

MADRAS RECORD OFFICE.

Government of Madras.

Revenue DEPARTMENT.

G.O. No.	926	Press Mis.
¹⁶⁸⁻⁶⁹ Dated	7-4-	1868.

Not to be folded or roughly handled

*Proceedings of the Madras Government, Revenue Department,
7th April 1868.*

No. 168. Read the following letter from GULAM MAHOMED SAVI, late Jaghir Pensioner, to the Chief Secretary to Government, Fort St. George, dated Madras, 12th March 1868:—

I beg to forward herewith triplicate copies of my Memorial to the Right Honorable the Secretary of State for India in Council, and to represent that I and my large family are suffering the direst want and starvation for the long period of eight years, combined with the miseries of raggedness and penury, in consequence of the stoppage of my pension; the circumstances of which are fully detailed in my Memorial, a perusal of which will fully convince your Honor that great injustice has been done to me. I have therefore to request that you will be graciously pleased to obtain the favorable recommendation of His Excellency the Right Honorable the Governor to the Right Honorable the Secretary of State for India in Council, and procure an order for the re-continuance of my pension of Rupees 4-3-9.

No. 169. ORDER THEREON, 7th April 1868, No. 926.

Miscellaneous.

The Memorial will be forwarded to the Right Honorable the Secretary of State, through the Government of India, under clause III of the revised Memorial rules.

(True Extract.)

(Signed) W. HUDLESTON,
Secretary to Government.

Esd. S. T. Augustin.

REVENUE DEPARTMENT,
FORT ST. GEORGE,
7th April 1868.

No. 170.

No. 927.

To

THE SECRETARY TO THE GOVERNMENT OF INDIA,
FINANCIAL DEPARTMENT.

SIR,

Miscellaneous.

1. I am directed to forward, to the Government of India, a Memorial from one Gulam Mahomed Savi, late a Jaghir pensioner, for transmission to the Secretary of State for India under clause III of the revised Memorial rules.

2. The Memorialist, a pensioner of Government, was convicted in 1858 by the Session Court, and sentenced on two separate charges to two periods of imprisonment, for fifteen and twelve months, for complicity in extensive frauds discovered in connection with the payment of pensions to the family of the former Sattampakum Jaghirdar. The Memorialist, among others, deposed in 1855, and again before the Collector in 1856, that a pensioner named Ghouse Bee, who was in receipt of Rupees 46-10-0, was the daughter of one Jainup Bee by her husband Syud Ali, and thus a granddaughter of a deceased stipendiary of the Jaghir, whereas in fact Ghouse Bee was a daughter of one Sheik Hussein, a Vakeel employed on behalf of certain "Gosha" pensioners. In the second case, the Memorialist was convicted of similar false testimony in regard to the asserted relationship of one Koolsum Bee to another member of the Sattampak family. The Memorialist had been further committed for trial on a third similar charge, which however it was not considered necessary to prosecute, as convictions had been obtained against him in two cases.

3. The Government in 1858, concurred with the Board and the Collector in considering that the Memorialist's pension had been forfeited by his misconduct, and directed its discontinuance.

4. In January 1867, the Memorialist requested the restoration of his pension with arrears. His request was then refused, and the Governor in Council sees no reason now to recommend the present application for favorable consideration.

I have the honor to be,

Sir,

Your most obedient servant,

(Signed) W. HUDLESTON,

Secretary to Government.

Exd. S. T. Augustin.

The Right Honorable the Secretary of State
for India in Council.

East India House

London.

The humble Memorial of
Gulam Mahomed Saive late
a Jaghire Pensioner

Most humbly sheweth,

That Memorialist having been
deprived, under the order of Government of his
paltry pension amounting to Rupees 4-3-9
per Mensem in respect to a false charge
of complicity in the frauds practised by
certain members of the Batampathum Jagirdar
family he most humbly presumes to lay
his case before your Excellency in Council
in the earnest and fervent hope that after
a just and merciful consideration of the
same your Excellency will be graciously
pleased to pass an order to replace him in
the enjoyment of his hereditary pension.

That Memorialist's father
Mahomed Ismael Saive enjoyed a Jaghire
pension of Rupees 20 which on his demise
after deducting one third was apportioned
among his 5 heirs, Memorialist being
a recipient as the head male representative

Financial 1868 Department.

[]

From Government of
Fort St. George,

To

The Government of India.

No. 927.

Enclosures

6 spare copies.

Dated 7th April.

R.

D. No. }
L. No. } Progs. {
 { D. No.

SUBJECT.

Forwarding a Memorial from one Gulam Maho-
med Saive, late a Jaghir pensioner, for trans-
mission to the Secretary of State for India,
under clause III of the revised Memorial
rules.

of the family. Notwithstanding which the share of the two of the members of the family, who are living as also that of the two deceased have been solicited to Government and the above mentioned amount of Rupees 43.9 was alone continued to him.

That whilst Memorialist was content and thankful with his small stipend it also was solicited and the ground on which this stoppage was made is that he was one of the collusive parties by which the said fraud was perpetrated.

Memorialist here wants solemnly avers that he was no party to the fraud and that he was not at all aware that any such fraud was being practiced, for certainly, he would not have risked the forfeiture of his stipend, he not having received the smallest benefit from Ghose Bee, who, it would appear, drew her allowance under false pretences.

Mohideen Begum one of the Petitioners of the Satampattam Saghir applied to Mr. Collector, Hindleston for the continuance of her deceased grandmother's stipend which that Authority disallowed consequent on her enjoying a pension in her own right. She subsequently represented that she adopted one Ghose Bee and solicited that her grandmother's stipend should be continued to her said adopted daughter. Mr. Hindleston caused an enquiry to be made into the matter thro' one Abdul Cawder whom

whom Mohideen Begum nominated as her Vakil on the report of the Vakil. The Collector forwarded a report favorable to the claims of the adopted daughter Ghose Bee, to the Board of Revenue. Meanwhile Mr. Collector Hindleston took his departure for England, where Mr. Slater who succeeded him was directed to make further enquiry which that Officer did and submitted his report but before he could receive a reply from the Board he also retired. The Board however finally approved of the adoption and directed one third of the pension of Begum Bee the grandmother of Mohideen Begum should be continued to Ghose Bee and 4 years arrears paid.

Abdul Cawder, the Vakil, having denied Mr. Collector Cuscliffe ordered Mohideen Begum to appoint another whom she appointed Memorialist he being a Kameashdar.

The conditions on which Memorialist accepted the Vakilship were:

- I That he would scrupulously decline the stipend to the right party.
- II That he would faithfully report her existence and
- III That he would also report whether Ghose Bee strictly confines herself a Parha female. Beyond these three conditions, Memorialist was not responsible, he not having

been acquainted with the antecedents of either
Mahideen Begum or Ghasee Bee nor the
nature of the statements made by the
former Vakil Abdool Camder or the
Germani's Master.

Here Memorialist would humbly
beg to solicit the attention of your August
authority to the following points.

First - Memorialist gave no deposition
or any declaration as to whether Ghasee
Bee was or was not a member of the
^{Saghuider's} Satimphaknu family.

Second - That it was on the deposition
of Abdool Camder who must have acted
in collusion with Mahideen Begum and
the connivance of the Circar servants that
sanction was obtained from Government
for the payment of the stipend of Ghasee
Bee.

Third - That it was only after the sanction
of the pension that Memorialist was asked
by Mahideen Begum to act as Vakil
which to his great misfortune disinterestedly
did, tho' he was in no ways connected
with the family.

From the foregoing your Excellency
cannot but perceive that Memorialist was
perfectly innocent and that in fact he could
not have been guilty of complicity in the
fraud and that it was only thro' the
misrepresentations of the Katcheri Subor-
dinates that he was so severely punished
as

as to be taken on mere suspicion, placed in
strict confinement; precluded from citing witnesses
and thereby rendered unable to establish his
innocence and thereafter to be sentenced to
rigorous imprisonment for 15 months together
with the deprivation of his hereditary pension.

And what was done to the really
guilty individual, said Mahideen Begum?
Was he brought to trial? Was she placed in
confinement? Was she sentenced to imprisonment
anything of the kind. On the contrary tho' her
distress allowance was discontinued yet she
was allowed a moiety of the pension drawn
by her sister Mahumunadi Begum.

Yet still more Memorialist would
further submit that the pension of Ghasee Bee
was only Rspees 300 per mensem and what
could she have given him out of that small
amount? Besides if Memorialist had been
aware of the fraud practised by Ghasee Bee
in drawing a pension which had lapsed he would
have been the first to bring it to notice as
he would have thereby secured a reward and
not been simpleton enough to risk his own stipend
by conniving at it.

Memorialist again and again pe-
titioned the local Government for the restoration
of his pension but to no effect - his guilt
being taken for granted and without any
inquiry into the real nature of the case
from the very commencement refer him to
their previous orders.

the secretary of state
through the Govt

His now nearly 8 years since Memorialists
stipend has been discontinued and he and his
hapless family have been suffering the
greatest privation and distress. In con-
sideration of his hard and pitiful case
and of all the foregoing circumstances
Memorialist most humbly solicits
Your Excellency to pass an order directing
the local Government to pass an order
to recontinue his pension.

And Memorialist as in duty bound

Shall ever pray.

Madras
12th March
1868

Proceedings of the Madras Government, Political Department,
15th June 1867.

Read the following :—

No. 47. To THE HONORABLE A. J. ARBUTHNOT,

Chief Secretary to Government, Fort Saint George.

The humble petition of GOOLAM MAHMOOD
SAVEE, late Jaghire Pensioner, residing at
Madras,

RESPECTFULLY SHOWETH,

That your poor and humble petitioner being fully impressed of your Honor's gracious and charit-
able disposition in bettering the condition of the poor and needy, most respectfully begs leave to
represent that the hereditary Jaghire pension which he has been enjoying, in substitution of the
Jaghire which was resumed by Government, was most unjustly and unmercifully put a stop to,
owing to certain alleged charges of his having been complicated in a fraud committed by one
Ghouse Bee, a pensioner.

2. That, in refutation of the above charge, the petitioner begs leave to state that he acted
only as Vakeel in drawing the stipend of the above Ghouse Bee, as directed by the Collector, from
whose office that woman was drawing her stipend, and that he was, and is, quite ignorant of any
deceit which had been proved to have been committed by that woman; and, besides, petitioner
was not in the habit of drawing any pension from the Collector's Office, to be acquainted with the
particulars on which that woman was pensioned. It is, therefore, quite unreasonable and
unjust to punish the petitioner, both by unjustly subjecting him to legal punishment for the
alleged offence, and more cruelly by putting a stop to the payment of the pension, which was
continued to be paid to petitioner, not as a bounty of Government, but as a compensation for the
Jaghire resumed by Government.

3. That your petitioner further begs leave to state that the pension which he was enjoying,
being one that is to be continued for another life also, he cannot be deprived of the same,
for the alleged offence for which he was most unjustly punished.

4. That two pensioners, who were deprived of their pensions for having been complicated
in the fraud above alluded to, have been since restored to their pensions. One of them, named
Abdoollah Sayid, was paid his pension with arrears for four years; and the other pensioner, Fiddah
Hoossain, was pensioned on two-thirds of his former pension.

5. That, as your petitioner has been unjustly deprived of his hereditary pension, and
as his large family and himself are now suffering very seriously in these days of scarcity,
and are left without anything whatever to eat and dress, he prays that his case may be sub-
mitted for the benevolent consideration of His Excellency the Governor, and that orders may be
issued to the Government Agent at Chepauk for the restoration of his small pension of only
Rupees 4-3-9 per mensem, with arrears, as he was severely punished for the alleged offence.

For which act of benevolence and justice, your petitioner, as in duty bound, shall ever pray.

MADRAS, 22nd January 1867.

(Signed) غلام محمود ساوی

No. 48.

ORDER THEREON, 15th June 1867, No. 170.

The Government are not prepared to issue orders for the re-continuance of the petitioner's
stipend with arrears. The petitioner's complicity in the frauds in connection with which he was
convicted by the Session Court cannot be disputed; while, with reference to the two cases cited, it
is observed that, in each case, there were special reasons for the indulgence shown, which special
reasons do not exist in the petitioner's case.

(True Extract).

(Signed) A. J. Arbuthnot
Chief Secretary.

To the Government Agent, Chepauk.

Endorsement to Goolam Mahmood Savee, through the Petition Department.

Exd. J. H. Burns.

Revenue Separ ¹¹/₁₂

N. 926.

Proceedings of the Madras Court
under date the 7th March 1868.

Read the follow-
ing petition from Gulum
Mohamed Savi, late
Jaghire Cessioner, Madras.

stating the distress
to which he is subjected
owing to the discontinu-
ance of his stipend, the
last 8 years, and
his memorial, in tripli-
cate, addressed to the
Secy of State for India
soliciting the continuance
of his stipend, & prays
that it may be forwarded
to its proper destination.

(Here entered 12th
March 1868).

The memorial
will be forwarded
to the Right Honorable
the Secretary of State
through the Govt.

11th June 1868

of India, under clause
III of the revised memo-
rial rules -

N. 168 x 169

Revenue 1808 Defiant
Pro: of Court for April
N. 926
Pro: of the other side
27 April 1808

Car
Des

Specimen
of the
Dust

Revenue Defiant
4. Apr. 1808
N. 927

207

The Secy to the Govt of India,
Financial Dept.

Sir,

I am directed
to forward to the Govt of
India a memorial from
Gulam Mohamed Lavi,
late a ~~freedom fighter~~
for transmission to the
Secy of State for India
under clause III of the
revised memorial rules.
2. The memorialist,
a pensioner of Govt, was
convicted ^{in 1852} by the Session
Court and sentenced
on two separate charges
to two periods of im-
prisonment for 12 ¹⁵ months
for complicity
in extensive frauds
discovered in connection

W.D.

N. 168 x 169

with the payment of
pensions to the family
of the former Sattam-
-pattam Jaghiredar.
The memorialist, among
others, deposed in 1855,
and again before the
Collector in 1856 that
a pensioner named
Chouse Bee who was
in receipt of Rs 46-10-¹¹
^{to keep him up sufficiently} was a grand daughter
of a deceased stipendiary
of the Jaghire, whereas
in fact, Chouse Bee was
the daughter ^{or think daughter} of a Kakeel
employed on behalf
of certain "Gosha" pen-
sioners. - In the second
case the memorialist
was convicted of similar
false testimony in re-
gard to the asserted
relationship of one
Koolam Bee to another
member of the family

The memorialist had
been further committed
for trial on these
similar charges. It
however it was not
considered necessary
to prosecute - as conviction
had been obtained against
him in two cases.

family - X
3. The Govt ^{in 1858} con-
-curred with the Board
and the Collector, in
considering that the
memorialist's pension
had been ^{by his misconduct} forfeited, and
directed the discontinu-
-ance of his allowance.
4. In January 1867
the memorialist request-
ed the ^{recommenda-} ~~recommenda-~~
of his ^{pension} ~~stipend~~ with an
allowance - this request
was then refused, and
I am to state that the
Governor in Council ex-
presses no reason to re-
-commend the present
application for favora-
-ble consideration.

[Signature] 7B

[Signature]

No 140

Received at 1808 Dep't
Pro: of 1000 of and April
1809
No 140
He kept to the Government
of Charles Finney
Department dated 17 April 1808