

MADRAS RECORD OFFICE.

Government of Madras.

Revenue DEPARTMENT.

G.O. No.	2103	Press
		~~Mis.~~
	283. 281	
Dated	21-11-1918	1863

Not to be folded or roughly handled

*Proceedings of the Madras Government, Revenue Department,
21st November 1863.*

No. 285. Read the following letter from Lieutenant-Colonel W. J. WILSON, Commissioner of Police, to the Honorable A. J. ARBUTHNOT, Chief Secretary to Government, Fort Saint George, dated Madras, 28th August 1863, No. 115 :—

SIR,

1. I have the honor to return Petition No. 786 of 1863, referred to me on the 28th March last, and to submit the following report thereon, together with fourteen statements containing all the material evidence on the subject, which I have been able to procure. The witnesses were not examined on oath, as I did not consider such to be expedient lest it might afterwards be thought advisable to institute legal proceedings in the matter.

2. The actual writer of the English Petition is an East Indian named Moses, by whom it was prepared at the dictation of the Cauzy Syed Azeezooddeen, or more properly speaking Syed Aizooddeen, who states that he caused this to be done at the request of one Eyen Khan then residing in a village near Sydapett or Sydabad, but who quitted it immediately after the Petition was presented to Government.

I have made every endeavour to discover the said Eyen Khan or to obtain some satisfactory proof of his existence, but without success, and my impression is that the Cauzy himself is the real Petitioner, but was unwilling to come forward in person as he was one of the two witnesses examined in support of the claim in 1857, at which time he stated that he performed the Nicka ceremony between Syed Mahomed Khan and a woman named Azeeza Begum.

3. The evidence of the witnesses Jan Bee, Fatmah Bee, Ebrahim Khan, Noor Khan and Golam Hoossain is, if believed, conclusive against the claims of Mucdoom Bee *alias* Azeeza Begum. Jan Bee and Fatmah Bee having been brought forward by the Cauzy, their statements are open to considerable suspicion; but I have not any reason to discredit the testimony of the other three.

4. Mahomed Shereef Hoossain, a respectable Mahomedan gentleman, states, that he was on intimate terms with the late Syed Mahomed Khan, and that he must have known of his marriage had such ever taken place.

5. The only evidence in favor of Mucdoom Bee is that of one Syed Emam, at present in the village of Errumbaloor, in the District of Chingleput. He says he was for many years a domestic servant in the family of Syed Mahomed Khan, and that he knows Mucdoom Bee *alias* Azeeza Begum to be his widow; but this witness can scarcely be considered a disinterested person, as he received a present of 100 Rupees from Mucdoom Bee when her arrears were paid, and also a monthly allowance of 3½ Rupees, which allowance he has since continued to receive.

Claims of this kind are constantly repudiated even when made a condition on which a pension has been granted, but in this instance there was no legal claim whatever, and the moral obligation, if such can be said to have existed at all, was very slight, Syed Emam not having been a dependant of the family of Mucdoom Bee, but of that of her alleged husband by Nicka. Moreover, it is highly improbable, and opposed to ordinary experience that a woman in the position of Mucdoom Bee should make a monthly allowance of 3½ Rupees out of a stipend of 25 from motives of charity alone.

6. It will also be seen from Mucdoom Bee's statement that she paid away a large proportion of the sum received by her as arrears, to the persons by whom she was assisted, and that for some time she made a monthly allowance of 3½ Rupees to one of those persons named Mahomed Ally, whose statement is forwarded herewith.

It may not be safe to draw any absolute conclusion from such circumstances as these, but it must be allowed that the fact of Mucdoom Bee's having given away some 1,200 Rupees of the arrears to Vakeels and others is suspicious.

7. Syed Emam and the Cauzy Syed Azeezooddeen were examined at this Office in 1857, and their depositions were sent to the Collector for transmission to the Board of Revenue together with a Mahzurnamah produced by Meer Tussooddook Hoossain. These depositions* are short, and somewhat loose. It is not set forth that the Cauzy saw the face of the bride, but simply that he performed the ceremony of Nicka between Syed Mahomed Khan and a woman named Azeeza Begum. The Cauzy still adheres to his statement, but adds that he never saw Azeeza Begum's face. It does not appear that any one was examined here with the exception of those two persons, and it is worthy of remark that no female friend or domestic has been brought forward either originally or at present to speak to the identity of Azeeza Begum *alias* Mucdoom Bee. It is reasonable to suppose that if she had lived at Sydapett for five or six years with Syed Mahomed Khan as his wife, some respectable female testimony would be forthcoming to that effect.

8. I have examined the Mahzurnamah mentioned in the preceding paragraph, and forward a translation thereof. This document does not appear to be of any value whatever as

* Copies enclosed.

WORK DONE UNDER ONE REGULATION

Proceedings of the Madras Government, Revenue Department,
21st November 1863.

evidence of the identity of Muctoom Bee alias Azeeza Begum. Two of the persons whose seals are affixed thereto are dead, and of the remaining three, two, viz., Meer Mahomed Tucky and Meer Hussan Ally Khan, have confessedly no knowledge of the facts. They now deny ever having seen the Mahzurnamah, and profess entire ignorance of the manner in which their seals could have been procured. The Cauzy also denied all knowledge of the document until it was shown to him, when he not only admitted his seal, but that he had himself written the paper. There can be little doubt that the Mahzurnamah was prepared by the Cauzy in communication with Meer Tussooddook Hoossain, and that each of the persons who certified to the truth of the facts alleged therein by lending his seal and name, received a consideration for so doing.

9. On the 24th instant I received a Petition from Azeeza Begum, stating that she had a number of documents which she requested I would examine. Her Vakeel Syed Enoyet Ally appeared before me accordingly on the 26th instant, and produced a receipt for 200 Rupees granted to Azeeza Begum by Cauzy Syed Aizodeen, a translation of which is herewith forwarded. He also produced a Petition in English addressed to the Deputy Collector of Madras, dated in the early part of 1832, which did not seem to have any bearing on the present question. The Vakeel at the same time informed me that these were the only documents in the possession of his client.

10. On the same day I questioned the Cauzy as to whether he had ever received any considerable sum of money from Azeeza Begum, to which he replied that with the exception of the small sums mentioned in his statement she had not given him any thing. He was then shown his receipt, and explained that it had been granted by him at Azeeza Begum's request for the aggregate of the small sums received by him from time to time as stated above. This man appears to me utterly unworthy of credit, and his conduct throughout the transaction has been such as to create great doubts in my mind as to the authenticity of the Marriage Certificate.

11. Muctoom Bee having stated that she used to receive a certain sum monthly during the absence of Syed Mahomed Khan through the medium of a bearer named Rama not now forthcoming, I endeavoured to ascertain the facts by a reference to the Deputy Collector's Office in Madras, but there is not any thing on record there to show to whom the stipend was paid although it continued to be drawn here until the pensioner's death.

12. In consequence of the death of one of the certifiers of Azeeza Begum alias Muctoom Bee and her inability to procure another, she was personally examined on the 8th January last, by the Deputy Collector of Madras, who satisfied himself that she was the person described in the Pension Certificate, and she was subsequently examined at the Deputy Collector's Office in February and March with the same result.

13. I have omitted to mention that the Cauzy did not give any information regarding the English Petition until it was traced to him through the East Indian Writer.

14. In conclusion I have the honor to state that nothing has been elicited during the course of this investigation which leads me to believe there has been any change in the person of the recipient since the pension was granted, but it appears to me that the sufficiency of the testimony adduced in support of the original claim, that is to say the Mahzurnamah, and the two depositions taken at this Office in 1857, might be re-considered, and I trust that in so saying I have not gone beyond the proper limits of this report.

No. 286.

ORDER THEREON, 21st November 1863, No. 2,103.

1. These papers will be forwarded to the Government Law Officers for their advice as to whether the parties should be criminally prosecuted or not.
2. Meanwhile the pensions of Meer Hussein Ally Khan, Meer Mahomed Tucky and Muctoom Bee alias Azeeza Begum will be suspended.

(True Extract.)

(Signed) J. D. SIM,

Secretary to Government.

To the Government Solicitor, with Petition and 17 enclosures.

- „ Commissioner of Police.
- „ Board of Revenue.
- „ Civil Paymaster.

Exd, S. T. Augustin.

... Rev. No. 2282 ...
This paper has reference to a pension of 25 Rupees a month granted with effect from November 1853, to one Azizah Begum as nikah widow of Syed Mahomed Khan's great grandson of the Lash Nawab of Cuddapah.
A pension of 250 Pagodas per annum was, in 1812, conferred on the recommendation of the Bd of Revenue, upon Syed Mahomed Khan; and was afterwards increased to 350 Pagodas. The pensioner died on the 21st November 1853. Two days later an application was received from a person styling himself nephew of the deceased for a portion of the allowance. An enquiry was instituted by the collector & a tabular report submitted to the Bd who recommended that half the original allowance should be continued to the applicant. The Govt however considered the evidence produced by the claimant & he mere hear-say, of a very vague and remote character. They declined to give him any thing. No mention of a nikah wife of the deceased occurs in any of these papers. About this time one Azizah Begum styling herself nikah widow

of the late Syed Shahomed Khan in a claim for a portion of her late husband's pension. This was referred to the Board of Revenue for report. Great difficulty was experienced in finding out anything about the Petitioner. The Collector of Cuddapah could obtain no information about her. The Collector of Madras, to whom he had referred the matter reported that the Govt Agent at Chepauk knew nothing about her, and that the Commissioner of Police, who was engaged in the enquiry found the evidence to be conflicting. Subsequently the Collector of Madras forwarded to the Board a letter from Colonel Boulderson & the record of the enquiry held in the case. The former was a bare covering letter expressing no opinion. The latter consisted of two informations taken on solemn affirmation, an original Nichah marriage certificate, in Chaharvernamah. In sending these papers up, the Collector made no remark as to their probable value.

In submitting their report to Govt. The Board contented themselves with remarking in reference to the record of enquiry, that "the Certificate bears the seal and signature of a Cauly named Syed Azeez Ooddeen who in his deposition swears that

* 5 Aug/56

* 30 Aug. 1856.

From Coll. to T. & L. of Govt. 20 Feb. 1857, No. 13.

17 June 1857. No. 8/12

31 August/57 No. 137

22 Oct 1857. No. 3585-

he performed the ceremony. The 2nd de position is that of a person who corroborates the foregoing, and states that Syed Shahomed Khan whom he knew for 30 years contracted a Nichah marriage with the Petitioner some 12 or 13 years ago.

Upon this report the Govt determined to recommend the Council of Directors to grant Petitioner a pension of Rs. 25 per mensem for the term of her natural life as she appears to have succeeded in establishing her relationship to the deceased descendant of the Nawab of Cuddapah.

In their despatch to England after remarking upon the documents from which evidence of the claimant's connection is derived they added "in the four years which have elapsed since Syed Shahomed Khan's decease, no claim has been advanced by any shade widow, but even were such claim to be brought forward it would not, in our opinion, invalidate the plea for some provision now advanced by his widow, who is represented to be in poor circumstances."

On the 15 December 1858. The Secretary of Govt sanctioned the grant of the pension recommended, with arrears from date of the husband's death.

G.O. 16 Nov. 1857. No. 1169-

* 18 Nov 1857. No. 40-

vide G.O. 30 March 1859. No. 437.

In March 1863 a Petition was No 786 of 16
received from one Eyya Khan stating
that his sister Hussiah Begum who
had married one Syed Mahomed
Khan, late Petty Nabob at Cudda-
pah, who had been in the receipt
of a pension of Rs. 25 per mensem,
died a year ago, and that her
vakil still continued to draw
the pension in the name of the
deceased & to give it to one huk-
toom Bee. This Petition was re. 23 March 63
forwarded to the Commissioner of
Police for immediate enquiry
& report.

Colonel Wilson now reports
that the Petitioner is not for the
Cauzy. The petition was traced
to an East Indian writer named
Shoes, who had prepared it at
the dictation of the Cauzy
Syed Azeerooddeen. The Cauzy de-
clares that he had been requested
to do this by one Eyya Khan, who
however cannot be found and
Colonel Wilson is of opinion that
the Cauzy himself originated
the Petition & that he adopted
this mode of procedure be-
cause having been a witness
in support of Azizah Begum's
claim in the first instance,
he was unwilling now openly

to prove her an impostor.
The conclusion to which
Col. Wilson has come is that
there is no reason to suppose
any change to have taken
place in the person of the
recipient since the Pension
was granted, there is reason
to doubt the sufficiency of
the testimony adduced in
support of the original claim.

The four
teen persons
named in
the margin
have been
examined
by the Com-
missioner
of Police.
Of these
Nos. 1. 5. 6. 13
were con-
firmed in the
original sw-
No. 1.
No. 14. confirmed this and Nos. 1. 5. 6
(together with the two other persons
now deceased) signed a shah-

Germanah testifying that such
an event took place.

Translations of these
papers are enclosed by Col. Wilson.
Who styles the depositions "some-
what loose" & the Shahazgermainah
is of no value whatever as evi-
dence of identity. The Canzy (No. 1)
merely deposed that he had per-
formed the ceremony between the
two persons named. There was no-
thing to shew that he had seen the
face of the bride, and Syed Esmam
(No. 14) in his deposition equally
failed to shew that the woman with
whom his master Syed Shahouid
Khan performed nikah was iden-
tical with the applicant for an
allowance from Govt.

The Canzy (No. 1) now states
that Azizah Begum being 80th, he did
not see her at the time of the marriage
but that from what Esmam Khan,
(the supposed Petitioner) ^{recently} told him,
he believes that the woman now
obtaining the pension is not the
real Azizah Begum. When shown
the Shahazgermainah of 1855, he
in the first instance denied all
knowledge of it, but subsequently
allowed that it was in his own hand
writing, & sealed with his seal.
It was also brought to light that
he had received 200 Rupees from

Azizah Begum in 1859 as com-
pensation for his services. Col. Wilson
considers this man to be utterly
unworthy of credit.

Nos. 5 and 6 when questioned
regarding their connection with
the Shahazgermainah of 1855, as-
serted entire ignorance of its
existence, and were quite unable
to explain how their seals were
appended to it. The individuals are

No. 14. denied having been ex-
amined in 1859. he asserts however
that Shuktoom Bee is the same
as the Azizah Begum, and that
there has been no change. His
evidence in her favor stands
alone, and, as the Commission-
ers observe, it can hardly be con-
sidered. That of a disinterested
person, considering that he
receives a monthly allowance
of 3½ Rs from Shuktoom Bee
alias Azizah Begum out of
her pension of Rs. 25. and that
she presented him with 100 Rs.
on the arrears being paid.

Colonel Wilson considers it
worthy of remark that ^{neither} in the ori-
ginal enquiry ^{nor in the present one} was any
or domestic brought forward
to speak to the identity of Azizah
Begum alias Shuktoom Bee.
If she really had lived with Syed

For Pensioners names in columns 12 and 13 do
not correspond with the original of Azizah
Begum's pension who was examined by a com-
missioner and secretary in her behalf in 1859.
The arrears from the Collector's Treasury
has been completely paid in the hands of
her identity.

Shahomed Khan in Sydapett
for five or six years, ^{as his wife} some respect-
table testimony to that effect
would have been forthcoming.

^{Direct} The evidence which was brought
forward in the recent examination
before Colonel Wilson against the
present recipient being the nickah
widow of the deceased Syed Shahomed
Khan consisted of Nos 3, 4, 8, 9, & 12.
Nos 3 & 4 are mother and daughter
and as they were brought forward
by No. 1. (The Caizy) the Commissioner
thinks their evidence open
to considerable suspicion. Nos.
8 and 9 are brothers, and connec-
tions of Nos. 2 and 3. No. 12 appears
to be unconnected with the other four.
Nos. 2 and 3 affirm that they were
acquainted with the real Azizah
Begum, a very different looking
person to Shuktoom Bee, the present
recipient, who, moreover, was, at the
very time, living in their house in Sy-
dapett. Though in what capacity
does not appear. Nos 8 & 9 depose
to having seen Shuktoom Bee in the
house of 2 & 3 at the time referred
to and to add that she was a poor
woman living there on charity. No
12, who was at the time in the
service of a Shahomedan gen-
tleman at Sydapett, declares
that Shuktoom Bee, the present

recipient of the Rs. 25 Rupee pension,
was a servant in the house of
the Cuddapah Nawab (the deceased
Syed Shahomed Khan) but certainly
not his nickah wife, as she
behaved in every respect as quite
a common woman.

The evidence of Nos. 10 and 11
who are brothers, and the latter
of whom is styled by Colonel Wilson
a respectable Shahomedan gen-
tleman goes to show that Syed
Shahomed Khan never contract-
ed any nickah marriage. No.
10 used to see Shuktoom Bee in
the house of No. 2. No. 11 was on
intimate terms with Syed Sha-
homed Khan when they both
resided at Sydapett and must
have known if any nickah
ceremony had been performed.

No. 4 is a shik who undertook
to carry through the different
stages of Azizah Begum's applica-
tion for a pension on condition
of receiving one-third of the share
of the goh aircaas, or
an amount equal to 2 years allow-
ance if she got only the allow-
ance. He was not acquainted with
the person of Azizah Begum
when the aircaas were actually
paid being only 300 Rs or one
year's allowance.
No. 7 deposes that Shuktoom

Bee was once an inmate of his house for 2 or 3 years on a small stipend for teaching his daughters the Koran, & that she used to claim to be the Nickah wife of the Cudda-pah Nabab Syed Shahommed Khan who she said was then at Saidpatt & who would not pay her anything for her maintenance.

No. 13. Muktom Bee alias Azizah Begum, details the circumstances connected with her marriage & states that after her husband's death she lived in No. 7's house as Tutoress to his children for about 3 years after which she petitioned the authorities & eventually got a pension. When the arrears amounting to 1750 Rs. were disbursed she gave

to No. 4 (Vakil)...	No. 300-0-0	for his trouble
Do -	500 or 600-0-0	for Durbar expenses
Tufsooduk Hussain	200-0-0	now dead
Late Husband		
Creditor	200-0-0	
Syed Samam (No. 14)	100-0-0	being an old servant
	<u>1400-0-0</u>	

Further she paid monthly stipends to Nos. 1 and 4, about 3 1/2 Rs. each. These have been recently discontinued, and in consequence of this stoppage they have got up this charge against her. She also has paid No. 14 at the same rate all along.

The Deputy Collector of Cudda has satisfied himself that the present recipient, Muktom Bee, is the person described in the Pension Certificate.

The fact seems to be that a gross fraud has been perpetrated, and the only wonder is why the pension was ever given. The application was not made till 3 years after the death of Syed Shahommed Khan. The greatest difficulty was found in learning anything about the applicant. The then Commissioner of Police was reported to have said that the evidence was conflicting. The statement at least forwarded here of the loosest description, no opinion in favor of the applicant, was recorded by any of the subordinate authorities. No trustworthy female evidence was forthcoming to support the claim.

It would seem that the Company put the woman forward and with the help of the Vakil (No. 4) and the Government Pensioners 5 & 6 and others now dead, all of whom, as the Commissioner observes, probably received a consideration for their trouble, carried out his plan, & got a large share of the

blunder. Now probably, as
Lusk too has deposed, because
nothing more is to be had, he is
endeavouring to revenge him-
self on the pensioners.

Colonel Wilson who has not examined the witnesses on oath in case it might afterwards be thought advisable to institute legal proceedings in the matter, suggests that the whole case be reconsidered.

From certain petition, pre-
sented by "Azizah Begum" it
appears that the pension has
not been disbursed to her since
May last. What steps are now
to be taken? Should the paper
be sent to the Law Officers for
their opinion as to prosecuting
the parties concerned? Should
payment of the pension of Nos.
5 & 6 be suspended?

call
16/11

Fort St George
24th Novr/68

24 Nov/08
 Mr C. To the Govt Solicitor with Petition of Encl. Asst. Secy. 2^d Div. 40/11
 " " Commissioner of Police
 14 " B of Recd
 8 " Civil Paymaster

Handwritten text in Urdu script, mostly illegible due to fading and bleed-through from the reverse side of the page.

Memo for orders

Azizah Begum's
Pension

3

Be Watch
Today

Handwritten text at the bottom of the page, mostly illegible.

Revenue 1863 Dept
Pres. Govt. for 1863

No 2102

Pres. of the Madras Govt
D/21st Nov/63

From the Govt. of Madras.
D/26th November 63. No 2895 in No.

Report of the Commis-
sioner of Police on a petition
presented by one Gyan Kishan
bringing to notice that certain
fraud is carried out in drawing
the pension of Huzeyah Begum
a widow wife of late Syed
Allahomed Khan of Cuddapah
forwarded to the Government
Law Officers for opinion.

No 285 + 286.