the resumption of the Carnatic by
the Crown, issued a Poyal Proclamation on the 1st November 1858 as-
suring that the rights and privileges of the people of India would
be duly respected, Your Excellency's petitioner's claim could not
be considered barred by limitation.

That, moreover, the benevolent Government were pleased in ac-
cordance with Her Gracious Majesty's said Poyal Proclamation, to
grant pensions and sanction additions to pensions after the lapse
of several years in many instances a few of which are quoted be-
low for Your Excellency's information.

(a) Muhammad Abdullah Hussain Sahib &c. maternal great grand-
son and great grand-daughters of Shurfunnissa Begum Sahiba, daughter
of

*Your Excellency's humble
petitioner prays that this
memorial may have your
Excellency's personal perusal.*

of Nawab Wallajah were granted pensions after a lapse of 22 years
(b) Ghulam Hussain Sahib &c. maternal grand-son & grand-daughters of Fatima Begum Sahiba, maternal grand daughter of Nawab Wallajah were granted pensions after a lapse of 20 years out of their said maternal grand-mother's lapsed pension, notwithstanding they had commuted their shares of pensions granted to them out of their father's stipend.

(c) Husainee Begum, maternal grand-daughter of Hafiz Muhammad Nasir Khan Bahadur nephew of Nawab Wallajah was granted a pension out of her mother Jehandar Begum's stipend after a lapse of 45 years, though she had commuted her share of pension of her father's lapsed stipend.

(d) Muhammad Burkat-ulla Sahib, a servant of Nawab Ghulam Muhammad Ghouse Khan Bahadur last Nawab of the Carnatic was granted pension after a lapse of 30 years.

(e) Sirdar Jung Bahadur was first in receipt of a monthly pension of Rs. 200 only and after a lapse of ten years he was granted an increase of Rs. 534.

(f) Pashid-ud Dowlah Bahadur was drawing Rs. 600 per mensem in the time of Nawab Ghulam Muhammad Ghouse Khan Bahadur, after whose death his pension was increased to Rs. 2000 and again after the lapse of about 14 years he was granted a further increase of Rs. 700 per mensem.

(g) Turab Ali Khan Bahadur third son of Abdul Hamid Khan Bahadur, brother of your Excellency's petitioner's grand-mother Rabia Begum Sahiba was enjoying a pension of Rs. 107-12-0 only per month and after the lapse of about 17 years he was granted an increase of Rs. 92-4-0 per mensem.

That Your Excellency's petitioner respectfully solicits Your Excellency will be pleased to refer this petition to the Paymaster Carnatic Stipends for the verification of the instances detailed above.

That Your Excellency's petitioner trusts that he will not be deprived of his rights on the ground that if his prayer is granted other members of the family will forward their claims which cannot be done, as no existing member of the Carnatic Family

Your Excellency's petitioner respectfully solicits that this matter may be referred to the Paymaster Carnatic Stipends for the verification of the instances detailed above.

11-5-72
192
11-5-72
14-10-53
2-4

His case was of a special nature

Go 5514/8-10-53

is able to establish his claim on documentary evidence and if any such claimant does come forward Your Excellency's petitioner will forfeit his claim.

6 In conclusion Your Excellency's petitioner takes the liberty to request your Excellency will be graciously pleased to peruse his petition dated 24th March 1898 (copy herein enclosed) fully & render him justice by issuing necessary instructions for the restoration to him of his hereditary Jaghir or for the continuation to him of B.481-2-6 lapsed to Government as shown in para.10 of his first petition to Government dated 24th March 1898.

1 For this act of Justice and benevolence petitioner, as in duty bound, will ever pray.

Madras
Mirsaidpattah
26. Ice House Road
17th June 1898



C. No. 1303 From the Karim-ul-din, Madras. No. 17/61, dated 17/6/1898

F O R O R D E R S.

The Nawab Wallaja.....half sister Nur-ul-
nisa Begam

nikahi' daughter Adul Hai Khan

Rabia Begam ————— Nizam-ud-din

Muhammad
Taki-ud-din.

Muhammad Taki-ud-din was on his

father's side the great grandson of the
half sister - and on his mother's side
the grandson - of the Nawab Wallaja.

2. The history of his case is given in paras.10 et seq of Dr.Balfour's letter dated 6th March 1854 in the E.M.C. dated 21st March 1854..He was in receipt of two pensions, the larger Rs.125 in right of his mother Rabia Begam, and the smaller Rs.19-5 $\frac{3}{8}$ in right of his father, Mizam-ud-din, the Wallaja's grand-nephew. Out of this aggregate of Rs.144-5 $\frac{3}{8}$, Rs.70 was continued to his shadi widow Tyeb-un-nisa Begam for the support of the family.

3. On the death of Tyeb-un-nisa
Begam Rs.35 was continued under G.O.
No.629, Political, dated 12-8-1857 to
the

E.M.C. dated 21-3-1854 7X

the two surviving shadi daughters, two nikahi sons and three nikahi widows of Muhammad Taki-ud-din, each receiving Rs.5.

4. Later the shares of the shadi daughters were increased to Rs.10 each vide G.O.No.818, Pol., dated 25-9-57.

5. The above arrangement was described by Col. R.S. Wilson in para.3 of his report dated 28th June 1871, as unnecessary, unjust and contrary to rule, and as the result of his representations Govt. passed its order No.269, Pol., d/

1st September 1871 where specified sums were assigned to each of the surviving relatives and dependents of Muhammad Taki-ud-din as life grants. It will be seen that one of the grandsons, Karim Mohi-ud-din was given Rs.9-8 per mensem. It is this grandson who is the petitioner now. He calls himself Karim-ud-din.

6. Petitioner's request is quite inadmissible. He states that the pension of his great grand mother Rabia Begam has dwindled down by successive lapses from Rs.5000 a year (416 odd a month) to Rs.12-8 a month out of which he gets Rs. 9-8, and that on the death of his great grand father Nizam-ud-din Ahmad Khan Bahadur, his pension of Rs.77 a month lapsed entirely. He asks to be given the sum of Rs.481 odd a month i.e. the sum of Rs.77 plus Rs.(416 $\frac{2}{3}$ -12-8) Rs.404 odd. The ground advanced for this extraordinary request is that when

the

XV No.212, Pol., d/ 12-7-1871

The cases of Rashid-ud-daula (para.3(f) of current) and Turab Ali (para.3(g) were quite of a special nature. vide G.O's. 192, Pol., d/ 11th May 1872 and 351, Pol., d/ 8th October 1853.

XV
V

the Company resumed the perpetual jaghirs of the descendants of the late Wallaja Nawab it did so "in contradiction to the usual royal principle" and that he holds the sanad "and other titles", of his grandfather's jaghir.

7. As to the above please see the extracts from the despatches from the Court of Directors dated 22nd May 1850 and 11th March 1846. The granting of pensions in lieu of the jaghirs was decided on in 1801 vide letter dated 2nd October 1801 flagged C and Lord Clive's minute therewith. It is not true that the pension of Mizam-ud-din (petitioner's great grand father) lapsed on his death. It was continued to his children vide E.M.C., dated 31st December 1811.

8. The petitioner quotes a number of "precedents" in support of his request and asks that the Paymaster, Carnatic Stipends may be referred to. The Record Office notes that "some of the precedents quoted by petitioner are not easily traceable as he does not give dates." Please see para. 3 of the current.

9. Col. Price's Indt. at XVII would appear to reject the petitioner's request merely on the score that 27 years have elapsed since G.O.No.269, Political, dated 1st September 1871 was passed. But the family of Taki-ud-din has no reason to complain of

illiberal

liberal treatment. "On the death of the first holder the original stipend was continued to her family without reduction. On the death of the 2nd holder more than half of the amount drawn by him was continued to the third holder and on her death more than a half of her stipend was continued".
vide report flagged XIV with G.O. dated 16th August 1869 and the subsequent order No. 269, Political, dated 1st September 1871 referred to in para. 5 supra.

10. Submitted, therefore, that the petitioner may be told that his request cannot be complied with.

(Id.) C.W.
20-10-98.

C.S. There appears to be no need for any reference to the Paymaster. Petitioner has no case and it is submitted that his petition should be rejected. Please see draft attached.

(Id.) C.S.
23-10-98

I think it would be better to refer to the Paymaster.

(Id.) G.S.
25-10-98.

* Rabia Begam (5000)

* Muhammad Taki-ud-din (128⁵)

* Tyeb-un-nisa Begam (Rs. 70)

A

Political (1898) Department.

CURRENT No. 1440



Order

From

The Paymaster
Carnatic Shipunds
Chepak

No. 394 of 1898

Dated 11th November 1898

Received 12 — 11 — 98

Registered 14 — 11 — 98

Enclosures 2 Poll CN 21303 ntd.

Spare copies

SUBJECT.

Reports on the petition from
Kariam Munkhi-ud-din and
states that none of his requests
are admissible.

BACK PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.
R 117:	22.4.98		
357:	22.5.85		
357:	22.6.85		
192:	11.5.72		
269:	1.9.71		
212:	12.7.71		
145ndt	1290+1665	168.69.	
818:	25.9.57		
629:	12.8.57		
9m2	6.3.53		
Papers (RO).			

FURTHER PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

* Herewith returned with enclosures.

N^o 394 of 1898.

Paymaster Carnatic Stipendiary
Office Chepauk 11th November 1898.

From

Lt. Colonel D. D. Pryce I. S. C.
Paymaster Carnatic Stipendiary
Chepauk.

To,

The Chief Secretary to Government
Fort St. George.

Sir,

With reference to your Endorsement N^o 2256 dated 26th October 1898, on petitions current N^o 1303 from Carnatic Stipendiary N^o 411¹/₂ I Karim Nuh. ind. din, I have the honour to report as follows:-

2. Petitioner draws a monthly Carnatic Stipend of Rs 9.8.0 by G.O. N^o 269 dated 1st September 1871 "Political" as a nikahi son of a Shadi Son of the late Jagi. ind. din Khan Bahadur who was one of the 4 sons of Rabia Begam a nikahi daughter of Nawab Walaja. He now appeals to restore the Jagir which was given to Rabia Begam by Nawab Walaja and which was resumed in 1801 along with similar jagirs, or to increase the amount of his stipend by the sums that have lapsed on the demise of the several recipients in the family of Rabia Begam.

3. The above alternative requests of the petitioner are in fact one and the same in as much as the pension allotted to the members of the families of Nawabs Wata and

and undat. ul. umara under Lord Clive's Minute of 29th September 1801, were consequent on the resumption of the several jagirs and the administration of the Carnatic by the Honorable East India Company by the virtue of the treaty of 1801. vide para 72. of the Honorable Court of Directors letter dated 10th August 1814. Petitioner's prayer for the restoration of the jagir that was resumed by virtue of the treaty of 1801 is vexatious and untenable.

4. As regards his prayer for the continuation of the shares in his name of the several members of the families of Rabia Begam and Nizam. ud. din Ahmad Khan, aggregating in all to Rs 481-2-6, I have the honour to state that his claim is frivolous. Even if it were to be admitted, petitioner is not only the person to get it, as there are still living a large number of descendants of the family of Rabia Begam and Nizam. ud. din Ahmad Khan most of whom being in the direct Shadi line have a better claim than the petitioner who is only a wikahi son of a Shadi grandson of Rabia Begam.

5. Petitioner's statement in para 10(2) of his first petition dated 24th March 1898, that the stipend of Rs 77 per mensem which Nizam. ud. din Ahmad Khan was in receipt of lapsed on his demise, is incorrect, as it will be seen by E. M. C. dated 31st December 1811, that Nizam. ud. din Ahmad Khan having predeceased his father Abdul Hye Khan never drew his share of Rs 77-4-9 but the amount was subdivided amongst his 4 sons named in para 2. of Mr Barclay's letter to Government dated 20th December 1811.

The instances cited by the petitioner in support of his claim in para 3. of his 2nd petition dated 17th June 1898

1898 are not analogous to his. The cases (d) & (f) are those of 1855 pensioners, whereas petitioner belongs to the class of 1801 stipendiaries. The other cases are more or less of persons being pensioned after a lapse of time ranging from 10 to 45 years, whereas on the other hand petitioner is already a stipendiary and now after a silence of 27 years, claims an increase to his stipend.

7. In conclusion I beg to submit that if questions of this sort were to be opened now, it will be taken as a precedent by others, with the result that there will be no end to similar claims being put forth. Under these circumstances I am of opinion that the petitioner has not made up his case and I respectfully beg to recommend that his claim be considered as inadmissible.

I have the honour to be
Sir

your most obedient servant

My Lord Super Lt. Colonel
Paymaster Carnatic Stipends
Chepak.

Encl.

This Note is in Court
of that flagged A in
this 80. —

XX

FORWARDED

CS

The Paymaster, Carnatic Stipends
now returns the petition with his re-
marks as called for.

2. The Paymaster states that the
main request of the petitioner, i. e.,
for the restoration of the Jaghir re-
sumed by the treaty of 1801 is vexa-
tious and untenable (vide para. 72 of
letter of Board of Directors of E. I.
Company, dated London, 10th August 1814
flagged S in which the moral obli-
gation of Govt. to provide for the
family & dependants of Nawab Umdat-
ul-Omrah is acknowledged and the
policy of pensioning them off and
gradually reducing the expense by
lapse of pensions at death of the
respective recipients is clearly laid
down.) The Paymaster considers that
the claim to lapsed pensions is fri-
volous (para. 4 of his letter at XX)
inasmuch as, even if it were admis-
sible, there is a large number of des-
cendants still living, most of them in
the direct Shadi line, whose claims
would be much stronger than those of
petitioner who is only a nikahi son of
a shadi grandson of Rabia Begam. The
Paymaster shows that petitioner's

statement

statement that the Rs. 77 per mensem of Mizam-ud-din Ahmad lapsed at latter's death is incorrect (vide closing para. of letter of Paymaster of Stipends to Govt. dated 20th December 1811 flagged in which it may be seen that the Rs. 77 pension said by petitioner to have "lapsed" was sub-divided among his children after Mizam-ud-din's death), while the instances quoted by petitioner in support of his claim (vide para. 5 of petition at VII) are not analogous to his- indeed two of these cases (d & f) are 1855 pensioners and not 1801 pensioners at all. All the other cases are of persons without pension submitting successfully their claims after long periods and differing from the present petitioner's case in that the latter, already a pensioner, is now, after 27 years silence, seeking an increase thereto.

3. The Paymaster's remarks that if questions such as those raised in the petition were now permitted to be opened, a precedent would be established which would lead to no end of similar claims being put forth. He therefore recommends the rejection of the petition on the ground that no case has been made out by the petitioner.

4. It is submitted that the Paymaster's views are correct and that the petitioner may be informed that on a review of all the facts of the case Govt. rejects his petition on the

ground

ground that his claims are inadmissible.

note
25/11/98

*The original draft below may be
is subd. issue*

Cms
25.11.98

M. /
25/11/98

Radical Dept

C. No. 1303 + 1440

CB

Order 821 of 30-11-98
This Petitioner will be informed
that this ^{his} requests are inad-
missible and that the Govt.
declines to ^{reconsider} ~~reopen~~ the ^{question} ~~case~~
question of his pension

Curb.
23. x. 51

Wesley C.

Petitioner (910) with orig. incl. ref.
PCB (910)

Desp. 9
3/12/98

re
grow
by

Official copy

C. No. 1003

Order of Government will be referred to the President and the Secretary of State for their consideration and the President will decide whether to approve the same or not.

Order of Government will be referred to the President and the Secretary of State for their consideration and the President will decide whether to approve the same or not.

When given for copying *20/11*
When copied *12/11* } 1898
When examined
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

F. PERS 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.