

MADRAS RECORD OFFICE.

Government of Madras.

Revenue DEPARTMENT.

G.O. No. 493

Press
~~Mis.~~

260-262

Dated 22 - 3. 19/86

Not to be folded or roughly handled

*Proceedings of the Madras Government, Revenue Department,
22nd March 1864.*

No. 260.

Read the following letters:—

(Copy.)

OFFICE MEMORANDUM.

FORT WILLIAM, FINANCIAL DEPARTMENT, *the 1st July 1863*, No. 2,885.

1. With reference to Office Memorandum from the Foreign Department, No. 297, dated 8th June 1863, the undersigned is directed to state, that it seems clear that the pension of Rupees 300 a month drawn by the late Mirza Mahomed Ali Khan from Masulipatam, was in addition to the Persian pension of Rupees 400 a month, which is mentioned in the Memorandum; and that, so far as present information shows, it was unauthorizedly drawn. As, however, the letters of the Government of Madras relating to the monthly pension of Rupees 300 were addressed to the Foreign Department, who, in Endorsement No. 171, of 24th March 1863, connected them with the separate correspondence regarding the Persian pension, it was presumed in this Department that the two pensions were identical, and that the discrepancy in the amounts arose from inadvertence in the correspondence received from Bombay.

2. The undersigned is further directed to state that a copy of the Memorandum under acknowledgment will be sent to the Pay and Audit Departments, Madras and Bombay, and that a copy of the Foreign Department's Endorsement No. 60 of 9th October 1861, which has already been communicated to the Departments at Madras, will now be communicated to the Departments at Bombay; but that, with reference to the concluding words of the Memorandum of the 8th June 1863, no further orders appear to be necessary in the Financial Department.

(Signed) E. H. LUSHINGTON,
Secretary to the Government of India.

Copy to the Deputy Auditor and Accountant General, and the Civil Paymaster, Madras, with a copy of the Foreign Department's endorsement, No. 297, dated 8th June 1863.

Copy of the foregoing, and of the Foreign Department's endorsements, Nos. 60 and 297, dated 9th October 1861, and 8th June 1863, to the Deputy Auditor and Accountant General, and the Civil Paymaster, Bombay.

No. 384.

Copy forwarded to the Government of Fort Saint George for information and any further observations.

FORT WILLIAM,
FOREIGN DEPARTMENT, FINANCE,
The 31st July 1863.

By Order,

(Signed) J. T. WHEELER,
Assistant Secretary to the Government of India.

(True Copy.)

(Signed) J. T. WHEELER,
Assistant Secretary to the Government of India.

No. 261. From J. T. WHEELER, Esq., Assistant Secretary to the Government of India, Foreign Department, Finance, to the Chief Secretary to the Government of Fort Saint George, dated Fort William, the 14th December 1863, No. 600.

SIR,

1. I have the honor to draw your attention to this Office docket, No. 384, dated 31st July last, relative to the pensions enjoyed by the late Mirza Mahomed Ali Khan, and to request that the further information therein called for may be furnished without delay.

*Proceedings of the Madras Government, Revenue Department,
22nd March 1861.*

2. I am at the same time directed to forward, for the information of the Government of Fort Saint George, copy of an Office Memorandum, addressed to the Financial Department No. 237, dated 8th June last, on the subject.

(Copy)

OFFICE MEMORANDUM.

FORT WILLIAM, FOREIGN DEPARTMENT, FINANCE, the 8th June 1863, No. 237.

1. In reply to the Office Memorandum from the Financial Department, dated 28th March No. 1,237, regarding pensions to the family of Jaffir Ali Khan, the undersigned has the honor to submit the following statement which, it is believed, exhibits the actual state of the case, that given in the Memorandum under reply being apparently in some points erroneous.

2. Jaffir Ali was fourth son of the Nawab of Masulipatam, to whose family the Government granted a pension of one lac per annum in 1772. Jaffir Ali's share of this pension was 419-6-0 under an arrangement made by Mr. Cotsford, from which, however, upon his employment in Persia a sum of Rupees 119-6-0 was allotted for the maintenance of his wife and family at Masulipatam, he continuing to receive the balance of 300 himself.

3. Jaffir Ali died in Persia in 1818, and from the correspondence of that period (a copy of which is herewith enclosed) it will be seen that he was in receipt of a pension in Persia of 400 Rupees, which is stated to have been only the moiety of a pension which he received from the British Government.

4. Jaffir Ali's Persian pension at the rate of 400 Rupees was continued to his son, Mahomed Ali, who also it seems not improbable through his Agents at Masulipatam, received 300 Rupees from the Madras Government on account of his father's share in the original lac granted to the Nawab of Masulipatam. Upon Mahomed Ali's death last year, a moiety of his "Persian" pension or 200 Rupees was continued to his sons.

5. There can be no question that to Jaffir Ali's two sons a separate pension of 400 Rupees a month (between them) was granted by the letters to the Governments of Bombay and Madras, dated 31st July 1818. In the former it is said "this pension being assigned to the family on account chiefly of Jaffir Ali's political services in Persia, the amount of it seems to be justly chargeable to the Supreme Government in the Political Department, and communication on the subject of this letter will be made to the Government of Fort Saint George." Mahomed Ali appears to have come into possession of the whole of this pension, and what the Order of the Foreign Department of the 9th October 1861 granted to Mahomed Ali's sons was the moiety of this sum, which as these facts will show was correctly stated at 200 Rupees and not at 150 Rupees as the Financial Department suppose. The only questions for consideration are, firstly, whether the 300 Rupees to which Jaffir Ali seems to have been entitled as the son of Hussain Ali under Mr. Cotsford's division of the lac granted in 1772, descended to Mahomed Ali or any portion of it in addition to the separate pension granted in 1818; and secondly, if so, whether Mahomed Ali's descendants have any claim to its continuance.

6. The correspondence of 1818 shows that Jaffir Ali was supposed to have drawn 400 Rupees in Persia and 400 Rupees in Madras. Whether this was or was not approximately correct, there can be little doubt that the Order in which that correspondence resulted was intended to include every thing to which the family was considered entitled. If Mahomed Ali in addition to the 400 Rupees per mensem granted in Persia, drew any part of the pension granted originally to Hussain Ali Khan in Masulipatam he drew, it would seem, more than he was intended to have. Pensions of that class it would appear in the case of Durdambee's daughters (quoted by Mr. Thornhill in his letter* No. 4 of 1862) have been decided not to be hereditary, and could therefore only be continued by a special grant, of which the

* Enclosure in letter from Secretary to Government, Fort Saint George, dated 20th February 1862, No. 373.

*Proceedings of the Madras Government, Revenue Department,
22nd March 1864.*

present correspondence not only affords no trace, but of which on the contrary it goes rather to infer the improbability.

7. As to the second point, it may be conceded that if Mahomed Ali even had a separate grant of the share of Hussain Ali Khan's pension, yet as it is not hereditary, its further continuance is by no means a matter of course, and the further grant of any portion is therefore still a question for consideration.

(Signed) J. T. WHEELER,

Assistant Secretary to the Government of India.

(True Copy.)

(Signed) J. T. WHEELER,

Assistant Secretary to the Government of India.

No. 232.

ORDER THEREON, 22nd March 1864, No. 493.

* G. O. 5th December 1861, No. 2,262.
" 20th February 1862, " 371.
" 27th March " " 670.
" 2nd June " " 1,270.

Resolved that the Board of Revenue be requested, with reference to the Orders of Government noted in the margin,* to call upon the Collector of the Kistna District to report whether Mahomed Ali therein referred to has left any family or near relatives entitled to support from him at Masulipatam, and if so, to state their names, age, relationship and circumstances.

(Signed) J. D. SIM,

Secretary to Government.

REVENUE DEPARTMENT.
FORT SAINT GEORGE,
22nd March 1864.

No. 494.

No. 263.

From

J. D. SIM, Esq.,

Secretary to the Government of Fort Saint George,

To

The Assistant Secretary to the Government of India, Foreign Department.

SIR,

1. I am directed by His Excellency the Governor in Council to inform you with reference to your Office docket No. 384, dated 31st July last, and your letter dated 14th December last, No. 600, that there is no information on the records of this Government relating to the pension of Rupees 400 per mensem paid to the late Mirza Mahomed Ali Khan by the Bombay Government. All the available information regarding the pension of Rupees 300 per mensem paid to him from

20th February 1862, No. 372.
27th March " " 671.
2nd June " " 1,208.

the Masulipatam Treasury has already been furnished in the letters from this Office of dates noted in the margin.

2. Mahomed Ali's pension was duly sanctioned by this Government on the 1st October

To the late Honorable the Court of Directors, dated 12th
October 1821, paragraphs 5, 6.
From do. dated 18th August 1824, paragraphs 89, 90.

1822 in accordance with the recommendation of the Commissioners appointed to investigate and report upon the claims of the family. It was

charged to the revenues of this Presidency, and it is now for this Government to consider what should be done with it, and in due course to submit their recommendation to the Supreme Government. It seems a waste of time to go into the questions which are discussed in the Memorandum received with your letter, dated 14th December 1863. Whether Mahomed Ali was entitled to the good service pension which he drew from the Supreme Government, as well as to the share of the Masulipatam allowance which he drew from this Government is now a matter of very little importance, for the consequences of any such error could not be visited on his children. Neither the good service pension nor the Masulipatam allowance are hereditary, and in their ultimate recommendation this Government will take into consideration the grant of a moiety of the former which the Supreme Government have seen fit to make to Mahomed Ali's two sons.

3. The Collector of Masulipatam has been desired to report whether Mahomed Ali has left any family or near relatives entitled to support from him at that place, and if so, to state their names, age and circumstances. On receipt of this information a further communication will be addressed to you, and the Supreme Government can then finally decide the matter.

I have the honor to be,

Sir,

Your most obedient servant,

(Signed) J. D. SIM,

Secretary to Government.

Exd. S. T. Augustin.

Revenue Department

1498 No. 1493
Proceedings of the Madras Government
under date the 22nd March 1864

Read the fol-
-lowing letters from the
Asst Secy to the Govt of
India, Foreign Departt-
(Here enter 31st
July and 14th Decr 1863,
Nos 384 and 600/-

Resolved that the
Board of Revenue here
presented with reference
to the orders of Govt
noted in the margin
to call upon the Collector
of the Krishna District
to report whether Mahomed
therein referred to
all has left any family
or near relatives
enabled to support
from him at Mas-
lipatam and if not to

14th Decr 1861 No 2262-
-11- 20th Feb 1862 - 371.
-11- 27th March 1862 - 640.
-11- 2nd June 1862 - 1270-
2nd June 1862

MD
Rev Secy

state their names
relationships:
age and circumstances.

4 Copies to the B. of Rec. Aug 17
2 to Bank

out of hand

Revenue Department

W. 494.

W. 494.

Sir,

The Assistant Secretary
to the Govt of India
Foreign Department

W.B.

The big bundle which
accompanies is not
worth looking into. The
case is this - Mahomed
ally some how got hold
of two pensions - one
from Bengal or Bombay
& one from Madras. The
Supreme Court ^{have} continued
for the former to his two
sons - and are colly dis-
cussing whether he shall
have any of the Madras
pension! It is clearly
for the Madras Court to
consider & report on
this - & the Draft is
founded on this view

I.D.S.

W. 494.

Sir,
I am directed
by His Excellency the
Governor in Council
to inform you with re-
ference to your office
docket, No. 384 dated
31st July last and your
letter dated 14th Decem-
ber last, No. 600 that
there is no information
on the records of this
Government relating
to the pension of Ru-
pees 400 per mensem
paid to the late Mirza
Mahomed

Revenue 1864. 12/15
no of Govt for others.

W. 493.

Secy of the Madras Govt.
12/22. Madras 1864.

To Secy of Govt of India
Foreign Department.

Revenue 1864.

Reported to Secy of India
certain particulars as
to the family of Mirza
Mahomed ally & the
of the said Mirza.

No 2600 262.

Best
W. 494.

Mahomed Ali Khan
by the Bombay Go-
vernment. All the
available informa-
tion regarding the
pension of Rupees
300 per mensem
paid to him from
the Masulipatam
Treasury has already
been furnished in
the letters from this
office of dates noted
in the margin.

20th Feb^y 1862, No 372.
27th March " " 671.
12th June " " 1208.

Mahomed Ali's
pension was duly sanc-
tioned by His Gov^y on the
1st October 1822 in accordance with
the recommendation of the Com:
appointed to investigate and re-
port upon the claims of the family.
It was charged to the
revenue

To the late Hon^{ble} the Com^r of
Directors dated 12th Oct^r 1821
paras 5-6
From Do. - dated 18th Aug^r 1824
paras 89-90

31
revenues of this Presi-
dency - and it is now
for this Government
to consider what should
be done with it, and
in due course to sub-
mit their recommenda-
tion to the Supreme Gov^t.
It seems a waste of time
to go into the questions
which are discussed
in the memo received
with your letter dated
14th December 1863.
Whether Mahomed Ali
was entitled to the good
service pension which
he drew from the Su-
preme Gov^t as well as
to the share of the Masu-
lipatam allowance
which he drew from
this Government is now
a matter of very little
importance.

importance, for the
consequences of any
such error could not
be visited on his children.
Neither the good service
rendered nor the Masulihataw allowance
are hereditary and
in their ultimate recom-
mendation this Govt will
take into consideration
the grant of a moiety
of the former which
the Supreme Govt have
seen fit to make to
Mahomed Ali's two
sons.

The collector of
Masulihataw has
been desired to report
whether Mahomed Ali
has left any family
or near relatives entitled
to support from him
at

91 91
at that place and
if so, to state their
names - age and
circumstances. On
receipt of this inform-
-ation a further
communication will
be addressed to you
and the Supreme
Government can then
finally decide the
matter.

Fort St. George
23^d March / 64

Revenue 1864 Sept 11th
220 of Govt for Island.

18494.

To the Capt. Henry C.
Wentworth of Dublin
American Agent
of 1864 Island 1864.

From the same day 1864. per 1/2
of 1864 per 1864.

Concerning to the
quarantine of the
concerning the revenue
and family of things
abandoned all the

Handwritten signature
James H. H. H.