

- (1) Number of Pages 68
(2) Date of repair 2-8-68
(3) Initials of the Referencer _____

MADRAS RECORD OFFICE

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS

Revenue DEPARTMENT

G.O. No.
B.P. No.

1801

Press
Mis.

Dated

25-11-1966

196

Not to be folded or roughly handled

130

*Proceedings of the Madras Government, Revenue Department,
25th November 1876.*

No. 471. Read the following Proceedings of the Board of Revenue, dated 27th September 1876, No. 2,446 :—

Read again Board's Miscellaneous Proceedings, dated 13th January 1875, No. 237.

Read also the following papers :—

From W. S. WHITESIDE, Esq., Collector of North Arcot, to H. F. STOKES, Esq., Acting Secretary to the Board of Revenue, dated Palmanair, 30th September 1875, No. 529.

In returning herewith the Petitions, Nos. 2,455 and 2,925 of 1874 and Nos. 154 and 990 of 1875, received with the Board's Proceedings, dated 30th July last, No. 2,140, I have the honor to state that from the report of the Tahsildar of Vellore it appears that Mahomed Motafar Khan, the eldest son of the late Jaghiredar of Rangangadi, possesses Inam lands in the town of Arcot measuring Cawnies 31-14-0 enfranchised by the Inam Commissioner, and a house in the Vellore Town, the former worth about Rs. 700 and the latter Rupees 200. A portion of the Inam lands has been leased out for building purposes to some persons who pay an annual rent of Rupees 210, the other portion being left waste from time immemorial as it is not fit for cultivation. Of the above sum, Rupees 90 are paid annually on account of the salary of a servant employed in collecting rent and as quit-rent due on the Inam in question. The difference between these two sums, viz., Rupees 120, is paid to the niece widow, Zenatim Nissa Begum, as interest on a partition bond of Rupees 1,000 executed by the eldest son of the Jaghiredar on mortgaging the Inam lands and the house above alluded to. Besides this, the family has contracted debts to the extent of Rupees 1,000 on the mortgage of certain jewels. Under these circumstances, it will be seen that the family of the late Jaghiredar is by no means in a prosperous condition.

ENCLOSURES Nos. 1 to 4.—Petitions.

From J. H. GARSTIN, Esq., Collector of South Arcot, to H. E. STOKES, Esq., Acting Secretary to the Board of Revenue, dated Cuddalore, 25th November 1875, No. 507.

In reply to the Board's Proceedings of the 30th July, No. 2,140, I have the honor to enclose an abstract of a report from the Tittagudi Deputy Tahsildar relative to the property possessed by the late Mahomed Jaffer Hussain Khan, Jaghiredar of Rangangadi.

ENCLOSURE No. 1.

Abstract of an Arzi from the Deputy Tahsildar of Tittagudi.

It appears that none of the relatives of the late Mahomed Jaffer Hussain Khan, Jaghiredar of Rangangadi, formerly resided or now resides in the village of Tittagudi or in any other village of that division. He had Cawnies 33-10-3 of punjah worth Rupees 350, Cawnies 4-4-0 of nunjah worth Rupees 1,000, and a house and shed worth Rupees 200, in the village of Malayanoor, in Virdachellum Taluq. Of these, Cawnies 36-3-3 of punjah and nunjah are mortgaged to one Veerachi Reddy of Sirupakam for Rupees 2,606-4-0. In addition to this, the mortgagee is also in enjoyment of Cawnies 0-11-0 of the land; the remaining 1 Cawny of punjah has been given by the Jaghiredar to one Syed Rahiman alias Syed Jalal Sahib. Some of the late Jaghiredar's relations (fifty-nine in number, including some servants) reside at Vellore and ten others at Triplicane. One Ali Raja Sahib Kalami, late Jaghiredar's grandson by his daughter, who holds a Power of Attorney

*Proceedings of the Madras Government, Revenue Department,
25th November 1876.*

from the widow of the said Mahomed Jaffer Hossain Khan Bahadoor, resides at Rangangadi. This man and one Saravana Pillay who had been in the service of the Jaghiredar (it appears his forefathers also were in the service of the Jaghiredar's family) state that, besides the above-said property, the Jaghiredar possessed also property (land, trees, and fort), valued at Rupees 17,885, in seven villages in the taluq of Perambalor in the district of Trichinopoly. He also owned twenty-four godowns or shops worth Rupees 10,000 at Triplicane, and a tiled house of 150 Rupees value at Vellere. Of the property situated in the Perambalor Taluq, Rupees 7,216 worth has been mortgaged for Rupees 6,425 and the mortgagees are in the enjoyment thereof, the remainder 469 Rupees worth having been endowed for the maintenance of a Musjeed, &c. The shops at Triplicane are rented out and the income therefrom, amounting to between 50 and 70 Rupees a-month, is appropriated by the Jaghiredar's widow towards the cost of the establishment and repair of the shops and the liquidation of debts incurred by the Jaghiredar, and the house at Vellore is in the occupation of the Jaghiredar's widow and children.

(Signed) J. H. GARSTIN,
Collector.

From H. SEWELL, Esq., Acting Collector of Trichinopoly, to C. A. GALTON, Esq.,
Acting Secretary to the Board of Revenue, dated 12th April 1876, No. 89.

ADVERTING to the Board's Proceedings, dated 30th July 1875, No. 2,140, I have the honor to submit the following report.

2. The family of the deceased Mahomed Jaffer Khan possesses property no where in the district except Perambalor Taluq:

	RS.	3. The property consists of the items noted in the margin, but it is stated to be heavily encumbered with debt, not a single acre being in the possession of the family.
23.72 Acres of wet land situated in seven villages and valued at ...	5,717	
49 Acres of dry land do. do. ...	1,943	
20 Tamarind trees do. do. ...	20	
3 Buildings do. do. ...	200	
Total ...	7,885	

4. The Tahsildar of Perambalor, in submitting his report on the subject in October last, simply stated that the lands in question were in the enjoyment of persons who have advanced money upon them. Not satisfied with this vague statement, I required him to find out upon what title they enjoyed the land, and after a protracted delay and repeated calls he submitted the result of his inquiry, which I still think not complete. It now turns out that most of the documents upon which these money-lenders base their claim are of recent dates, so recent as 24th February last, in some cases that the Deputy Collector in charge of the division doubts their genuineness. Further inquiries regarding them are being made, and the result will be communicated in due course.

5. There is a fort in Thevayur belonging to the family which goes by the name of Rangangadi Fort. It is a fine building and in tolerable preservation, though greatly overgrown with prickly-pear. The fort has no money value except on account of its stones, and there is not likely to be any demand for them. It is a picturesque object and of some historical interest, and I hope it will be preserved. I entered it in the list of buildings sent to Board.

From the same Officer, dated 7th August 1876, No. 206.

REFERRING to my letter, No. 89, dated the 12th of April last, I have the honor to inform you that I have received a further report from the Deputy Collector on General Duties, and the following particulars are elicited therefrom.

*Proceedings of the Madras Government, Revenue Department,
25th November 1876.*

2. The extent given in my letter, No. 89, dated the 12th of April last, was, for convenience of reference, divided in the statement furnished by the Deputy Collector on the 6th idem into sixteen lots as follows:—

Lot No.	Village.	Wet.	Dry.
1	Thevayur ...	9.57	4.69
2	Do. ...	...	75
3	Do. ...	1.50	5.46
4	Do. ...	.19	...
5	Do. ...	...	.87
6	Do. ...	...	2.6
7	Do. ...	...	3.85
8	Do. ...	...	5.71
9	Mungalum ...	...	2.32
10	Do. ...	4.40	10.93
11	Do. ...	1.90	...
12	Mettupalaiyam ...	1.16	1.69
13	Tirumandurai ...	4.72	...
14	Koneripalaiyam ...	...	3.1
15	Neikuppai ...	.28	1.96
16	Veppanthatei ...	...	5.70
	Total ...	23.72	49.

3. Lot No. 1.—The Deputy Collector's statement above referred to sets forth that the lands comprised in this lot were, with the exception of a portion thereof, viz., acres .88 wet and acres 1.21 dry, mortgaged to one Venkatachella Reddi for Rupees 2,700 by Mariyam Begam, the Jaghiredar's widow, under a deed of mortgage, dated the 28th of October 1868, and that the entire lot was sold by her to Krishna Reddi, son of the said Venkatachella Reddy, for Rupees 3,000 under a deed of sale, dated the 21st of September 1875, and registered on the 18th December following.

(1.) The statement now submitted shows that the lands conveyed under the deed of sale in question were acres 10.71 wet and acres 8.46 dry. The difference, viz., acres 1.14 wet and acres 3.77 dry, does not form a part of the extent entered in my letter No. 89, but appears to be quite a new block not hitherto accounted for.

(2.) The Deputy Collector states that the lands parted with in excess of the mortgaged portion are worth several times the sum (Rupees 300) for which they have now been sold.

No. 1,663 ...	75 dry.	margin. In the papers forwarded in the first instance, No. 1,663 was stated to have been mortgaged to one Saravana Pillay for Rupees 190, Nos. 94-B and 94-C to have been held by him, the former as additional security for the loan and the latter as a subsistence grant made to him by the Jaghiredar in recognition of the services rendered by him.
" 94-C ...	5.46 "	
" 95-B ...	1.50 wet.	
Total ...	7.71	

4. Lots Nos. 2 and 3 comprise in all acres 7.71 in extent as noted in the margin. In the papers forwarded in the first instance, No. 1,663 was stated to have been mortgaged to one Saravana Pillay for Rupees 190, Nos. 94-B and 94-C to have been held by him, the former as additional security for the loan and the latter as a subsistence grant made to him by the Jaghiredar in recognition of the services rendered by him.

5. In the papers now submitted, No. 1,663, valued at Rupees 5, together with a house ground, is stated to have been sold to the said Saravana Pillay by Allirayakalam, authorized agent of the Jaghiredar, for Rupees 50 under an unregistered deed of sale, dated the 15th of December 1875, and Nos. 94-B and 94-C to have been mortgaged to one Nattu Nallapareddi for Rupees 200 under a deed, dated the 21st February 1876,

*Proceedings of the Madras Government, Revenue Department,
25th November 1876.*

executed to him by the said agent. The incongruity of the two statements is not explained. The sale deed in question does not allude to the alleged previous mortgage.

6. The Lot No. 4 containing 19 decimals of wet land, valued at Rupees 20, was in the original statement stated to have been mortgaged to one Lakshmana Naiken for Rupees 20. The papers now submitted show that it was sold to him by the aforesaid agent for Rupees 10 under a deed of sale, dated the 19th December 1875. The sale-deed contains no reference to the previous mortgage.

7. The Lots Nos. 5 and 6, valued each at Rupees 100, were sold by the aforesaid agent, the former for Rupees 95 to one Muthi Nallappa Reddy on the 19th December 1875, and the latter for the same sum to one Nattu Subbi Reddy on the following day.

8. The Lot No. 7 consisting of three fields as per margin was in the former statement said to be mortgaged to one Khadar Hussain. The papers now sent show that Field No. 26 was given to him as a remuneration for his service under the late Jaghiredar, and that the remaining two fields were sold by the agent to the aforesaid Saravana Pillay and Lakshmana Naiken on the 19th December 1875 for Rs. 50. These two fields are said to be rich with fruit trees and are supposed to have been the Jaghiredar's garden once.

S. No.	dry	...	...	A. D.
26	dry	...	...	0.98
23	"	...	...	0.38
90	"	...	...	2.49
				3.85

said Saravana Pillay and Lakshmana Naiken on the 19th December 1875 for Rs. 50. These two fields are said to be rich with fruit trees and are supposed to have been the Jaghiredar's garden once.

9. The Lot No. 8 was in the original statement stated to be the maniam assigned for the support of the Musjeed within the Rangangadi Fort. The information now furnished shows that it was on the 24th February 1876 given to the aforesaid Lakshmana Naiken in exchange for certain other land included in Lot No. 1.

10. The Lot No. 9 is not encumbered. It is valued at Rupees 20 and is in possession of the family.

11. Lot No. 10, valued at Rupees 1,200, was mortgaged for Rupees 1,000 to one Muthi Nallappa Reddy under a deed of mortgage of the 9th October 1868. He transferred the deed to another, Lenganam Nallappa Reddy, on the 7th January 1874, and the latter purchased the lot for the same sum from the Jaghiredar's widow on the 21st September 1875. The Deputy Collector is of opinion that the property is undervalued and that the wet portion of the alienated extent ought to have alone fetched far more than the alleged purchase money.

12. Lot No. 11, valued at Rupees 170, was sold on the 23rd February 1876 by the agent in two parts for Rupees 99 and Rupees 43-2-0 to the aforesaid Saravana Pillay and Lakshmana Naik respectively in settlement of certain alleged previous mortgage debts and other dealings.

13. Lot No. 12 is said to have been sold to one Adinapudiyam for Rupees 150 by the late Jaghiredar in 1872. The sale-deeds are alleged to have been lost.

14. Lot No. 13 was sold by the Jaghiredar's widow to one Muthi Reddy for Rupees 2,000 on the 25th September 1875 in liquidation of certain previous mortgage.

15. Lot No. 14 is an endowment of a pagoda at Perambalore; the grant is not supported by any document.

16. A portion of Lot No. 15 has been let to one Ibrahim Beg who pays the assessment. The other portion is under attachment for Government dues.

*Proceedings of the Madras Government, Revenue Department,
25th November 1876.*

17. Lot No. 16 is let out to one Mannaur Udaiyan who pays taram assessment on it.

18. From the foregoing the Board will perceive that (with the exception of Lots 9, 15, and 16, acres 28 wet and acres 9.98 dry in extent which seem to belong still to the Jaghiredar's family, and Lot No. 14 which is said to form an endowment made in favor of a pagoda) all other lots have, save Lot No. 12 alleged to have been sold by the Jaghiredar in 1872, been alienated chiefly by sale and partly by mortgage since September 1875. The Deputy Collector entertains grave doubts as to the good faith with which the alienations in question have been made, chiefly because these alienations were made subsequent to the inquiry instituted under Board's Proceedings, No. 2,140, dated the 30th of July 1875, and the consideration in some cases for which the property has been parted with is barely nominal.

19. This information has been obtained mainly from Saravana Pillay, one of the principal purchasers. The extent of holdings as given in my former letter was acres 23.72 wet and acres 49 dry; the accounts now received show an increase of acres 1.14 wet and acres 3.77 dry under Lot No. 1.

20. I must apologise for the delay in submitting this final report, but the Board will see that the matter is somewhat complicated and the inquiry into details necessarily took time.

From C. CUNDASAWMY MOODELLIAR, Acting Deputy Collector, to J. HUNTER-BLAIR, Esq., Collector of Madras, dated Madras, 20th October 1875, No. 1,360.

ADVERTING to your Official Memorandum, No. 761, of 11th August last, requesting information as to the property left by deceased Nawab Jaffer Hussain Khan Bahadoor in Madras and referred to in Revenue Board's Proceedings, No. 2,140, of 30th July last, I have the honor to inform you that the deceased Nawab is reported to have a house property in Triplicane, Mylapore, High Road Survey No. 350, extent eight grounds and odd, and yielding a monthly rental of 40 Rupees.

2. This property it is also reported is mortgaged, but to whom and for what amount cannot be ascertained.

3. It does not appear that he possesses any other property in Madras.

No. 349.

SUBMITTED to the Board of Revenue with reference to paragraph 2 of their Proceedings, No. 2,140, dated 30th July 1875.

MADRAS,
26th October 1875.

(Signed) J. HUNTER-BLAIR,
Collector of Madras.

From the same Officer, dated 27th October 1875, No. 1,402.

In continuation of my letter, No. 1,360, of the 20th instant, I have the honor to report that from further inquiries instituted it appears that Jaffer Hussain Khan Bahadoor's house in Triplicane is mortgaged to one Kanchi Kristna Row for 250 Rupees the house itself being worth about 5,000 Rupees.

Proceedings of the Madras Government, Revenue Department,
25th November 1876.

No. 359.

SUBMITTED to the Board of Revenue with reference to their Proceedings, No. 2,140, dated 30th July 1875, in continuation of this office docket, No. 349, of the 26th October 1875.

MADRAS,
2nd November 1875.

(Signed) J. HUNTER-BLAIR,
Collector of Madras.

THE Board's Petitions Nos. 2,455 and 2,925 will be submitted for the orders of Government.

2. A reduced pension of Rupees 250 a-month was continued to Mahomed Jaffer Hussain Khan Bahadoor for life as sanctioned by the Government of India—G.O., dated 14th June 1871, No. 182, Political Department. He died in 1874 leaving two widows (one niece) and two sons and two daughters by his shadi wife. His eldest son Mahomed Motafar Khan petitioned the Board requesting the continuance of the pension for the support of the family, which he said was left quite destitute and wholly unprovided for. The petition was referred* to the Collector of Madras for report in communication with the Collector of North Arcot where the family resided, and with Mahomed Yusuf, Magistrate of Madras, who was supposed to be acquainted with the circumstances of the family. As the information afforded was meagre, and as the family had at different times resided in Madras, North Arcot, South Arcot, and Trichinopoly, the Collectors of these districts were required to report the nature, extent, and value of the property belonging to the family in their respective districts—Board's Proceedings, dated 30th July 1875, No. 2,140.

* Board's Procs., 13th January 1875, No. 237.

3. From the replies received it appears that the family has property in each of the districts above mentioned.

In North Arcot† they have Inam land, Cawnies 31-14-0, valued at Rupees 700, and

† Letter, dated 30th September 1875, No. 529. a house, value Rupees 200, both mortgaged since the pensioner's death for Rs. 1,000.

The net income of the Inam, Rupees 120 a-year, is paid to the niece widow as interest on a partition bond for Rupees 1,000. Some jewels are pawned for Rupees 1,000.

In Madras‡ there is house which is valued at Rupees 5,000 and rents for Rs. 40

‡ Letters, 26th Oct. and 2nd Nov. 1875. a-month, but it is said to be mortgaged

§ Letter recorded in Bd.'s Procs., 30th July 1875. for Rupees 250. Mahomed Yusuf says he heard that the deceased had some rice bazaars in Triplicane, but the Madras Deputy Collector only mentions the house above referred to.

South Arcot.—It appears from the Tahsildar's report that in this district there are

Letter dated 25th November 1875. Cawnies 37-14-3, valued at Rupees 1,350,

and a house worth Rupees 200. Cawnies 36 are mortgaged for Rupees 2,606-4-0 and the mortgagee is in possession. One Cawny has been given away. The Tahsildar also gives information obtained from persons acquainted with the family regarding property in Trichinopoly and Triplicane, viz., Trichinopoly, land, trees, and fort, valued at Rupees 17,885, of which land, valued at Rupees 7,216, is mortgaged for Rupees 6,425 and the mortgagees are in possession. The rest of the land, valued at Rupees 469, is said to be a Mosque endowment. In

Proceedings of the Madras Government, Revenue Department,
25th November 1876.

Triplicane there are said to be twenty-four godowns or shops worth Rupees 10,000, and renting for between Rupees 50 and 70 a-month, which is received by the pensioner's widow. These appear to be the rice bazaars referred to by Mahomed Yusuf but of which the Madras Deputy Collector makes no mention.

Trichinopoly.—In this district the family had in seven villages acres 24-86 wet and acres 52-77 dry as detailed in the annexed statement, but of this they now have only acres 28 wet and 9-98 dry. With this exception and Lot No. 14, which is said to be a religious endowment all has been sold or mortgaged and for the most part only recently since September 1875, except Lot No. 12 which was sold in 1872. The Deputy Collector entertains grave doubts as to the *bona fides* of the alienations, because they were made subsequent to Board's Proceedings, dated 30th July 1875, directing

* See list annexed.

inquiry as to the circumstances of the family and the consideration in some of the cases is barely nominal.*

4. The pension of Rupees 250 a-month was continued to the deceased in express terms for life, and his eldest son requests its continuance for the support of the family in consideration of its being "left destitute and wholly unprovided for," a statement which is now shown to be exaggerated. The Board see no sufficient reason for recommending the continuance of the pension either in full or in part, and consider that there are no circumstances in the case which entitle the claimant to any special indulgence.

Particulars of Property in the Trichinopoly District.

Lot No. 1—Acres { 10-71 wet.
8-46 dry.

MORTGAGED in 1868 for Rupees 2,700 and sold September 1875 for Rupees 3,000.

Lot No. 2—Acres 75 dry.

This and a house sold December 1875 for Rupees 50.

Lot No. 3—Acres { 1-50 wet.
5-46 dry.

Mortgaged for Rupees 200 February 1876.

Lot No. 4—Acres 19 wet.

Sold for Rupees 10 December 1875.

" " 5— " 87 dry.

Do. do. 95 do. do.

" " 6— " 2-6 dry.

Do. do. 95 do. do.

" " 7— " 3-85 dry.

Portion sold for Rupees 50 December 1875, and the rest given away in consideration of service rendered. Portion sold contains many fruit trees and was formerly the Jaghiredar's garden.

Lot No. 8—Acres 5-71 dry.

Given in exchange for other land included in Lot No. 1.

Lot No. 9—Acres 2-32 dry.

No encumbrance; is in possession of the family. Value Rupees 20.

Lot No. 10—Acres { 4-44 wet.
10-93 dry.

Mortgaged in 1868 for Rupees 1,000 and sold September 1875 for the same sum which Deputy Collector says is much

below its value, the wet portion alone being worth much more.

Proceedings of the Madras Government, Revenue Department,
25th November 1876.

Lot No. 11—Acres 1.90 wet.

Sold in settlement of outstanding claims.

Lot No. 12—Acres { 1.68 wet.
1.69 dry.

Said to have been sold in 1872 for Rupees 150. Sale-deed lost.

Lot No. 13—Acres 4.72 wet.

Sold September 1875 for Rs. 2,000 in liquidation of previous mortgage.

Lot No. 14—Acres 3.1 wet.

Said to be Mosque endowment. No document in support of grant.

Lot No. 15—Acres { .23 wet.
1.96 dry.

Portion let to a person who pays the assessment, the rest attached for arrears of revenue.

Lot No. 16—Acres 5.70 dry.

Let to a person who pays the assessment.

There is an old fort belonging to the family which has no money value but for its stone for which there is no demand. The Collector says it is a picturesque object of some historical interest and he hopes it will be preserved.

(True Copies and Extract.)

(Signed) E. GIBSON,
Acting Sub-Secretary.

No. 472.

ORDER THEREON, 25th November 1876, No. 1,801.

Miscellaneous.

As there is a large family, many of them very young, application will be made to the Government of India for a pension of 84 Rs., being 22 Rs. a month for each child:—the allowance to cease, in the case of the two boys, at the age of 21; and in the case of the two girls, at the same age unless they are married sooner.

(True Extract.)

(Signed) D. F. CARMICHAEL,
Secretary to Government.

To the Board of Revenue

To the Accountant General.

Erd. F. R. Bantleman.

1801/6
No. 2,140.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE BOARD OF REVENUE, dated 30th July 1875.

Read again Board's Proceedings, dated 13th January 1875, Miscellaneous No. 237.

Read also the following letter from J. HUNTER-BLAIR, Esq., Collector of Madras, to H. E. STOKES, Esq., Acting Secretary to the Board of Revenue, dated 31st May 1875, No. 137:—

ADVERTING to the Proceedings of the Board, No. 237, of the 23rd January last, I have the honor to enclose a statement showing the names and ages of the several members of the family left by the deceased Mahomed Jaffer Hussain Khan, and to state they were all dependants on deceased during his life-time.

2. The Nicka widow lives separately on some property received from the Shadi widow about three months ago, but the others have no means of subsistence.

3. Copies of letters received from the Collector of North Arcot and Mahomed Yusuf, a Magistrate of the Madras Town, are also submitted for information.

ENCLOSURE No. 1.

From MAHOMED YUSUF, Esq., Magistrate of Police, Madras, to J. HUNTER-BLAIR, Esq., Collector of Madras, dated 28th January 1875, No. 9.

In reference to your letter of the 26th instant, No. 50, enclosing copy of the Board's Proceedings, Miscellaneous No. 237, dated 13th instant, I have the honor to state, I knew the deceased Nawab Jaffer Hussain Khan, Bahadur, Jaghiredar of Runjungud, and his son Mahomed Abid Hussain Sahib, for some time past. I have heard that he had another boy and two girls, I do not remember their names; but of the other members of his family, I know little, much less of their means of subsistence. There was some landed property, consisting of dry and wet lands and gardens in some villages, I do not remember their names, in Perambalur, one of the two taluqs I was in charge of in Trichinopoly; but I think the deceased Jaghiredar disposed of some of them by sale, or otherwise, before the family left Trichinopoly for Vellore. I have heard that he had some rice-bazaars in Triplicane; what the rental is I do not know. Jaffer Hussain Khan was a man who spoke very little about his family to others. Some time prior to his death, I heard he had made Nicka with a dancing-girl, named Sinee Zeenuth Oonissa.

(True Copy.)

(Signed) J. HUNTER-BLAIR,
Collector of Madras.

ENCLOSURE No. 2.

From W. S. WHITESIDE, Esq., Collector of North Arcot, to J. HUNTER-BLAIR, Esq., Collector of Madras, dated Palmanair, 5th May 1875, No. 487.

With reference to your letter, dated 25th January 1875, No. 48, I have the honor to forward, herewith, copy of the Acting Sub-Collector's letter, dated 28th ultimo, No. 258, and the statement showing the names and ages of the several members of the family left by the late Mahomed Jaffer Hussain Khan, &c., as requested in your letter under reply.

2. The enclosures of your letter are herewith returned.

(True Copy.)

(Signed) J. HUNTER-BLAIR,
Collector of Madras.

Col. of 1876 313073.

REVENUE.

THE BOARD OF REVENUE.

Dated November, 25th.

Recd.

G.O., 25th November 1876, No. 1,561.

NOVEMBER.
No. 471-472.

Pension of Rs. 250 offered by late Mahomed Jaffer Hussain Khan to North Arcot. — Instructions to apply to the Government of India for the continuance of a pension of Rs. 125 a month to the children of the deceased in perpetuity, the pension ceasing in the case of boys at the age of 21, and in the case of girls at the marriage or on reaching majority.

ENCLOSURE No. 3.
Statement showing the Names and Ages of the several Members of the Family left by the deceased Mahomed Jaffer Hussain Khan.

No.	Names.	Age.	How related to the deceased.	Remarks.
1	Mariem Begum	35	(Shadi) widow.	
2	Mahomed Motafur Khan	16	Son by do.	
3	Gulam Mahomed Khan	8	Do. do.	
4	Asumathalli Shan Begum	12	Daughter do.	
5	Kyurallu do.	10	Do. do.	
6	Zeenatim Missa Begum	35	(Nicka) do.	
7	Amotholli Hussain Khan	45		
8	Oossainalliraja Kalami	50	Maternal uncle's son.	
9	Mahomed Mubin	38		
10	Gulam Kadar	10	Sons of maternal uncle's deceased sons.	
11	Hussain Modeen	8		
12	Raburanni Missa Begum	35	Daughter of do. do. in Madras.	

(Signed) A. L. LISTER,
Acting Sub-Collector.

(True Copy.)

(Signed) W. S. WHITESIDE,
Collector.

(True Copy.)

(Signed) J. HUNTER-BLAIR,
Collector of Madras.

ENCLOSURES Nos. 4 to 6.—Petitions.

As these papers contain little information regarding the family's present circumstances and means of support, the Collector of North Arcot, in whose district the family now resides, will be good enough to inquire and report on these points.

2. As it appears that the family has at different times resided in Madras, North Arcot, South Arcot, and Trichinopoly, the Collector of these districts are requested to report at an early date, whether the family has any property in their respective districts, and, if so, to state its nature, extent, and value.

(True Copies and Extract.)

(Signed) C. A. GALTON,
Acting Sub-Secretary.

To the Collector of Madras.

.. the Collector of North Arcot, with Petitions Nos. 2,455 and 2,925 of 1874, and Nos. 154 and 990 of 1875.

.. the Collector of South Arcot, with copy of Board's Proceedings, dated 23rd January 1875, Miscellaneous No. 237.

.. the Collector of Trichinopoly, with do.

Exd. W. H. French.

Yeomick Pension—of Rupees 250 per month
sem enjoyed by the deceased Mahomed Jaffer
Hussain Khan.—Collector of North Arcot to
report regarding present circumstances and
means of subsistence possessed by the family of
the deceased. Certain other Collectors to report
whether the family has any property in their
districts, and, if so, to state its nature, extent,
and value.

JULY.
No. 2,140.

Received

OP. 11/3/75

PROCEEDINGS, 30th JULY 1875, No. 2,140.

1875.
Board of Revenue,
MADRAS.

Particulars of Property in the Trichinopoly District.

Lot No. 1—Acres { 10.71 wet.
8.46 dry.

MORTGAGED in 1863 for Rupees 2,700
and sold September 1875 for Rupees
3,000.

Lot No. 2—Acres .75 dry.

This and a house sold December 1875
for Rupees 50.

Mortgaged for Rupees 200 February 1876.

Lot No. 3—Acres { 1.50 wet.
5.46 dry.

Sold for Rupees 10 December 1875.

Lot No. 4—Acres .19 wet.

Do. do. 95 do. do.

" " 5— " .87 dry.

Do. do. 95 do. do.

" " 6— " 2.6 dry.

Portion sold for Rupees 50, December

" " 7— " 3.85 dry.

1875, and the rest given away in consideration of service rendered. Portion sold contains many fruit trees and was formerly the Jaghiredar's garden.

Lot No. 8—Acres 5.71 dry.

Given in exchange for other land
included in Lot No. 1.

Lot No. 9—Acres 2.32 dry.

No encumbrance; is in possession of
the family. Value Rupees 20.

Lot No. 10—Acres { 4.44 wet.
10.93 dry.

Mortgaged in 1868 for Rupees 1,000
and sold September 1875 for the same
sum which Deputy Collector says is much

below its value, the wet portion alone being worth much more.

Lot No. 11—Acres 1.90 wet.

Sold in settlement of outstanding
claims.

Lot No. 12—Acres { 1.66 wet.
1.69 dry.

Said to have been sold in 1872 for
Rupees 150. Sale-deed lost.

Lot No. 13—Acres 4.72 wet.

Sold September 1875 for Rs. 2,000
in liquidation of previous mortgage.

Lot No. 14—Acres 3.1 wet.

Said to be M'sque endowment. No
document in support of grant.

Lot No. 15—Acres { .23 wet.
1.96 dry.

Portion let to a person who pays the
assessment, the rest attached for arrears of
revenue.

Lot No. 16—Acres 5.70 dry.

Let to a person who pays the assess-
ment.

There is an old fort belonging to the family which has no money value but for
its stone for which there is no demand. The Collector says it is a picturesque object
of some historical interest and he hopes it will be preserved.

1801/5

PROCEEDINGS OF THE BOARD OF REVENUE, dated 27th September 1876.

Read again Board's Miscellaneous Proceedings, dated 13th January 1875, No. 237.

Read also the following papers:—

From W. S. WHITESIDE, Esq., Collector of North Arcot, to H. E. STOKES, Esq., Acting Secretary to the Board of Revenue, dated Palmanair, 30th September 1875, No. 529.

In returning herewith the Petitions, Nos. 2,455 and 2,925 of 1874 and Nos. 154 and 990 of 1875, received with the Board's Proceedings, dated 30th July last, No. 2,140, I have the honor to state that from the report of the Tahsildar of Vellore it appears that Mahomed Motafar Khan, the eldest son of the late Jaghiredar of Rangangadi, possesses Inam lands in the town of Arcot measuring Cawnies 31-14-0 enfranchised by the Inam Commissioner, and a house in the Vellore Town, the former worth about Rs. 700 and the latter Rupees 200. A portion of the Inam lands has been leased out for building purposes to some persons who pay an annual rent of Rupees 210, the other portion being left waste from time immemorial as it is not fit for cultivation. Of the above sum, Rupees 90 are paid annually on account of the salary of a servant employed in collecting rent and as quit-rent due on the Inam in question. The difference between these two sums, viz., Rupees 120, is paid to the niece widow, Zenatim Nissa Begum, as interest on a partition bond of Rupees 1,000 executed by the eldest son of the Jaghiredar on mortgaging the Inam lands and the house above alluded to. Besides this, the family has contracted debts to the extent of Rupees 1,000 on the mortgage of certain jewels. Under these circumstances, it will be seen that the family of the late Jaghiredar is by no means in a prosperous condition.

ENCLOSURES Nos. 1 to 4.—Petitions.

From J. H. GARSTIN, Esq., Collector of South Arcot, to H. E. STOKES, Esq., Acting Secretary to the Board of Revenue, dated Cuddalore, 25th November 1875, No. 507.

In reply to the Board's Proceedings of the 30th July, No. 2,140, I have the honor to enclose an abstract of a report from the Tittagudi Deputy Tahsildar relative to the property possessed by the late Mahomed Jaffer Hussain Khan, Jaghiredar of Rangangadi.

ENCLOSURE No. 1.

Abstract of an Arzi from the Deputy Tahsildar of Tittagudi.

It appears that none of the relatives of the late Mahomed Jaffer Hussain Khan, Jaghiredar of Rangangadi, formerly resided or now resides in the village of Tittagudi or in any other village of that division. He had Cawnies 33-10-3 of punjah worth Rupees 350, Cawnies 4-4-0 of nunjah worth Rupees 1,000, and a house and shed worth Rupees 200, in the village of Malayanoor, in Virdachellum Taluq. Of these, Cawnies 36-3-3 of punjah and nunjah are mortgaged to one Veerachi Reddy of Sirupakam for Rupees 2,606-4-0. In addition to this, the mortgagee is also in enjoyment of Cawnies 0-11-0 of the land; the remaining 1 Cawny of punjah has been given by the Jaghiredar to one Syed Rahiman alias Syed Jalal Sahib. Some of the late Jaghiredar's relations (fifty-nine in number, including some servants) reside at Vellore and ten others at Triplicane. One

Alli Raja Sahib Kalami, late Jaghiredar's grandson by his daughter, who holds a Power of Attorney from the widow of the said Mahomed Jaffer Hussain Khan Bahadoor, resides at Rangangadi. This man and one Saravana Pillay who had been in the service of the Jaghiredar (it appears his forefathers also were in the service of the Jaghiredar's family) state that, besides the above-said property, the Jaghiredar possessed also property (land, trees, and fort), valued at Rupees 17,885, in seven villages in the taluq of Perambalor in the district of Trichinopoly. He also owned twenty-four godowns or shops worth Rupees 10,000 at Triplicane, and a tiled house of 150 Rupees value at Vellore. Of the property situated in the Perambalor Taluq, Rupees 7,216 worth has been mortgaged for Rupees 6,425 and the mortgagees are in the enjoyment thereof, the remainder 469 Rupees worth having been endowed for the maintenance of a Musjeed, &c. The shops at Triplicane are rented out and the income therefrom, amounting to between 50 and 70 Rupees a-month, is appropriated by the Jaghiredar's widow towards the cost of the establishment and repair of the shops and the liquidation of debts incurred by the Jaghiredar, and the house at Vellore is in the occupation of the Jaghiredar's widow and children.

(Signed) J. H. GARSTIN,
Collector.

From H. SEWELL, Esq., Acting Collector of Trichinopoly, to C. A. GALTON, Esq.,
Acting Secretary to the Board of Revenue, dated 12th April 1876, No. 89.

ADVERTING to the Board's Proceedings, dated 30th July 1875, No. 2,140, I have the honor to submit the following report.

2. The family of the deceased Mahomed Jaffer Khan possesses property no where in the district except Perambalor Taluq.

	Rs.	
23.72 Acres of wet land situated in seven villages and valued at	5,717	3. The property consists of the items noted in the margin, but it is stated to be heavily encumbered with debt, not a single acre being in the possession of the family.
49 Acres of dry land do. do. ...	1,913	
20 Tamarind trees do. do. ...	20	
3 Buildings do. do. ...	200	
Total ...	7,885	4. The Tahsildar of Perambalor, in submitting his report on the subject in October last, simply stated that the lands in question were in the enjoyment of persons who have advanced money upon them. Not satisfied with this vague statement, I required him to find out upon what title they enjoyed the land, and after a protracted delay and repeated calls he submitted the result of his inquiry, which I still think not complete. It now turns out that most of the documents upon which these money-lenders base their claim are of recent dates, so recent as 24th February last, in some cases that the Deputy Collector in charge of the division doubts their genuineness. Further inquiries regarding them are being made, and the result will be communicated in due course.

5. There is a fort in Thevayur belonging to the family which goes by the name of Rangangadi Fort. It is a fine building and in tolerable preservation, though greatly overgrown with prickly-pear. The fort has no money value except on account of its stones, and there is not likely to be any demand for them. It is a picturesque object and of some historical interest, and I hope it will be preserved. I entered it in the list of buildings sent to Board.

From the same Officer, dated 7th August 1876, No. 206.

REFERRING to my letter, No. 89, dated the 12th of April last, I have the honor to inform you that I have received a further report from the Deputy Collector on General Duties, and the following particulars are elicited therefrom.

2. The extent given in my letter, No. 89, dated the 12th of April last, was, for convenience of reference, divided in the statement furnished by the Deputy Collector on the 6th idem into sixteen lots as follows:—

Lot No.	Village.	Wet.	Dry.
1	Thevayur ...	9.57	4.69
2	Do. ...	...	.75
3	Do. ...	1.50	5.46
4	Do. ...	.19	...
5	Do. ...	...	.87
6	Do. ...	...	2.6
7	Do. ...	...	3.85
8	Do. ...	...	5.71
9	Mungalum ...	...	2.32
10	Do. ...	4.40	10.93
11	Do. ...	1.90	...
12	Mettupalaiyam...	1.16	1.69
13	Tirumandurai ...	4.72	...
14	Koneripalaiyem..	...	3.1
15	Neikuppai ...	.23	1.96
16	Veppanthatei ...	...	5.70
	Total ...	23.72	49.

3. Lot No. 1.—The Deputy Collector's statement above referred to sets forth that the lands comprised in this lot were, with the exception of a portion thereof, viz., acres .88 wet and acres 1.21 dry, mortgaged to one Venkatachella Reddi for Rupees 2,700 by Mariyam Begam, the Jaghiredar's widow, under a deed of mortgage, dated the 28th of October 1868, and that the entire lot was sold by her to Krishna Reddi, son of the said Venkatachella Reddy, for Rupees 3,000 under a deed of sale, dated the 24th of September 1875, and registered on the 18th December following.

(1.) The statement now submitted shows that the lands conveyed under the deed of sale in question were acres 10.71 wet and acres 8.46 dry. The difference, viz., acres 1.14 wet and acres 3.77 dry, does not form a part of the extent entered in my letter No. 89, but appears to be quite a new block not hitherto accounted for.

(2.) The Deputy Collector states that the lands parted with in excess of the mortgaged portion are worth several times the sum (Rupees 300) for which they have now been sold.

4. Lots Nos. 2 and 3 comprise in all acres 7.71 in extent as noted in the margin. In the papers forwarded in the first instance, No. 1,663 was stated to have been mortgaged to one Saravana Pillay for Rupees 190, Nos. 94-B and 94-C to have been held by him, the former as additional security for the loan and the latter as a subsistence grant made to him by the Jaghiredar in recognition of the services rendered by him.	No. 1,663 75 dry.
	" 94-C 5.46 "
	" 95-B 1.50 wet.
	Total ... 7.71

5. In the papers now submitted, No. 1,663, valued at Rupees 5, together with a house ground, is stated to have been sold to the said Saravana Pillay by Allirayakalam, authorized agent of the Jaghiredar, for Rupees 50 under an unregistered deed of sale, dated the 15th of December 1875, and Nos. 94-B and 94-C to have been mortgaged to one Nattu Nallapareddi for Rupees 200 under a deed, dated the 21st February 1876,

executed to him by the said agent. The incongruity of the two statements is not explained. The sale deed in question does not allude to the alleged previous mortgage.

6. The Lot No. 4 containing 19 decimals of wet land, valued at Rupees 20, was in the original statement stated to have been mortgaged to one Lakshmana Naiken for Rupees 20. The papers now submitted show that it was sold to him by the aforesaid agent for Rupees 10 under a deed of sale, dated the 19th December 1875. The sale-deed contains no reference to the previous mortgage.

7. The Lots Nos. 5 and 6, valued each at Rupees 100, were sold by the aforesaid agent, the former for Rupees 95 to one Muthi Nallappa Reddy on the 19th December 1875, and the latter for the same sum to one Nattu Subbi Reddy on the following day.

8. The Lot No. 7 consisting of three fields as per margin was in the former statement said to be mortgaged to one Khadar Hussain. The papers now sent show that Field No. 26 was given to him as a remuneration for his service under the late Jaghiredar, and that the remaining two fields were sold by the agent to the aforesaid Saravana Pillay and Lakshmana Naiken on the 19th December 1875 for Rs. 50.

These two fields are said to be rich with fruit trees and are supposed to have been the Jaghiredar's garden once.

9. The Lot No. 8 was in the original statement stated to be the manim assigned for the support of the Musjeed within the Rangangadi Fort. The information now furnished shows that it was on the 24th February 1876 given to the aforesaid Lakshmana Naiken in exchange for certain other land included in Lot No. 1.

10. The Lot No. 9 is not encumbered. It is valued at Rupees 20 and is in possession of the family.

11. Lot No. 10, valued at Rupees 1,200, was mortgaged for Rupees 1,000 to one Muthi Nallappa Reddy under a deed of mortgage of the 9th October 1868. He transferred the deed to another, Lenganam Nallappa Reddy, on the 7th January 1874, and the latter purchased the lot for the same sum from the Jaghiredar's widow on the 24th September 1875. The Deputy Collector is of opinion that the property is undervalued and that the wet portion of the alienated extent ought to have alone fetched far more than the alleged purchase money.

12. Lot No. 11, valued at Rupees 170, was sold on the 23rd February 1876 by the agent in two parts for Rupees 99 and Rupees 43-2-0 to the aforesaid Saravana Pillai and Lakshmana Naik respectively in settlement of certain alleged previous mortgage debts and other dealings.

13. Lot No. 12 is said to have been sold to one Adinapudiyar for Rupees 150 by the late Jaghiredar in 1872. The sale-deeds are alleged to have been lost.

14. Lot No. 13 was sold by the Jaghiredar's widow to one Muthi Reddy for Rupees 2,000 on the 25th September 1875 in liquidation of certain previous mortgage.

15. Lot No. 14 is an endowment of a pagoda at Perambalore; the grant is not supported by any document.

16. A portion of Lot No. 15 has been let to one Ibrahim Beg who pays the assessment. The other portion is under attachment for Government dues.

17. Lot No. 16 is let out to one Mannaur Udaiyan who pays taram assessment on it.

18. From the foregoing the Board will perceive that (with the exception of Lots 9, 15, and 16, acres 28 wet and acres 9-98 dry in extent which seem to belong still to the Jaghiredar's family, and Lot No. 14 which is said to form an endowment made in favor of a pagoda) all the other lots have, save Lot No. 12 alleged to have been sold by the Jaghiredar in 1872, been alienated chiefly by sale and partly by mortgage since September 1875. The Deputy Collector entertains grave doubts as to the good faith with which the alienations in question have been made, chiefly because these alienations were made subsequent to the inquiry instituted under Board's Proceedings, No. 2,140, dated the 30th of July 1875, and the consideration in some cases for which the property has been parted with is barely nominal.

19. This information has been obtained mainly from Saravana Pillay, one of the principal purchasers. The extent of holdings as given in my former letter was acres 23-72 wet and acres 49 dry; the accounts now received show an increase of acres 1-14 wet and acres 3-77 dry under Lot No. 1.

20. I must apologise for the delay in submitting this final report, but the Board will see that the matter is somewhat complicated and the inquiry into details necessarily took time.

From C. CUNDASAWMY MOODELLIAR, Acting Deputy Collector, to J. HUNTER-BLAIR, Esq., Collector of Madras, dated Madras, 20th October 1875, No. 1,360,

ADVERTING to your Official Memorandum, No. 761, of 11th August last, requesting information as to the property left by deceased Nawab Jaffer Hussain Khan Bahadoor in Madras and referred to in Revenue Board's Proceedings, No. 2,140, of 30th July last, I have the honor to inform you that the deceased Nawab is reported to have a house property in Triplicane, Mylapore, High Road Survey No. 350, extent eight grounds and odd, and yielding a monthly rental of 40 Rupees.

2. This property it is also reported is mortgaged, but to whom and for what amount cannot be ascertained.

3. It does not appear that he possesses any other property in Madras.

No. 349.

SUBMITTED to the Board of Revenue with reference to paragraph 2 of their Proceedings, No. 2,140, dated 30th July 1875.

MADRAS,
26th October 1875.

(Signed) J. HUNTER-BLAIR,
Collector of Madras.

From the same Officer, dated 27th October 1875, No. 1,402.

In continuation of my letter, No. 1,360, of the 20th instant, I have the honor to report that from further inquiries instituted it appears that Jaffer Hussain Khan Bahadoor's house in Triplicane is mortgaged to one Kanchi Kristna Row for 250 Rupees, the house itself being worth about 5,000 Rupees.

No. 359.

Submitted to the Board of Revenue with reference to their Proceedings, No. 2,140, dated 30th July 1875, in continuation of this office docket, No. 349, of the 26th October 1875.

MADRAS,
2nd November 1875.

(Signed) J. HUNTER-BLAIR,
Collector of Madras.

The Board's Petitions Nos. 2,455 and 2,925 will be submitted for the orders of Government.

2. A reduced pension of Rupees 250 a-month was continued to Mahomed Jaffer Hussain Khan Bahadoor for life as sanctioned by the Government of India—G.O., dated 14th June 1871, No. 182, Political Department. He died in 1874 leaving two widows (one niece) and two sons and two daughters by his shadi wife. His eldest son Mahomed Motafar Khan petitioned the Board requesting the continuance of the pension for the support of the family, which he said was left quite destitute and wholly unprovided for. The petition was referred* to the Collector of Madras for report in communication with the Collector of North Arcot where the family resided, and with Mahomed Yusuf, Magistrate of Madras, who was supposed to be acquainted with the circumstances of the family. As the information afforded was meagre, and as the family had at different times resided in Madras, North Arcot, South Arcot, and Trichinopoly, the Collectors of these districts were required to report the nature, extent, and value of the property belonging to the family in their respective districts—Board's Proceedings, dated 30th July 1875, No. 2,140.

* Board's Procs., 13th January 1875, No. 237.

3. From the replies received it appears that the family has property in each of the districts above mentioned.

In North Arcot† they have Inam land, Cawnies 31-14-0, valued at Rupees 700, and a house, value Rupees 200, both mortgaged since the pensioner's death for Rs. 1,000. The net income of the Inam, Rupees 120 a-year, is paid to the niece widow as interest on a partition bond for Rupees 1,000. Some jewels are pawned for Rupees 1,000.

In Madras‡ there is a house which is valued at Rupees 5,000 and rents for Rs. 40 a-month, but it is said to be mortgaged for Rupees 250. Mahomed Yusuf says§ he heard that the deceased had some rice bazaars in Triplicane, but the Madras Deputy Collector only mentions the house above referred to.

South Arcot.—It appears from the Tahsildar's report that in this district there are Cawnies 37-14-3, valued at Rupees 1,350, and a house worth Rupees 200. Cawnies 36 are mortgaged for Rupees 2,606-4-0 and the mortgagee is in possession. One Cawny has been given away. The Tahsildar also gives information obtained from persons acquainted with the family regarding property in Trichinopoly and Triplicane, viz., Trichinopoly, land, trees, and fort, valued at Rupees 17,885, of which land, valued at Rupees 7,216, is mortgaged for Rupees 6,425 and the mortgagees are in possession. The rest of the land, valued at Rupees 469, is said to be a Mosque endowment. In

1891/11
Triplicane there are said to be twenty-four godowns or shops worth Rupees 10,000, and paying for between Rupees 50 and 70 a-month, which is received by the pensioner's widow. These appear to be the rice bazaars referred to by Mahomed Yusuf but of which the Madras Deputy Collector makes no mention.

Trichinopoly.—In this district the family had in seven villages acres 24-86 wet and acres 52-77 dry as detailed in the annexed statement, but of this they now have only acres 28 wet and 9-98 dry. With this exception and Lot No. 14, which is said to be religious endowment all has been sold or mortgaged and for the most part only recently since September 1875, except Lot No. 12 which was sold in 1872. The Deputy Collector entertains grave doubts as to the *bona fides* of the alienations, because they were made subsequent to Board's Proceedings, dated 30th July 1875, directing inquiry as to the circumstances of the family and the consideration in some of the cases is barely nominal.*

* See list annexed.

4. The pension of Rupees 250 a-month was continued to the deceased in express terms for life, and his eldest son requests its continuance for the support of the family in consideration of its being "left destitute and wholly unprovided for," a statement which is now shown to be exaggerated. The Board see no sufficient reason for recommending the continuance of the pension either in full or in part, and consider that there are no circumstances in the case which entitle the claimant to any special indulgence.

(True Copies and Extract.)

E. W. J. Lewis
Acting Sub-Secretary.

To the Secretary to Government, Revenue Department,
with 2 Petitions, List and copies of Board's Proceedings,
dated 13th January 1875, Miscellaneous No. 237,
and 30th July 1875, No. 2,140.

Copy to the Collector of Madras.

" " " of North Arcot.
" " " of South Arcot.
" " " of Trichinopoly.

Erd. W. J. Lewis.

R. & 1901/12

Prop. Bd. Rev. 27/9/76

No 2446.

Think it will be harsh to withdraw at once all pensionary assistance to this family - The last pensioner has left a very large family - many of them young - should be disposed to work for the benefit of India to allow a further continuance of R.S. 84 per mensem 1/3rd of the village of the Tajin was continued up cash pension - & that this should be the last continuance - All reasons for continuance -

This is a case of a rapid expansion, last enjoyed by a man who was the representative of a military feudatory or retainer of the habits of the farmatic - styled Jajindar of Pranjangali. 2. There were 31 of these Jajins at the capture of the farmatic - they were mostly resumed. This one shared that fate, but as the Tajindar had been friendly to the British Govt - an allowance equivalent to the rent of the village of the Tajin was continued to him, for life.

This grant, in successively reduced proportions - has however, from motives of compassion - been continued to 1st his son, 2^d the son's widow 3^d the surviving male representative of the family.

3. The 3^d is now dead & the family endeavours to establish a claim to a further stop on the ground of poverty, as the 1st & 2^d have not been made out; & they decline to support it. 4. The eldest son aged 8 - daughter aged 12. & 3rd aged 10. Memo attached to the letter to same of Oct 25/75 are the previous references. 5. 2nd & 3rd of 18/9-55, & the letter to G. I. of 18/9-55, & the memo attached to the letter to same of Oct 25/75 are the previous references. 5. 2nd & 3rd of 18/9-55, & the letter to G. I. of 18/9-55, & the memo attached to the letter to same of Oct 25/75 are the previous references.

P.O. 20/10/76

Dec 1876

1870. No 4343

Board of Revenue,

MADRAS.

PROCEEDINGS, 27TH SEPTEMBER 1876, No. 2446.

Original Dec 1876

Each 4

Received 20

SEPTEMBER

No. 2446.

Technical Pension - of Rupees 250 a-month enjoyed by deceased Mahomed Jaffer Hussain Khan. - Submitting to Government Board reviews with reference to petitions from Mahomed Mostafar Khan praying for continuance of -

1/10/76 15:15 AM A.M.

the persons allowed to
each ^{son} to cease on ~~the~~
respective persons allowing
age of 21 - & of each
daughter on attaining that
age or marrying -

This would I think effect
what is needed - My ^{1st} ~~1st~~

Cum gratia
Largest stipend

for order

2288
18th
10/9/74

2450

18th
2/10/74

The Honorable the President
and Members of the Board of Revenue
Madras.

The humble Petition of Mohammed
Motahar Khan eldest son of the
late Nawab Mohammed Jaffer
Hussain Khan Bahadur Jagheer
of Runjungada, Trichinopoly
District and now at Madras.

Respectfully Sheweth

That your Honorable Board
petitioner who is the lineal descendant of the
original Jagheerdar respectfully begs leave
to bring to the notice of the Board of Revenue
the deeply lamented demise of his father who
unexpected melancholy event occurred on the
26th July 1874.

2. That to convince the Honorable Board
of the illustrious nature of the Family of
which the Petitioner is a direct heir and
representative he has taken the opportunity
of enclosing herewith Copy of the Petition presented
by his late Father on the 15th August 1870

marked A.

which

As there is a large family
many of them very young, a
petition will be made to the
G. L. for a pension of Rs 400,
being Rs 200 a month for
each child: - the allowance to
cease, in the case of the 2 boys,
at the age of 21; and in the
case of the 2 girls, at the same
age unless they are married
doon.

14th Bazaar
2nd Dec 1874

15/11/74

at the house of S. N. R. 17, N. N.
C. 1st Dec 1874

which having been duly considered as it
deserves, the Petitioner's Father's Claim was
in accordance with the principles of Equity
and Justice and in consideration of the Meri-
torious Services rendered by the Petitioner's
ancestors the particulars of which have been
fully described in the petition referred to
above and having had in view the extensive
benefit which the Madras Government
derive by the resumption of the valuable
Jaghire of Rungungada which yielded a
very large revenue annually, justly and
properly treated and he was granted the Jaghire
Stipend of Rs: 250 per mensem which proved
to be quite inadequate to maintain his large
Family and dependants.

3. That by the demise of the late Chandab
Mohammed Jaffer Hoossain Khan Bahadur
the petitioner, his brother and sisters (orphans)
his mother and another Nika widow of the
deceased as well as the several members of the
Family of the former Jagheendar's sister,
Ameroon Nesa Begum who were supported
by petitioner's Father and many other old
dependants are now left quite destitute and
wholly unprovided for; and that as the
petitioner's father who was admitted as
rightful heir and granted the pension -
was not destined to enjoy the same for more

190/5
than 3 years, the same having been granted
him only in June 1871, but was cut off in
the prime of his youth while endeavouring
to obtain his proper and well-founded right
of the full pension of Rs: 500 enjoyed by his
aunt and adoptive mother Zahra Begum Sahib
the petitioner therefore cannot but be deemed
worthy of the bounty of Government.

4. And that the petitioner having been informed
that the hereditary Jaghire stipend which he
by the demise of the Petitioner's Father is one
which should in accordance with the provisions
made in the Despatch of the late Honorable
Court of Directors dated 11 March 1846
continued in the name of his father, he
respectfully begs leave to solicit the favor
of the Honorable Board interceding in behalf
of the petitioner and others of his Family as
also other dependants &c who are altogether
about 50 in number and whose support,
entirely devolves on your petitioner, and laying
the same with their best recommendation and
support before the Government for the
continuance in his name of the Jaghire Stipend
enjoyed by his late Father; as the Board of
Revenue have in their standing order No: 17
expressly stated that pensions granted in

lieu

150/16

beir according to land and usage.

For which act of benevolence petition
as in duty bound

Shall Ever pray.

محمد عرفان

General Patter's Road
Madras
Door No: 1
9th September 1874

Mohammed Motabar Khan

Re. Submitted for the favourable Consideration
of the Board being submitted

1st October 1874

محمد عرفان

line of Jaghirs will not be declared extinct
until the existence of the Family of the origi-
nal grantee notwithstanding the length of
time which might elapse in their existence.

5. And your Honorable Board's petitioner
further begs leave to state that his request
will not be found an unprecedented one
as several other similar cases will be found
in the Records of the Board of Revenue as
well as Government.

6. Under these special circumstances and
for the cogent reasons mentioned above
petitioner most fervently and humbly
craves the generous and merciful
graciously and mercifully please to continue
in his name the full stipend of Rs. 250
per mensem enjoyed by his late and
lamented Father and will not allow the
descendants of a Family once so noble
and exalted to perish under degradation
and misery, as the Jaghire stipend now
claimed for him, by documentary evidences
in the Records of the Government and the
Revenue Board, been acknowledged as
perpetual, and the petitioner is the legal

beir

(Copy)

To The Right Honorable
Francis Lord Napier
Governor in Council
Fort Saint George.

The humble address of Mahomed
Jaffer Hussain Khan Bahadur,
the legal heir and head of the
family of the late Nalob
Matalabar Khan Bahadur,
Tahir Lufder Jung Joghirdar
of Rungjunga, and nephew
of Zorah Baigum deceased.

Most Respectfully Sheweth,

The said Zorah Baigum
who was in receipt of Rs 600 a month
as the widow of the late Matalabar Khan
Bahadur the last Joghirdar of Rungjunga
in the District of Trichinopoly, departed this
life on the 11th May 1870, and that consequent
on her death, the allowance has ceased to be
disbursed

disbursed.

2. The object of the present address is to submit for consideration, certain facts connected with the original grant of the pension in view that on a consideration of the circumstances set forth it may please the Government to continue the allowance.

3. That the Jaghirs of Runjungada was originally conferred by the Emperor of Delhi as per ^{*}Permanah Dated 10th Ramejan 1116 Hijry.

^{*} Referred to in clause I of Part of this address.

4. As per ^{*}Permanah the abstract translation of which Mrisket A is herein submitted the Jaghirdar was styled with the word "Musrer" in Carnatic (Assistant to the Carnatic) and the enclosed original documents marked B.C. & D. can show that Petitioner's Ancestors were addressed as Nabob by the Nabobs of the Carnatic as equal in position, but they were not servants of the Nabobs of the Carnatic as has been supposed.

^{*} which can be submitted if necessary.

Translation accompany

5. On the demise of Ahmed Sahib Khan the first Jaghirdar, the Jaghirs was enjoyed by his son Mahomed Ally styled Aliid Khan (the maternal grand son of the

Appendix E & F
(the original
Permanahs can
be submitted when
required.)

the late Nabob of the Carnatic Saduloh Khan Bahadur), and not by Mahomed Hussain Khan Bahadur, Sahib after his death the Jaghirs was conferred to his son the above mentioned Mahomed Hussain Khan Bahadur Sahib who fell in action in the year 1789 when rendering assistance to the Carnatic against Chundar Sahib and the French.

6. After the death of the said Mahomed Hussain Khan Bahadur Sahib, the Jaghirs passed to his son Akatabar Khan Bahadur Sahib a favorite of the late Nabob Wallajah and on his demise to his eldest son Ahmed Sahib Khan styled Miran Sahib Khan Bahadur on whose death it devolved on his nephew and adopted son Mahomed Hussain Khan Bahadur Sahib who was in the uninterrupted enjoyment of the same up to the year 1801 when the Carnatic was ceded to the British Government as per Ratified Treaty of 1801 between the Nabob of the Carnatic and the late Honourable East India Company. The Jaghirs having then been resumed by the British Government, and only on a question of Pedigree, it was restored

restored in 1804 to the said Mahomed Hulsaim
Khan Bahadur Sahib in consideration of the
valuable assistance rendered to the British
Government, and on the demise of Mahomed
Hulsaim Khan Bahadur Sahib in 1815 the
Jaghire was again resumed by the Govern-
ment and a comparatively small pension
of 6000 Pagodas or 21000 Rupees per annum
was sanctioned in the name of his son
Mudatib Khan Bahadur Sahib who died
in 1854 leaving a large family encumbered
with debt, in consequence of the distressed
condition of the late Mudatib Khan's
family, the Board of Revenue recommended
the continuance of the pecuniary pension
in Petitioner's name, that the Government
were pleased to sanction a pension of only
Rupees 500 per annum in the name of
the aged widow Zorah Baiyamm Sahiba
That this old Lady after enjoying the
pension for a short period of 15 years has
now breathed her last, leaving a grand
daughter who is married to Petitioner the
lawful heir and head of the family that
they have five children together with
several

* As per Perwannah
dated 10th Purnima
116 Hijry.

* Appendix marked
G Original case
be produced when
required.

several other relations and dependants to whom
but are really without means of doing so.
That your Lordship's Petitioner
having thus stated the facts connected with
the Jaghira begs to lay before your Lordship
the grounds on which he bases his claims
for the continuance in his name of Zorah
Baiyamm's Pension.

1st That the Jaghira which was
resumed by the British Government was
originally granted to the Petitioner's ancestors
by the Emperor of Delhi as a perpetual
grant as per Perwannah taken by Govern-
ment through the Collector of Ferozepore
after the cession of the Province and further
the Quab Coradool Omirah Bahadur
in his letter of condolence (herewith submitted
with Translation) on the occasion of the
demise of the late Ahmed Sahib Khan
styled Mahomed Hulsaim Khan Bahadur
Sahib wrote with reference to the Jaghira
that it will be continued to be enjoyed
by the members of his family in posterity
and that Nobleman's statement may well
be taken as evidence of the fact of the
perwannah.

the continuance in his name of the Pension
enjoyed by the late Mroatabar Khan, and
Zorah Baiyuni Sahiba as Petitioner is
descended from Mohammed Zewan Khan the
second son of Ahmed Sahir Khan 1st Jaghirdar
of Runjungad and connected with the
above Jaghirdar's family both by the male
and female lines, that is Paternal and Maternal
grand son of Ahmed Sahir Khan Jaghirdar
and the nephew of the late Zorah Baiyuni
Sahiba, and not that Petitioner is only the
son of a female cousin of the last recipient
as erroneously supposed as well he seen by the
Genealogical Tree. The name of Ali Khan * Appendix H
which seems to have been entirely omitted
should have preceded Mahomed Husein Khan
Bahadur Sahir, Doubtless these misstatements
have had a great share in misleading the
Government as to the Petitioner's position
and claims.

7th That in the 7th Article of the ratified
Treaty of 1801. between the Honorable East
India Company and the Nabob Azemood Dowlat,
the British Government engaged to take into
consideration

100/107
consideration the actual situation of the
families of their Highness the Nabobs Wallajah
and Comdant. Comdant Bahadur as well as
the situation of the principal officers of the
late Highness's Government and the British
Government engaged to charge itself with the
expense of suitable provision for their respective
Maintenance. -
8th That the late Court of Directors who
had a perfect knowledge of the affairs of the
Carnatic after a series of correspondence on
the subject were pleased to direct the Madras
Government by their despatch No 1 of 1850
dated 22nd May Para 51 to the following effect
The Acting Government Agent Dr. Balfour
considers the rules which relate to the Carnatic
stipends too favourable for the case of
what are called Jaghire Pension, being of
these having been originally granted for life
only. We are of opinion however that the
rule ought not to be that of reduction as an
successive lapses since we have repeatedly
remarked such a rule is liable to interfere
with the life interests of persons receiving
and

and entitled to receive support from the funds,
we are willing that such of these cases should
be decided by Government on its own particular
merits.

9th That the similar pension granted
to Jaghirdars of Sindh & Poona, &c. have
been up to the present moment continued to
the heir of the original grantee and that none
of the surviving relatives and dependants are
now left without the means of support.

8. That Petitioner trusts that, on
a consideration of the above grounds, the
Government will be able to admit the validity
of the Petitioner's claim on behalf of himself
and other relatives and dependants of the late
Moolabar Khan whose ancestors rendered
meritorious and valuable assistance to the
British Government. Petitioner would here
observe that, whilst the Government are
indebted to the Petitioner's family for the special
services rendered in critical times it is difficult
to conceive that its recognition by the British
Government should be characterized by the
resumption of the Jaghire reduction of allowances
and

and finally, by its treatment as a life grant,
when the position of the Petitioner and his
family for centuries rendered it impracticable
to seek a livelihood by other means and he would
further state that unless indeed the British
Government were pleased to grant the
interests of the family, it must as a sequence
be utterly ruined.

That by the Government justly
granting the Petitioner's request, Petitioner's
family will not only be made partakes of
the Government's kind patronage but they
will be greatly relieved from the trouble
debts contracted by the late Goral Begum
Sahaba and Moolabar Khan Bahadur, for
the due support of the family owing to the
inadequacy of the pension passed to them.

10. And in conclusion your Petitioner
most respectfully solicits that the Government
will be looking to the antiquity of the family
the high position which they have occupied
and the assistance which Petitioner's ancestors
rendered to the British Government and also
the value of the Jaghire resumed with, be pleased
to continue in Petitioner's name for the support
of

of the family as already recommended by the collector of South Arcot and the Board of Revenue the pension drawn by the late Zorah Baigum Sahiba, Petitioner who in the first instance was admitted to her pension during the continuance of the widowhood of her husband as head of the family, but which however was granted by Government to Zorah Baigum Sahiba respectfully prays that his position may now be recognized and the pension continued to him, the object of its grant being for the support of the family. It is for the Government to treat the case with that peculiar consideration which has characterized its proceedings towards other noble families in similarly circumstanced. For which Act of justice and benevolence your Lordships Petitioner as in duty bound shall ever pray.

Madras
General Posters Road
Class, to Madras
Club Door No 1
15th August 1870.

(Sealed) Mahomed Jaffer Hussain
Khan Bahadur
Jaghirdar of Rungunzaba.

A

1871/27

Yazirul Munim
lik Althamud God
Dowlah Hussain Khan
Khan Khien Bahadur
Biswath Prang, Sibney
Mahomed Shah
Badshah Gajy

Ordered that a Munsif of Pungrode and the title of (Mow-i-Farnat) be conferred upon Ahmed Sahir Khan alias Mahomed Jaffer son of the late Ahmed Sahir Khan.

B

Biswath Prang
Khan Bahadur
Biswath Prang

It is written to the servants of the Oukar who received salaries that they should in part payment of the salaries receive from according to the market rate as shall be paid by the kind Nabob Sahib Mohammed Hoosain Khan Sahir and should not demand the Rupees only. consider this as a peremptory order.

C A

Be it submitted to the perusal
of the Nabob Sahib, Mohammed Hoossein
Khan Bahadur Bafder Jung who is kind to
the sincere friends may Almighty God keep
him in safety.

Regarding the dependants of Syed
Mohammed Ameer and Syed Mohammed Peer

The Seal of

Mohammed
Hoossein
Khan Bahadur

D. A

Be it submitted to the perusal
of the Nabob Sahib Mohammed Hoossein Khan
Bahadur Sahib who is kind to the friends,
may Almighty God keep him in safety.

Mohammed
Hoossein
Khan Bahadur

Be

E.

Be it known to the Chief and others
Officers of the Village, that a jaghere yielding
a revenue of eleven Lacks, and sixty thousand
Dams has been allowed to Mohammed Ally the
Kalladar or the Governor of the Fort of Renjanga
gadra attached to the Taluk of Larnatic below
the Lyhat belonging to the said Province from
the date of the demise of Ahmed Sahib Khan.
It is required that the said jaghere may be left
in charge of his son, afterwards whenever
a formal document of Assignment shall be
received it may be acted upon accordingly.
(Remark)

From the date of the demise of Ahmed
Sahib Khan who was the Governor of the Fort
of Renjanga gadra in the Taluk of Larnatic below
the Lyhat of the said Sooba, the jaghere had been
continued to Mahomed Ally son of the late Khan
and the grand son of the late Saidutollah Khan
who has been succeeded his father. It is necessary
that the said jaghere be left in his charge and
things may be done according to the Rules after
the receipt of a Summad.

Summad of Piraj Sadde has been
conferred on Mahomed Ally son of the late
Ahmed Sahib Khan and that a Summad of
Sadopinjabe

Sadojungah has been conferred on Mahomed
Zameen the second son of the deceased.

Eventual and all other

(Circular stamp: Nizam's Secretariat, Hyderabad, Deccan, India)

It is known to the Chief and
other officers of the Village, that a jaghire
yielding a revenue of eleven Lacks and Sixty
thousand Dams has been allowed to Mahomed
Rufsum Khan Sahib alias Mahomed Ali
the Governor of the Fort of Rungungha
attached to the Taluk of Carnatic below the
ghat belonging to the said Province from
the date of the demise of Ali Khan alias
Mahomed Ali. It is required that the said
jaghire may be left in charge of his homestead
Afterwards whenever a formal Summad of
assignment shall be received it may be acted
upon accordingly.

(Remark)

From the date of the demise of
Ali Khan the Governor of the Fort at Rungun
gha in the Taluk of Carnatic below the ghat
of

100/15
of the Subah, a jaghire has been continued to
Mahomed Rofsum Khan Sahib the son of the
late Khan and he has been succeeded his father.
It is necessary that the said jaghire may be
left in his charge and things may be done
according to Rules after the receipt of a
Summad.

Translation of a Persian letter from Amiroob Khud
Wallajah Oordulathool Omrah to Mahomed
Rufsum Khan Bahadur Sahib dated 7th
day of Reboofance 1211 Hijri.
It is Khordar,

The death of your maternal uncle
the late Mahomed Rofsum Khan Bahadur
Sahib who had a great friendship and
intimacy with us has occasioned great sorrow
and regret. The Deedat Wiltis beyond the
power of any one to resist and we are from
God and we shall return again to God. It
is required that you be patient and render
consolation and comfort to those who are
left by the deceased behind him.

As

Mahomed Fakir Khan the first Jaghirdar of Rumpungabad, and the son in law of the late Sultan Khan Bahadur the father of the present

Mahomed Ally Khan the grand son of the late Sultan Khan Bahadur the father of the present

Mahomed Ghouse Khan alias Mahomed Shor a noble Khan Bahadur

1. Mahomed Ghouse Khan Bahadur married Shahrbanoo Begum alias of the late Ghouse Khan Bahadur alias Fakir Khan	2. Fatemah Begum B.	1. Ghouse Khan married Fatemah Begum B.	2. Shahrbanoo Begum A.
--	---------------------	---	------------------------

1. Mostafiz Khan Bahadur	2. Mookh Khan Bahadur	3. Jaffer Begum married Ghouse Khan alias Fakir Khan C.	Ghouse Khan married Jaffer Begum C.
--------------------------	-----------------------	---	-------------------------------------

1. Mahomed Fakir Khan Khan Bahadur	2. Ali Khan Bahadur	3. Jaffer Khan Bahadur	4. Jaffer Khan Bahadur married Ali Khan Bahadur	5. Ghouse Khan married Jaffer Khan Bahadur
------------------------------------	---------------------	------------------------	---	--

1. Shahrbanoo Begum alias Begum Begum E.	2. Mahomed Ghouse Khan Bahadur married Shahrbanoo Begum E.	3. Ghouse Khan Bahadur	4. Fatemah Begum	5. Shahrbanoo Begum married Ghouse Khan Bahadur
--	--	------------------------	------------------	---

1. Mostafiz Khan Bahadur married Jaffer Begum	2. Jaffer Khan Bahadur married Ali Khan Bahadur	3. Mahomed Ghouse Khan Bahadur	4. Shahrbanoo Begum
---	---	--------------------------------	---------------------

1. Jaffer Khan Bahadur married Ali Khan Bahadur	2. Mahomed Ghouse Khan Bahadur
---	--------------------------------

1. Jaffer Khan Bahadur	2. Mahomed Ghouse Khan Bahadur
------------------------	--------------------------------

1. Ghouse Khan married Jaffer Khan Bahadur	2. Shahrbanoo Begum
--	---------------------

1. Mahomed Ghouse Khan Bahadur married Ali Khan Bahadur	2. Shahrbanoo Begum
---	---------------------

As the Jaghir of Rumpungabad
 Part subject is conferred from the time of your
 ancestors for generation to generation it will
 by grace of God and through the favour of
 Mahomed and his holy posterity prove
 prosperous to you it is incumbent upon
 you to consider us always to be your
 cordial friend assistant and defender and
 exercise full power as was done by your
 ancestors and for the managing
 and administering the affairs of the state
 We have conferred upon you the title of
 Mahomed Ghouse Khan Bahadur Fakir
 and out of our cordial favour we have sent
 an embroidered robe of honour together with
 "Jeeva and Lurpach" ornaments set
 with precious stones by way of a good
 omen which will reach you. What more
 is to be written. Consider us always your
 sincere friend and well wisher. Set your
 mind at rest.

Dated in Court 19th June 1811.

(Signed) L. H. Higginson
 Register

A

Copy of the Petition
 presented to your committee
 by the Anti-Slavery
 Association of the
 State of New York,
 dated 15th August 1850.

Am No. 228572
 Am No 245574

So. 25.11.76 No 1201

as the Wife of such a respectable Mahomedan
Gentleman was much cared for by her deceased
husband. And your Petitioner deeply regrets that
her husband, for whom the Honorable Government
has a very high regard as it will be clearly evident
by the perusal of the following commendation, left the
Government of India by the late Governor of Madras
Lord Napier, was cut off in the prime of his youth,
to the irreparable mortification & serious detriment
of the interest of the Petitioner's other who were, res-
pectably maintained by him.

That the Petitioner in particular
having now been left quite destitute, without any
means of subsistence whatever, and as the deceased
Nabob Mahomed Jaffer Khan of the Khan of Badoon
has in his deathbed, which occurred at the Petitioner's
own house & advised her, that the Honorable Govern-
ment will not neglect to take her claims into
benevolent Consideration when the same is laid
before them, your Honorable Board's Petitioner has now
taken the liberty of addressing your Honorable Board
on the subject, with the full assurance, that the Board
of Revenue will take her respectable position as the
Widow of the above Gentleman into such deserv-
ing view, as your Board may deem her case is entitled to,
as becoming her rank & rank, and then submit her
just case for the favorable Consideration of the
Honorable Government, & see that some portion of her
husband's Jaghere pension be continued in her hands
with arrears from the date of his demise, & thus to make
her the partaker of your Honorable Board's Graciously &

And

Kind Patronage.

And in conclusion, your Honorable
Board's Petitioner most respectfully begs leave
to state, that as the Pension enjoyed by the Petitioner's
husband, was originally granted in lieu of the valu-
able Jaghere by the presumption of which the Honorable
Board's Government have been very highly benefited,
and as the Jaghere Pension, have been there in similar
other cases continued to the heirs of the original Jaghere
without any interruption whatever, your Honorable
Board's Petitioner humbly solicits that this important
& essential ground may be benevolently taken into
Consideration in the disposal of her claims, as she is
in accordance with the Principles of Mahomedan Law
entitled to a fair portion of her husband's Jaghere Pension
under a separate Receipt without the interference of
any others in the family.

For which act of justice & benevolence
your faithful & obedient Petitioner as is duty bound, -
shall ever pray,

Vellore
November
25 1874

مستد
زینب النساء

No. 9 No. 2925 of 1874
 leaving her quite
 destitute.
 The pension having
 been granted in
 view of the Saffire,
 Prays that the Board
 will recommend to
 Govt that a pension
 of Rs 125 be given
 to her, with arrears
 from her husband's
 death.
 In this case of 24th July
 In this case of 24th July
 In this case of 24th July

From Zeenathun Nissa
 the late Nissa widow of
 the late Nissa Mahomed
 Jaffer Hussain Khan
 Bahadur grandson of the
 late Jaghirdar of
 Rungungrad District
 who at Vellore.
 Dated 25th Nov 1874
 Recd 25th Nov 1874
 Quoted of 2 Refers
 July 1874
 States that her husband
 belonged to the family
 of the Jaghirdar of
 Rungungrad and was
 drawing a monthly
 stipend of Rs 250.
 He died in July last

Revenue Department
 Miscellaneous No. 237.
 Proceedings of the Board of Revenue.
 Dated 13 January 1875

Read Petitions Nos: 2453 & 2925 of 1874,
 Ann Mahomed Motabar Khan and
 Zeenathun Nissa Begum, eldest son &
 Nissa widow respectively of the late
 Nawab Mahomed Jaffer Hussain Khan
 Bahadur, Jaghirdar of Rungungrad
 District.

Referred to the Collector of Madras for report
 as to the family left by the late Mahomed
 Jaffer Hussain Khan, their names
 and age, their circumstances, and
 the means of subsistence possessed by
 them.

The Board believe that Mahomed
 Esoff, Magistrate of the Town of
 Madras is acquainted with the
 family and will be able to give an

the Collector information as to these
circumstances. The other information
should be obtained through the collector
of North Arcot from the widow who
resides at Vallure.

(True Extract)

(23) H. C. Stokes

Agal Secretary

To the Collector of
Madras.

(True copy)

L. A. S. S. S.

Agal Secretary.

C. S. S. S.

Agal Secretary.

Endorse in
Wm S. Houshargh
27 Sept. 1896, No: 2446.
1895 Secretary's Offt.
R.S.

1895-1896

Dec 4 3 52/75

Qd 25 Nov 1896
12-1891

Copy of
W.S. Houshargh: No: 237
27 13 Aug 1895