M.R.O. 14—10,000—21-4-22

MADRAS RECORD OFFICE.

Government of Madras.

Revenue **DEPARTMENT.**

G.O. No. 104 Press ~~Mis.~~

1-3

Dated 21 — 1 — 1860.

Not to be folded or roughly handled

No. 1. Read the following Remarks of the Board of Revenue, dated 27th October 1859, No. 4391, on the following tabular report of a Yaumia.

No. 3773, From Officiating Collector of Madras, dated 29th July 1859, No. 108.

(In Con. 29th July 1859.)

It is evident from the papers connected with this case, that the pension enjoyed by Saráf Ali Khan, was really drawn on account of his wife, Jáni Bégum, the second daughter of the original grantee, the Jáhgirdár of Valavanúr, and it was doubtless by an oversight that no change took place on her death.

2. As Jáni Bégum and Saráf Ali Khan are both dead, the Board recommend that two-thirds of the pension drawn up to the date of decease of the latter, be continued to their two sons, in equal shares, with arrears from the date of their father's death.

(By Order.)

(Signed) W. HUDLESTON, *Acting-Secretary.*

No. 2. Proceedings of the Board of Revenue, dated 15th December 1859, No. 5211.

Read the following letter from B. CUNLIFFE, Esq., Collector of Madras; to W. HUDLESTON, Esq., Acting Secretary to the Board of Revenue, dated 14th November 1859, No. 185.

With reference to the Board's Proceedings, No. 4391, dated 27th ultimo, I have the honor to report that the pension therein referred to was erroneously continued to Saráf Ali Khan instead of to his sons, as the preceding pensioner had been his wife Jáni Bégum, and Saráf Ali Khan was not related in blood to the family. When the pension was continued to Saráf Ali Khan in 1843, Jáni Bégum was already dead.

2. As regards the remark of the Board that "no change took place on Jáni Bégum's death," I beg to state that Jáni Bégum was in the enjoyment of Rupees 70* per mensem, as was her sister, Payari Bégum, of an equal amount out of the allowance continued to the late Mahamed Bákir Hussain, the head of the family, which on her death, and continued as stated above to having succeeded to one-third of their mother's pension, of which they are still in the enjoyment.

* *Vide Collector's letter to Chief Secretary to Government, dated 27th June* 1843, *and its enclosures.*

3. Under these circumstances, I am of opinion that the amount of pension enjoyed by Saráf Ali Khan is not liable to any further reduction; but should be transferred entire to his sons, the present petitioners, with arrears from his death.

Submitted to Government with reference to the Board's remarks, dated 27th October 1859, No. 4391.

2. As it appears that the pension drawn by the late Jáni Bégum was reduced from Rupees 70 to Rupees 23-5-4 on its continuance to her husband Saráf Ali Khan, and as the children of her deceased sister are in the enjoyment of a pension equal to the latter amount, the Board beg to recommend, in modification of the proposal contained in their remarks above quoted, that the amount drawn by Saráf Ali Khan be continued without reduction to his sons, with arrears from the date of his decease.

(A true Copy and Extract.)

(Signed) J. D. SIM, *Secretary.*

No. 3. ORDER THEREON, 31st January 1860, No. 104.

Paragraph 1. These papers relate to the continuance of a pension of Rupees 23-5-4 per mensem drawn by the late Saráf Ali Khan, a member of the family of the Jáhgirdár of Valavanúr in the South Arcot district.

2 On the resumption of this jaghire in 1802, a pension of Rupees 1,225 per mensem was granted to the Jágírdár Kádir Naváz Khan, on whose death in 1804, it was continued in full to his son Mahamed Bákir Hussain. The latter died without male issue in 1843; and one-third of his pension being Rupees 408-5-4 monthly was continued* in equal parts to his widow and his three daughters. These allowances were expressly given for life only.

3. Subsequently, the claims of the Shadi and nicka widows of Kádir Naváz, and of other members of his family, were admitted, at first† to shares in the amount of Rupees 408-5-4, but ultimately their allowances, which were increased‡ in the case of the widows, were continued as additions to that pension which was restored§ in full to the immediate family of Bákir Hussain. In sanctioning|| an increase to the allowance of the Shadi widow of Kádir Naváz, the Court of Directors appear to have qualified the order of this Government of 20th April 1843 that the allowances were to be limited to life only. They ordered that in all such cases, consideration should be given to the claims of persons dependant on a deceased pensioner, and who without such consideration would be left destitute.

4. The pension now immediately in question was given on the revision of the allowance of Rupees 408-5-4 mentioned above in the beginning of paragraph 3. The recipient was Saráf Ali Khan; but he drew it in right of his wife Jáni Bégum, the younger daughter of Kádir Naváz, who was then already dead. Saráf Ali Khan died on the 15th June 1853 leaving two sons; and the matter has now come before Government consequent on a petition addressed by the latter to the Collector of Madras.

5. In their "remarks" of 27th October 1849 recorded above, the Board of Revenue recommend that two-thirds of the pension should be continued to the two sons of the deceased. But in their subsequent Proceedings of 15th December also recorded above, they recommend that the whole amount should be so continued.

6. In the Collector's letter which accompanies the last mentioned proceedings it is stated that Jáni Bégum and her elder sister Payari Bégum received each 70 Rupees monthly from Bákir Hussain during his life out of the allowance paid to him. In the arrangement which followed his death, a third of this amount or Rupees 23-5-4 monthly was assigned to the family of each sister, both apparently being dead. That of Payari Bégum was given to her daughters who still enjoy it; and it is argued that in like manner that of Jáni Bégum ought to have been given to her two sons instead of to her husband. It is therefore recommended that the allowance in question, viz. Rupees (23-5-4) twenty-three annas five and pice four per mensem should be continued in full to the two sons Mahmad Saiyad-ud-din and Ahmad Ali, as heirs to their mother, with payment of arrears from the 15th June 1853 the date of Saráf Ali's decease.

*, *, This course seems fair and right, and the Government accordingly sanction it.

(Signed) T. PYCROFT,
Chief Secretary.

IN CON. 29TH JULY 1859, No. 3773.

From B. CUNLIFFE, Esq., Collector of MADRAS,
dated Madras, 29th July 1859, No. 108.

STATEMENT shewing the particulars of the case of Mahomed Sydoodeen Saib and Ahmed Ally Saib, sons of the late Mahomed Shariff Ally Khan, who drew a pension from the office of the Collector of Madras.

Case.	Talook and Village.	Extent and value of the entire Inam or Yeomiah.	When and by whom granted.	Sunnuds or other Documents in support of the Grant.	Nature of the Grant—charity or service. If service, nature of the duty prescribed by the Grant.	Name of the original Grantee.	Name of the last holder and the relation in which he stood to the original Grantee and date of his demise.	Share enjoyed by the deceased and that held by the other members.	Family left by the deceased and name and age of the parties.	Their circumstances and the means of subsistence possessed by the family.	Recommendation and grounds thereon.	Further Remarks.
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12.	13
1	Velavanoor, &c. belonging to a Jagheer in South Arcot.	1,225 Rupees per mensem.	Granted by the British Government in July 1802.	,,	For the support of the Jagheerdar's family.	Kader Navaz Khan, Jagheerdar of Velavanoor.	Mahomed Shariff Ally Khan, one of the family of the late Jagheerdar who died on the 15th June 1853.	Rs. 23-5-4 per mensem under the order of Government 7th July 1843.	Mahomed Sydoodeen, aged 36 and Ahmed Ally, aged 35.	The applicants are supported by the pensions of their wives.	Letter of the Deputy Collector in charge of the Pension Department under date 25th July 1859, is forwarded, and is explanatory of the circumstances under which petitioners claim. The Collector concurs in the conclusions arrived at by the Deputy Collector. It was apparently an error to have continued the pension to the husband, instead of to the children of Janee Begum, as the pension came from their mother, and he was not connected by blood with the original grantee. The petitioners are exactly in the same position as the daughters of Payaree Begum, and should receive the same allowance. The Collector begs to recommend, therefore, that each of the petitioners be granted a life pension of Rupees 11-10-8 monthly, with payment of arrears of Rupees 1,691-10-8, from the date of their father's decease. It is right to mention that each of them is married to a daughter of the late Mahomed Bauker Hoossain, who receives Rupees 102-1-4 per mensem under the orders of Government 16th October 1848.	

ENC. 1.

From V. RUNGASAWMY IYER, Deputy Collector of MADRAS,
To B. CUNLIFFE, Esq., Collector of MADRAS.

dated Madras, 25th July 1859, No. 463.

With reference to a petition presented to you on the 3rd November 1858, by Ahmed Ally and Mahomed Sydoodeen, setting forth their claim to pension as the sons of Janee Begum, a daughter of Khader Nevaz Khan, late Jaghiredar of Vullavanoor, I have the honor to submit the following circumstances for your consideration.

2. On perusing the papers connected with this subject, it seems from the letter of the Principal Collector of South Arcot, dated 25th September 1834, that, on the resumption of the Vullavanoor Jaghire villages in July 1802, a pension of Rupees 1,225 per mensem was granted to Khader Nevaz Khan, the Jaghiredar, and on his death in March 1804 the same amount, without any reduction, was continued to his son Mahomed Bauker Hoossain (for the support of the family), who enjoyed the pension up to 12th February 1843, and died without any male issue. One of the petitioners, Ahmed Ally, calling himself to be an adopted son of the late Mahomed Bauker Hoossain, requested that the pension may be renewed in his name as head of the family. His representation was forwarded by His Highness the Nawab of the Carnatic through the Political Agent at Chepauk, with his letter of the 27th March 1843, for the consideration of Government; who by an Extract from the Minutes of Consultation dated 20th April 1843, declined to recognise Ahmed Ally as the adopted son of the deceased, and in the mean time resolved to continue one-third of the allowance, Rupees 408-5-4, to the widow and daughters of the deceased. However, Ahmed Ally has been proved to be a son of Janee Begum, the youngest daughter of the late Khader Nevaz Khan, the original grantee. Moreover, both Ahmed Ally and his brother (the present petitioners), have married two sisters who are the daughters of the late Mahomed Bauker Hoossain, each of them drawing a pension of Rupees 102-1-4 monthly; and the Government Agent on the receipt of the above-mentioned Minutes of Consultation, addressed a letter to Government on the 25th May 1843, submitting copy of a note from His Highness the Nawab, stating that there were several other members, surviving, attached to the deceased's family who were duly entitled to certain shares in the above pension, besides the widow and daughters of the late Mahomed Bauker Hoossain; i. e., three daughters of Payaree Begum (elder daughter), two sons, the husband and a grand-son of Janee Begum, the younger daughter, and a grand-son by a Nicka daughter of Khader Nevaz Khan, representing that the Shadee and Nicka widows of the late original grantee had preferred petitions to Government through the Collector of Madras, by whom the pension was paid, and from which they also had portions allotted. Here this officer clearly mentioned that both the present petitioners are sons of the late Janee Begum. The Government, in their Extract Minutes of Consultation dated 17th June 1843, requested the Collector of Madras to enquire into and report upon the claims of the whole family of the late original grantee, in communication with the Political Agent at Chepauk. This order was duly attended to by the Collector, who on the 27th June 1843, in recommending several persons of the family as entitled to a share in the allowance, omitted the names of both the petitioners as sons of the late Janee Begum, while he has recommended the three daughters of her sister, Payaree Begum; but he recommended Shariff Ally Khan, the father of the petitioners, as entitled to a share of Rs. 23-5-4 per mensem equally with that proposed to the three daughters of Payaree Begum. Accordingly, the final sanction was granted by an Extract Minutes of Consultation dated 7th July 1843, No. 264, and it has subsequently been carried out. On looking into the pension certificate granted to Shariff Ally Khan, there is an entry in it that this man was a brother-in-law to the late Mahomed Bauker Hoossain, and the above allowance has been limited to his life. No reason has been assigned for renewing Janee Begum's pension in the name of her husband, while she had two sons (the present petitioners,) surviving at the time of her death; and on a personal enquiry made of Ahmed Ally, it seems his father Shariff Ally Khan had no other connection with the deceased's family, except his having married his mother, Janee Begum. Yet Shariff Ally Khan had enjoyed the pension up to 15th June 1853 and died, and his portion directly lapsed to Government. Although these petitioners seem to have remonstrated that the allowance should be renewed in their names, yet an endorsement had been passed on their petition by the then Collector, Mr. Stokes, on the 11th August 1853, saying that, "the pension enjoyed by the petitioners' late father being for life, the Acting Collector is precluded from recommending its continuance to them."

3. On considering all the above-mentioned particulars I am of opinion that, although Ahmed Ally, one of the petitioners, was rejected from being recognised as an adopted son of his maternal uncle, the late Mahomed Bauker Hoossain, and he and his brother, both, the petitioners, had married his daughters who are enjoying a portion of their father's pension, yet they were properly entitled to a share in the pension that was enjoyed by their mother, Janee Begum. I presume that their claim might have been overlooked solely by the omission of their names, which occurred in the final recommendation made as above stated by Mr. Robertson, the then Collector. I cannot see any reason why the indulgence granted to the daughters of Payaree Begum cannot be shown towards the petitioners, who are the heirs in the same degree to the late Mahomed Bauker Hoossain. Therefore, the amount of pension enjoyed by their father, the late Shariff Ally Khan, may be divided between both the petitioners, i. e., Rupees 11-10-8 per month, or Rupees 140 per annum, to each.

4. The arrears at the above rate due to the petitioners from 16th June 1853, (on which date their father died,) and up to 30th June last, amounts to Rupees 1,691-10-8, which I beg to leave for your consideration whether to recommend its payment to the petitioners or otherwise.

ENC. 2.

ABSTRACT.—Submitting, for favorable consideration, their claim to pension as the sons of Janee Begum, a daughter of Khader Navaz Khan.

Enclosure of No. 1. to a Remarks of the Board of Revenue to the Secretary to Government Revenue Dept. dated 27th October 1839 No. 4391.

P. 2094/58
Entered this day

Statement from the Collector of Madras to the Secretary to the Board of Revenue dated 29th July 1839 No. 108 regarding the Pension.

Memo on Rev Cons 2024 and 2391. Pension to the family of the Vellamanir Jagirdar

Para 1. On the resumption of the Vellamanir Jagir in South Arcot in 1802, a pension of Rs 1225 per annum was granted to Kadir Nawaz Khan the Jagirdar, on whose death in March 1814, it was continued in lack to his son Mahammad Baker Hussain. In 1813 he died without male issue, and the Govt sanctioned one third of the pension or Rs 408. 5. 4. in the name of his widow and daughters, stipulating that on their deaths their respective shares should revert to Govt. The distribution made of the above sum was as follows

a Order 30 April 1813. No 152 Pol Dep.

Fatima Begum, Widow of Bakar Hussain ——— Rs a p 102. 1. 4
Ramatoon Bibi Begum, daughter of do 102. 1. 4
Abbassi Begum, Daughter of Bakar Hussain by 1st wife —— 102. 1. 4
Azeezun Nissa Begum do of do —— 102. 1. 4
Total — 408. 5. 4

b Chepauk Agent's letter 25 May 1843 & 1st Jun 17 June 1843 No 232. 82.

2. On this order being passed, the Chepauk Agent at the request

request of the Nawab forwarded thro
petitions from the families left by the
daughters of the original holder
Kadir Nawaz, the father of the deceased
Bahar Hussain, requesting to have
some share left them. The widow
of Kadir Nawaz also petitioned for
the continuance of her share. This
led to a re-arrangement of the
pension of Rs 408. 5. 4. as shewn
below.

c. Ltr Order 17 June 1843 No 232

d. Ltr Order 24 May 1843 No 201.

c. Order 7 July 1843 No 264.

Note. This order does not specify the terms of the grant of continuance

To the widow and three daughters of Bahar Hussain @ 63. 9. 4 each	Rs a p 254. 5. 4.
To the other members of the family viz.	
Sharbaun Begum, Shadi widow of Kadir Nawáz -	33. 5. 4.
Laul Bebee, nieka widow of do	10 — —
Late Sahebuth Jung's Widows and sisters - - - -	40 — —
Kattimah Begum and her two sisters, daughters of Peyari Begum the elder daughter of Kadir Nawaz	23. 5. 4.
Saraff Ali Khan, husband of Jani Begum, the younger daughter of do	23. 5. 4.
Gulam Hussain, son of Kadir Bebee, the nieka daughter of do	10 — —
Imipa Begum	10 — —
	154 — —
Total	408. 5. 4.

c. From Sharbaun Begum 8 January 1845

J. Despatch dated 11 March 1846 No 2, para 12 & 14. Ltr Order 15 May 1846 No 213.

* Nothing was said as to the terms of continuance

Sharbaun Begum the Shadi widow of Kadir Nawaz memorialized the Court of Directors pleading the inadequacy of the portion assigned to her viz Rs 33. 5. 4 and praying for the continuance of the pension of Rs 100 which she formerly drew from Bahar Hussain. The Court acceded to her request, and observed that it was not their desire that reductions of pensions should affect life interests. The Court wished, when a pension was granted or renewed, that the amount should be divided into shares to the drawn by separate receipts; the shares of those who were not closely related to the family to cease with their death, but with respect to the principal representative of a branch of the original family they remarked, there might be reasons for a temporary continuance. In that case, they did not wish any fixed proportion to be arbitrarily deducted from the amount, but only so much discontinued as the present holder

holder might have expended in his own person or dignity; the remainder to be divided among those who had previously been supported by it. This rule they observed would lead to the gradual extinction of the pensions without subjecting individuals to hardship. Laul Bebee the Sheka widow of the original holder Kadir Nawáz then preferred a claim for a similar indulgence as was conceded to Sharbaun Begum; and to her also the pension of Rs 42 which she drew prior to the death of Bakar Hupain was restored, a measure which was approved by the Court.

4. Next came a claim from the widow and three daughters of Bakar Hupain to the pension of Rs 108. 5. 4 granted by the order of 20th April 1843. The Collr of Guadur, to whom a reference was made on the subject, reported to the following effect. He stated that the amount received by Bakar Hupain for himself out of the stipends of Rs 225 was Rs 763; and that if the memorialists on the principle observed in some other cases, were allowed only 2/3rds of that sum, the amount payable to them would have been Rs 508. 10. 8. The Collr considered the memorialists' case to be entitled to favourable consideration from their being the representatives of the original grantee in a direct line. The Collr was then asked to state the amount of income he would recommend to the pensions then drawn by the parties, with reference to the principle on which the stipends of Sharbaun Begum and Laul Bebee had been raised. In reply, Mr Hudleston stated that Sharbaun Begum and Laul Bebee were by Kadir Nawáz's will, entitled to receive respectively Rs 100 and 42, and that the restoration to them of those stipends was based on the principle that widows should not upset life reductions should not affect life interests. He considered this principle to be inapplicable to the memorialists' case, inasmuch as they

s. From Laul Bebee 28 Nov. 1846.

* Nothing is mentioned as to its being only a life grant.

t. Order 27 Nov. 1846 No 429.

u. Des patch 14 July 1847 No 5, para 5. in Order 16 Sept. 1847 No 419.

v. In Order 15 Augt 1848 No 369.

w. Letter from Govt 7 Sept 1848 No 10. In Order 19 idem No 432.

x. Order 19 Sept. 1848 No 432.

y. Collr's letter 28 Sept 1848 No 11 - In Order 16 Octr 48 No 481 -

they had not personally been in the receipt of any specific sum out of the portion viz Rs 763 enjoyed by Bakar Hupain as his own share. On the whole however, the Collr was of opinion that the sum mentioned by the memorialists themselves, viz Rs 108. 5. 4. was ample & this report the Govt permitted the memorialists four in number to draw the amount last mentioned; the share of each to be Rs 102. 1. 4. The Court of Directors concurred " in the propriety of this restitution on the principle that reductions made on the death of the head of a family should not affect the life interests of the other shares." They remarked that " the distinction drawn by Mr Hudleston between the case of these memorialists and that of the widow and daughter of Kadir Nawáz Khan was not clearly made out;" and wished " fractional parts of a rupee to be dedicated in future grants.

5. Amongst the shares granted to the other members of the family in the order of 7 July 1843 as partially varied in

Pr from Rev. Dr 27 Oct 1859 No 4361-

Pr Govt Letr to Collr of Bdn dated 16 Oct 1848 No 481-

Pr Govt Letr to Collr of Bdn dated 18 July 1843 para 83. Bdn Rev 20 Oct 1843.

Pr Govt Letr to Collr of Bdn dated 15 Dec 1859 No 5211.

in para 2 of this Memo, a sum of Rs 23. 5. 4 appears in the name of Sarafat Ali Khan the husband of Jani Begum the younger daughter of Kadir Nawáz. This man is now dead and the Board in their remarks of 27 Oct 1859 recommend that two thirds of the portion held by him be continued to his two sons, Ahmed Ali and Mahammad Saiyad Ali, on the ground that the pension ought not to have been granted to Sarafat Ali, but to Jani Begum who is a descendant of the original grantee wherein Sarafat Ali was no blood relation, but merely Jani Begum's husband. With their subsequent Proc of 15 Dec 1859, the Board send up a letter from the Collr stating that the pension in question was erroneously continued to Sarafat Ali Khan instead of to his wife Jani Begum who is dead, and that the amount so continued was one-third of that drawn by the latter from Bakar Hupain. It is also stated that the children of Jani Begum's deceased sister

are

° The payment of arrears from the date of Sarafat Ali's death (16 June 1853) was also recommended.

are in receipt of a pension equal
to that paid to Sarap Ali, No
No 23. S. 1. The Board therefore,
in modification of their former
proposal, recommend that Sarap
Ali Khan's pension be continued with that
reduction to his sons, with arrears
from the date of his decease.

The order of 20 March 1821 states with reference to the pensions of the Satampak Jágírdár that at the death of each incumbent the shares which they each enjoyed shall be reduced 1/3rd, at the death of their successors 2/3rds; and at their death to cease entirely.

r. Order 20 March 1821. No 244 P.C.

No 104

ceedings of the Madras Govern
Standard date the 21st Janua

Read the following

of the Board of Revenue
tting a Tabular report
transmitted from the

9

Encl. to Rev. 20 24th 1891.

Encl. in Rev. Dept. 6/43
No. 232 Pub. D.

Encl. to the Office
ment which accom-
panies Carter's
letter dated 7
the facts.

The Valavanúr Jaghír
in South Arcot was resumed
in 1802. A Pension of Rs. 1,225
monthly was granted to the
Jaghírdar's eldest male
full brother
The latter died without issue
in 1843; & one third of his
pension, being 408-5-4 monthly
was continued to each
of his widows during their
widowhood - Their allowances
were accordingly paid for
life only -
Subsequently, the claims
of the widows of

2. On the
tion of this Jag
a pension of Rs

Kádir nawáz, & of other members
of his family, were admitted, at
first to shares in the Pension
of Rs. 40 8-5-4, but ultimately on
addition & the pensions - And
in consideration there grants, the
Hon. Co. obtain & two exemplifi
the order & this first that the
allowances were & be for life only,
& & have ordered that in all such
cases, consideration shd be given
to the claims of persons dependants
on a deceased pensioner, & who
without such consideration wd, be
left destitute.

3. It was also ordered in the
case of the Sáttara Princess Jotsin,

that the Pension should not be dimi-
-nished on their on each Cabe-
-rished

4. The Pension was given
-diately in question was given
on the pension mentioned above in the le-
-gacy of Para 2.
The members was Saváj ali Khán;
but he died it in right of his
wife Jáni Begum, daughter of
Haidir Nawáj, who was then de-
-ceased - Saváj ali Khan's two
sons by their remarks: of
deceased, by their remarks: of

5- the Act 27, the the pensions
that two thirds of the Pension
shd be continued to the two
sons. But with their Proportion of
15th Dec, they remained the

the whole subject so continued.

6. In the Collr's letter which accompanies these proceedings it is stated that Jaini Bégum & her sister Bayani Bégum receive each 70 Rupees monthly from Bakir Hussain during his life. On the arrangement which followed his death, a third of this amt. viz. 23-5-4 was assigned to each of the family of Bakir, whereas Bayani was their sister. That Bayani was their sister, & that the daughters are still enjoying it; & it is argued that in like manner that Jaini Bégum ought to have been joined by her two sisters instead of the husband.

It is therefore recommended that the allowance be continued in full to the two sons, as heirs to their mother, with payment of arrears. I think this is fair & right.

Dec 27

Concurs 31 Dec

No. 104

Proceedings of the Madras Government
Under date the 21st January 1860.

Read the following papers

Remarks of the Board of Revenue
Submitting a Tabular report
of a peishcush received from the
Acting Collr of Madras & recommending
that two thirds of the pension drawn up
to the date of decease of Sheriff Alikhan
be continued to his two sons in
equal shares with arrears from
the date of their father's death-

Here enter 27th October 1859
No. 4391.

Proceedings of the 13th of Revenue
Submitting a letter from the
Collector of Madras reporting that
certain pension was erroneously
continued to Sheriff Alikhan in-
stead of to his sons & recommending
that the amount drawn by him be
transferred without reduction
to his sons, with arrears from
the date of his decease-

(Here enter 15th December 1859
No. 5211)

1. These papers relate to the continuance of Rs. 23. 5. 4 per mensem of a pension drawn by the late Sooraj Ali Khan, a member of the family of the Jahgirdar of Valavanúr in the South Arcot district.-

2. On the resump-
tion of this Jahgir in 1802
a pension of Rs. 1225 per
mensem

pension was granted to the Jáhgirdár Kádir Nawáz Khan, on whose death in 1804, it was continued in full to his son Muhammed Bákir Hussain. The latter died without male issue in 1843; and one third of his pension being Rs 408. 5. 4 monthly was continued in equal parts to his widow and his three daughters. These allowances were expressly given for life only.

3. Subsequently, the claims of the Shadi and Bicka widows of Kadir Nawáz and of other members of his family, were admitted* to participate to shares in the amount of Rs 408. 5. 4, but ultimately their allowances, which were increased† in

* Order 20 April No 152. Pol. and Chepauk Agency 25 May para. 2 17 June 1843 No 2

* Order 7 July 1843 No 264 Pol Dep

† Order 15 May and 27 Nov. 1846 Nos 213 & 429 Pol Dep

† Order 16 Oct 1848 No 481 Pol. D.

* Despatch from England dated 11 March 1846 No 2 Paras 13 & 14

on the case of the widows, were continued as additions to that pension which was restored in full to the immediate family of Bákir Hussain. In sanctioning an increase to the allowance of the widow of Kádir Nawáz, the Court of Directors appear to have qualified the order of the Govt of 20 April 1843 that the allowances were to be limited to life only. They ordered that in all such cases, consideration should be given to the claims of persons dependant on a deceased pensioner, and who without such consideration would be left destitute.

4. The pensions now immediately in question were given on the revision of the allowance

of Rupees 608-5-4 men-
tioned above in the begin-
ning of para 3. The recipi-
ent was Saráf Ali Khán;
but he drew it in right
of his wife Jáni Bégum,
the younger daughter of
Kádir Navázu who was
then already dead. Saráf
Ali Khan died on the 15th June
1853 leaving two sons; & the
matter has now come before Govt.
consequent on a petition addressed
by the latter to the Coll.r of Madras.

5 In their "remarks" of
27 Oct.r 59 recorded above, the Bd.
of Rev: recommend that two thirds
of the pension should be continued
to the two sons of the deceased. But in
their subsequent Proc.s of 18 Dec.r also re-
corded above, they recommend that the
whole amount should be so continued.

6. In the Coll.r's letter which ac-
companies the last mentioned
Proceedings it is stated

that

that Jani Begum and her
elder sister Payari Bégum
received each 70 Rs monthly
from Bákir Hussain during
his life out of the allowance
paid to him. On the arrang-
ment which followed his
death, a third of the
amount or Rs 23. 5. 4
monthly was assigned to
the family of each sister,
both apparently being dead.
That of Payari Bégum
was given to her daughter
who still enjoys it; and it
is argued that in like man-
ner that of Jáni Bégum
ought to have been given
to her two sons instead of
to her husband. It is
therefore recommended
[illegible]
that the allowance in
question viz Rs (23. 5. 4)

Inam Ry

Twenty three annas pie
and pice four per mensem
should be continued in
full to the two sons
Mahamad Saiyad-ud-din
and Ahmad Ali, as heir
to their mother, with
payment of arrears fro
the 15 June 1853 the dat
of Saráf Ali's decease

7. This course
seems fair and right,
and the Govt accordingly
sanction it. —

10 Copies to the Adv. of Revn Dispy 23d
for the year
1 — " Account Genl
1 — " Civil audr
3 — "

29-4-91 Pub.
13-5-91
1-6-97 Pub
22/7/98
16/12/02
19/8/03
4-12-05
6-6-08
11-6-08
16 10 19

Revenue 1860 Department.
Proc.s of Govt. 31st January.

No 104.

Proc.s of the Madras Govt.
Dt 21st January 1860.

Sanctioning the continu-
ance of a pension of Rs 23-5-4
per mensem drawn by the
late Sarfaraz Ali Khan, a member
of the family of the Jaigirdar
of Vellaveram in South Arcot-

G O Nos 11-12
7-7-43
7-9
17-10-48
20-1
21-4-43
9-10
20-6-43

No 1 at 3.