

MADRAS RECORD OFFICE.**Government of Madras.***Revenue* **DEPARTMENT.**

G.O. No.	287	Press
		~~Mis.~~
Dated	21 - 4 - 1390	

Not to be folded or roughly handled

PROCEEDINGS OF THE BOARD OF REVENUE

(LAND REVENUE).

MR. L. V. BLISS.

READ—again Proceedings of the Board of Revenue (Land Revenue), dated 2nd September 1888, No. 517.

ABSTRACT.—Requesting certain Collector to report how many of the yeomiah allowances granted in compensation for the resumption of jaghires granted by the Nabob of the Carnatic subsequent to the treaty of 1792 have lapsed, and how many are still continued in whole or in part.

READ—also the following paper from the Collector of Nellore, dated 15th May 1888, No. 1830-Acc. :—

REVISED statement of jaghires resumed having been granted subsequent to the treaty of 1792 and pensions allowed instead, Nellore district.

Names of persons.	Annual value of the jaghires resumed according to the Revenue with names of the villages forming the jaghire.	Amount of pension granted per mensem.	Remarks.
1. Syed Shawally Kadiry	Laboor in the Pargana of Nellore. Circular Sarvapally, commonly called Nellore.	STAR PAGODAS. 100	1. The pensioner first refused to receive the pension and withdrew that refusal sometime before his death on 20th December 1807. According to Government Order conveyed in Board's Proceedings, dated 29th April 1808, the arrears of Star Pagodas 6440, or Rs. 22,540, were paid (letter to Board, dated 19th July 1808) to the eldest son of the deceased. In Board's order of 7th July 1808, the application of the eldest son to continue the pension was rejected on the ground that the allowance was a life-grant.
2. Syed Jammal-ud-deen Ahmed Khan.	Coorgoondah in the Pargana of Cudved, Circular Sarvapally.	1, 70 100	2 and 3. It appears that these pensions continued to be paid till end of April 1887. With reference to the Board's order of 15th September 1814, the Provincial Accountant-General was addressed in the matter of paying these pensioners in Madras, and the pensions were regularly paid to the recipients in the general treasury office at the Presidency from 1st May 1814 to 30th April 1817. The last advice of payment received from the Accountant-General was dated 6th September 1817. I have now asked the Accountant-General to state what became of these two pensioners subsequently, and his reply will be communicated on receipt. No more information is available in the records of this office.
3. Syed Jellal-ud-deen Khan	Chelamaloore in the Pargana of Cudved, Circular Sarvapally.	114 50	

Submitted to the Secretary the Board of Revenue (Land Revenue), Madras, with reference to their Proceedings, dated 4th May 1888, Mis. No. 2309.

READ—also the following letter from H. H. O'FARRELL, Esq., Acting Collector of Nellore, to the Secretary to the Commissioners of Land Revenue, dated Nellore, 18th June 1888, No. 2374-Acc.

In continuation of this office No. 530-Acc., dated 15th May 1888, I have the honor to state that the Accountant-General has, in his letter, dated 2nd June 1888, No. I.A.D.-349-P., stated that the information called for cannot be furnished, as all the bill books on record in his office for the years prior to 1847-48 have been destroyed.

READ—also the following letter from J. LEE-WARNER, Esq., Collector of the Chingleput District, to the Secretary to the Commissioners of Land Revenue, dated Saidapet, 17th April 1888, No. 761-Ind:—

In continuation of my letter, Reference on No. 336-L.R.-G. & B., dated 4th instant, I have the honor to forward, herewith, a list (in original) received from the Paymaster of Carnatic Stipends showing the districts to which the jaghires (mentioned in the list forwarded with Board's circular of 10th July 1802) appertained. It would appear therefrom that none of these jaghires relate to this district.

READ—also the following letter from W. J. H. LEFANU, Esq., Acting Collector of North Arcot, to the Secretary to the Commissioners of Land Revenue, dated Walajapet, 10th July 1888, Reference on Government No. 17:—

With reference to G.O., dated 7th April 1888, No. 238, Revenue, paragraph 2, calling for a report as to how lapses among the other jaghiredars, who are granted pensions in the resumption of their jaghires, have been dealt with, I have the honor to state that this information so far as it was available was furnished to the Board in my letter, No. 701, dated 31st December 1887, referred to in Board's Proceedings, dated 10th February 1888, No. 141.

READ—also the following letter from H. SEWELL, Esq., Collector of South Arcot, to the Secretary to the Commissioners of Land Revenue, dated Cuddalore, 5th April 1888, No. 108:—

With reference to Board's Proceedings, No. 141, dated 16th February last, I have the honor to state that the records in this office do not show that any one of the pensioners named in the list circulated with the Board's circular of 10th July 1802 has ever been paid his pension from this treasury. Apparently none of them belongs to this district.

2. The Kistnapuram pensioners who now draw their pensions at this treasury were transferred from the North Arcot district (*vide* G.O., No. 1327, dated 8th November 1842), communicated with Board's Proceedings, No. 187, of 14th November 1842. Full particulars about these men are already before Government. They are the descendants of Mahomed Masum, the original grantee.

READ—also the following letter from W. A. WILLOCK, Esq., Acting Collector of Trichinopoly, to the Secretary to the Commissioners of Land Revenue, dated Trichinopoly, 8th June 1888, No. 274-4:—

Adverting to paragraph 3 of Board's Proceedings, No. 141, dated 14th February 1888, I have the honor to report that on causing both the English and Vernacular records of my office to be carefully examined, I do not find any papers showing the

payment of any pension at any time in this district either to Hussain-ul-Mulk* and Nazir-ul-Mulk,* the 4th and 5th legitimate sons of the Nabob Walajah, or to Amir-ul-Omra, the 2nd legitimate late son of the Nabob Walajah.

* No. 37.
† No. 38.

Reference on the above, dated 22nd January 1889.

In a list furnished by the Paymaster of the Carnatic Stipends to the Collector of Chingleput, copy of which will now be forwarded to the Collectors of North Arcot, South Arcot and Trichinopoly, it is observed that the 5th jaghire therein mentioned belongs to the Vellore taluk in the North Arcot district, and the 6th, 7th and 3th jaghires to South Arcot district (Belbore being said to be in South Arcot district and Nusrutghur to be another name for Gingee, also in South Arcot). The 9th appears, from the list as well as papers quoted in the margin, to belong to the Trichinopoly district. Yet these Collectors have reported that no papers relating to those pensions could be found. They are now requested to have a careful search made of the records of their offices with the aid of the information now afforded, and to report fully at an early date on the pensions in question.

(Signed) M. HAMMICK,
Secretary.

To the Collector of North Arcot, with copy of list.

" " of South Arcot, with do.

" " of Trichinopoly, with do.

Copy to the Secretary to Government, Revenue Department.

READ—also the following letter from W. J. H. LEFANU, Esq., Collector of North Arcot, to the Secretary to the Commissioners of Land Revenue, dated Chittoor, 9th April 1889, Reference on Acctt. Eng. No. 34:—

With reference to the correspondence noted in the margin, I have the honor to report that papers connected with the lapse of one of the other eight jaghire pensions, referred to in para. 2 of G.O., dated 7th April 1888, No. 238, Revenue, have been since discovered. These are Board's letter to Government, dated 24th June 1857, No. 2170, and Extract from Minutes of Consultation, dated 17th June 1857, No. 604. These papers appear to relate to the lapse of a share of the allowance originally granted to Mahomed Masum on the resumption of the jaghire of Kistnapuram in 1802.

2. Further search is being actively made for papers connected with the other allowances, and the result will be reported shortly.

READ—also the following letter from W. J. H. LEFANU, Esq., Collector of North Arcot, to the Secretary to the Commissioners of Land Revenue, dated Kuppam, 28th June 1889, No. 65-In:—

In continuation of my letter, No. 34, Reference on Acc. Eng., dated 9th April 1889, I have the honor to report the result of the further search made for records connected with the lapse of the jaghires, referred to in G.O., No. 238 (Revenue), dated 7th April 1888, and in Board's Reference on General Register Nos. 2277, 1149 and 1887, dated 22nd January 1889.

2. The first paper on record in connection with the jaghires is the Proceedings

- (1) List of jaghires to be restored.
- (2) Do. to be resumed.
- (3) List of persons to be pensioned on the resumption of their jaghires.
- (4) Abstract of family jaghires, showing the revenues of the jaghires.

of Government, dated 10th July 1802, with the marginally-noted lists. The Proceedings convey the order of Government directing the resumption of all the jaghires granted subsequent to the treaty of 1792 on the principle that such grants could not be binding with respect to the

Nabob's right of alienation under that treaty. The Seynoor jaghire, specially referred to in Board's memorandum above, dated 22nd January 1889, being one of the nine jaghires so resumed, a cash allowance of 50 pagodas was granted in lieu to each of the two Moulvies named in the list, viz., Moulvi Abdul Rub and Moulvi Imam Buksh. The former appears to have been in the enjoyment of his pension only up to fasli 1217 as appears from a Mahratta mohinzapitha of that period, and his name ceased to be borne in the mohinzapitha of the next and succeeding faslis. To trace the cause of this omission appears extremely difficult, as all possible and careful search was made in the records of the earlier years without avail, and the only conclusion that can be come to, is that the recipient had died, and that, therefore, the allowance had altogether lapsed in pursuance of the orders of Government conveyed in the 9th para. of the order quoted above.

3. As regards the pension of the other Moulvi, Imam Buksh, his name appears in the Mahratta mohinzapitha of all the earlier years until fasli 1223 when it altogether disappears. There is, however, a petition on record in the Persian language, presented to the Board in 1812, in which the petitioner stated that she was the widow of Moulvi Imam Buksh and was reduced to great poverty, and requested Government to extend their bounty to her. The petition was referred by the Board to the Collector in their letter, dated 2nd November 1812, with orders to report on the circumstances of the family; and on the 17th November 1812, the Collector reported that neither she nor any one on her behalf appeared before him to give any information respecting her family and their means of support. The claim of the widow was, however, rejected as the grant was not hereditary. This allowance, therefore, appears to have lapsed on the death of the incumbent.

4. As reported in my letter No. 34, Ref. Acc. Eng., dated 9th April 1889, the marginally-noted papers on record here relate to the lapse of a share of the allowance originally granted to Mahomed Masum on the resumption of the jaghire of Kistnapuram (No. 4 in the list) in 1802.

5. Regarding the jaghire of Chelamattur (No. 3 in the list), a full account is given in a statement submitted by me on the 19th July 1887, No. 84, and also in my letter, No. 116, dated 24th December 1887, both of which are embodied in G.O., No. 238, dated 7th April 1888.

6. The name of Mahomed Feroze Khan, No. 7 in the list, also appears in the Mahratta mohinzapithas of faslis 1213 and 1219.

7. Saving the above, the records do not afford any information respecting the lapses of the remaining jaghires. A reference was also made on the subject of the said jaghires to the Collector of Chingleput, and I submit a copy of his reply with enclosures for the information of the Board. From this it will be observed that the pension of the grandson of No. 1 was transferred to Hyderabad, that the son of No. 6 died on the 29th June 1869, and that no information exists in his office as regards the other pensioners.

READ—also the following letter from H. H. O'FARRELL, Esq., Acting Collector of South Arcot, to the Secretary to the Commissioners of Land Revenue, dated Cuddalore, 28th August 1889, No. 1316-Indexed:—

Adverting to paragraph 2 of my letter, dated 1st April last, Reference on Register No. 48-B.L., I have the honor to inform that the long expected report from the Collector of Madras on the subject of jaghire pensions has come, a copy of which is herein enclosed. The pensioners in question having been transferred to the Collector of Madras where they received payment of their pensions, I have nothing to add to the report made by the Deputy Collector of that district.

ENCLOSURE No. 1.

From C. E. PLUNKETT, Esq., Deputy Collector of Madras, to the Collector of Madras, dated Madras, 8th July 1889, No. 737.

Adverting to paragraph 1 of the South Arcot Collector's letter, dated 14th March 1889, No. 48-B.L., forwarded with your endorsement, dated 2nd April 1889, Ref. on No. 832-Genl., I have the honor to enclose copy of the letter, dated the 11th March 1813, with its enclosure, from the Principal Collector of the Southern Division of Arcot, to the Collector of Madras.

2. Referring to paragraph 2 of the South Arcot Collector's letter, I have the honor to state that under the sanction of Government, dated 20th June 1804, Mahomed Banker Hussain was granted a monthly jaghire pension of Rs. 1,225, and on his demise, on the 12th February 1843, one-third of the amount of his pension, i.e., Rs. 408-5-4 per mensem, was allowed by order of Government, dated 7th July 1843, to the whole of the family—seventeen in number—for their lives. Subsequently the widow, Fatima Begam, and her three daughters—Abbassy Begam, Aze-zoonissa Begam, Rahinatoonissa Begam—having petitioned the Government for an increase of their allowances, one-third of the original amount of pension, i.e., Rs. 408-5-4 per mensem, was granted them to be distributed into equal shares of Rs. 102-1-4 each under Extract from the Minutes of Consultation, dated 16th October 1848, No. 481. After that, Laul Beebee and Sharbonoo Begam, widows of the original jaghiredar Khadar Navaz Khan, who were drawing Rs. 42 and 100, respectively, from his son, Mahomed Banker Hussain, also petitioned for additional allowances, and their previous amounts were continued to them under the orders of the Court of Directors. Thereupon, the allowance of each of the seventeen members of the family stood as shown against their names in the margin.

	Per Annum.	Rs.	A.	P.
1. Goolam Hussain	120	0	0	
2. Fatima Begam	1,225	0	0	
3. Abbassy Begam	1,225	0	0	
4. Aze-zoonissa Begam	1,225	0	0	
5. Rahinatoonissa Begam	1,225	0	0	
6. Sheriff Ali Khan	280	0	0	
7. Katooma Begam	93	5	0	
8. Habiboonissa Begam	93	5	0	
9. Mahabooboonissa Begam	93	5	0	
10. Massa Begam	120	0	0	
11. Habeeba Beebee	80	0	0	
12. Karimoonissa Begam	80	0	0	
13. Rymoonissa Begam	80	0	0	
14. Hafiz Begam	80	0	0	
15. Fatima Beebee	80	0	0	
16. Sharbonoo Begam	1,200	0	0	
17. Laul Beebee	504	0	0	

3. Karimoonissa Begam, Rymoonissa Begam and Hafiz Begam dying, their respective shares of Rs. 80 each lapsed to Government. Katooma Begam had her allowance of Rs. 93-5-0 commuted for a bonus under G.O., dated 2nd December 1859. Habiboonissa Begam had likewise her pension of Rs. 93-5-0 commuted under Board's Proceedings, No. 3091, dated 13th June 1861. Mahabooboonissa Begam had her pension also commuted for a sum of Rs. 1,027-2-0 under Board's Proceedings, dated 20th July 1860. Massa Begam, who was drawing an allowance of Rs. 120 died, but it is not known whether the pension enjoyed by her was continued to any one or not. Habeeba Beebee and Fatima Beebee, who were each drawing Rs. 80, commuted their pensions under the G.O., dated 2nd December 1859. The three ladies—Katooma Begam, Habiboonissa Begam and Mahabooboonissa Begam, who, as said above, commuted their pensions, subsequently applied for a continuance of their pensions on the ground that they had outlived the number of years for which their pensions were commuted, and the matter was reported upon in this office letter, dated 9th June 1883, No. 478, and their request was eventually granted by the Government of India in their order quoted in the Board's Proceedings, dated 14th February 1884, Mls. No. 1355, communicated with Collector's endorsement, dated 22nd February 1884, No. 156.

4. The following members of the family of Mahomed Banker Hussain appear from the records in this office to have been drawing on the 31st December 1868, the pensions noted against each:—

Fatima Begam, Rs. 1,225, under G.O., dated 16th October 1848.
 Abbassy Begam, Rs. 1,225, under do. do.
 Azeezoonissa Begam, Rs. 1,225, under do. do.
 Rahinatounissa Begam, Rs. 1,225, under do. do.
 Ahmed Ali, Rs. 140, under dated G.O., 21st January 1865.
 Mahomed Sydoodeen, Rs. 140, under do. do.

As the payment of pensioners was transferred from this to the Accountant-General's office under G.O., dated 11th August 1870, No. 1228, Revenue, further particulars regarding this family are not traceable in the records of this office.

5. Mahomed Feroze Khan, referred to in paragraph 3 of the South Arcot Collector's letter, was granted a pension of Rs. 175 a month for life only, in lieu of a resumed jaghire. On his death in 1822, Rs. 70 lapsed to Government, and the remaining sum of Rs. 105 was allowed in equal shares to his sons, Abdul Wahab and Ghulam Hussain, under G.O., dated 16th August 1822, No. 545. Ghulam Hussain died in 1827 and Rs. 17-8-0 lapsed to Government, and the remainder Rs. 35 was distributed as per margin,

	Rs.	A.	P.
Cander Bee	10	8	0
Ghulam Hussain	10	8	0
Aiysha Beebee	7	0	0
Murtuza Hussain	7	0	0
Total	35	0	0

under G.O., dated 17th November 1829, No. 822. On the death of Aiysha Beebee and Murtuza Hussain, their allowances lapsed to Government; and on the death of Ghulam Hussain (the younger), his son Mahomed Abdulla applied for the continuance of his father's pension, and Government sanctioned in their order, dated 2nd December 1875, No. 1739, a reduced pension of Rs. 7 per mensem.

6. Abdul Wahab, the remaining son of Feroze Khan, died on the 20th June 1869, and Rs. 17-8-0 lapsed to Government. The remainder, viz., Rs. 35, was distributed among his survivors as shown below, under G.O., dated 13th March 1873, No. 301:—

	Rs.	A.	P.
(1) Mahomed Kasim	15	0	0
(2) Ghulam Hussain	7	8	0
(3) Ali Hussain	7	8	0
(4) Laul Beebee	5	0	0

Further particulars regarding the family of Feroze Khan are not available.

7. Bahadur Ali Shah, mentioned in the letter under report, was drawing a monthly allowance of Rs. 175, and when he died, one-eleventh of it, viz., Rs. 15-14-6, lapsed to Government, and the remainder was, under instructions from the Board, dated 30th January 1817, divided equally amongst the ten members of his family, viz.:—

(1) Syed Isooraliul Hussain.	(6) Ameena Beebee.
(2) Syed Assurdowlah.	(7) Syed Hussainoolah.
(3) Syed Niperoolah.	(8) Syed Isoofanoolah.
(4) Syed Azeezoolah.	(9) Accamy Begam.
(5) Manna Begam.	(10) Noor Beebee.

Syed Isooraliul Hussain dying, one half of his pension, viz., Rs. 7-15-3 per mensem, lapsed to Government; and the balance was allowed to his widow, Bannoo Beebee. Syed Niperoolah and Syed Hussainoolah having left the Presidency many years ago, their pensions were discontinued. Syed Assurdowlah, Ameena Beebee and Noor Beebee having died, their shares also lapsed to Government. Bannoo Beebee, widow of Syed Isooraliul Hussain, Manna Begam and Accamy Begam had their respective pensions commuted under G.O., dated 2nd December 1859. Syed Azeezoonallah, Syed Isoofanoolah, the remaining two individuals, appear to have been drawing their pensions in this office on the 31st December 1864, under G.O., dated 17th March 1847. No more particulars are traceable in the records of this office.

8. I regret the delay in the submission of this report, which was partly due to having waited for a reply to this office letter, No. 530, dated 23rd May 1889, which reply was received only on the 3rd instant, and partly also to having had to wade through a mass of old records bearing on the subject.

Ref. on No. 2035.

Forwarded to the Collector of South Arcot with the enclosures, with reference to his letter of the 14th March last, No. 48-B.L.

2. Copies of the Deputy Collector's letter of the 9th June 1883, No. 478, referred to at paragraph 3 and of the connected correspondence are also enclosed for reference.

3rd August 1889.

(Signed) R. W. BARLOW,
Collector.

To the Collector of South Arcot.

Enclosure No. 2.

From M.R.Ry. R. RAGHOONATHA ROW, Deputy Collector of Madras, to the Collector of Madras, dated Madras, 9th June 1883, No. 478.

I have the honor to submit the report called for in your endorsement, dated 13th March 1883, No. 321, on the petition presented by three Mahomedan ladies praying for the revival of their jaghire yeomiah pensions and to raise the grants to amount suitable to their rank and descent.

2. Under G.O., dated 7th July 1843, No. 264, a monthly jaghire yeomiah pension of Rs. 7-12-6 was granted to each of the three sisters, Kantumah Begum, Abulemnissa Begam and Mahabooboonissa Begam, on account of their close relationship to Mahomed Banker Hussain, they being the daughters of his sister Pyarea Begam, but for some reason or other they had all commuted their pensions to lump money grants so far back as 1859 to 1861 and Revenue Board's Proceedings of 2nd December 1859, of 20th July 1860 and of 13th June 1861, show that Kantumah Begam received Rs. 933-2-0, Abulemnissa Begam Rs. 979-12-6 and Mahabooboonissa Begam Rs. 1,027-2-0, being equivalents to 10, 10 1/2 and 11 years' purchase money of their pensions.

3. Copy of G.O. of 7th July 1843, No. 264, under which pensions were sanctioned to the three sisters is enclosed for your perusal, but the Revenue Board's Proceedings under which the pensions were commuted cannot be traced, and this does not matter much as the petitioners themselves and their vakil stated, both in the petition and in the statement given in this office, that the commutation of their pensions did take place on their own motion.

4. What the petitioners now contend is that having lived considerably longer than the number of years for which their pensions were commuted, and having grown old and very poor with age, their pensions should not only be revived, but that some additions should be made to them, as under G.O., dated 2nd January 1883, No. 2, Revenue, a large monthly pension of Rs. 102-1-4 was sanctioned to Ahmed Ali Khan, which was vacated by his deceased wife Abbassy Begam, simply because he traced his descent from the same Banker Hussain, of whom the three petitioners are the nieces.

5. The evidence taken in this office shows that the petitioners are the nieces of Banker Hussain; that they sold their pensions to Government; that they are now very old and very poor, so much so that they depend for food on the charity of neighbours; and that with the exception of Abubunissa Begam, the middle sister, they are encumbered with large families.

6. Bearing, however, in mind that Government, in their recent order, dated 18th September 1882, No. 244, Revenue Department, declined to receive a commuted pension in favor of one Chand Beebee alias Asunt Beebee, a much more distressing case than that of the three petitioners, and that the continuance of the pension of deceased Abbassy Begam to her surviving husband Ahmed Ali Khan, under G.O. of 2nd January 1883, No. 2, Revenue, was owing to the present recipients being the adopted son of Banker Hussain and the grandson of Kadir Navaz Khan, the petitioners, I think, have no claims upon Government.

7. If, however, you are disposed to view the petitioner's case favorably by reason of their old age and poor circumstances, Government may be moved to revive their pensions.

8. The petition under report and the three statements taken in the case, together with the futwah filed by the petitioners are forwarded for your perusal.

ENCLOSURE No. 3.
List of the pensioners and yeomahdars paid by the Collector in Southern Division of Arcot transferred to the Collector of Madras.

Names of the pensioners and place of residence.	Age.	Number of pensioners participating in the pension.	Date of the pension being granted.	Relation of the pensioner to the original pensioner.	Abstract of the reasons on record for granting the pension.	Amount of the pension per month.				Amount of the pension per year.	Remarks.
						Rs.	P.	A.	As.		
Madras.											
Moolhaloo Kanne or hereditary Subdar Hussain of Gingoe.	34	9	7th Shaban Hijree.	Grandson	For their subsistence.	6	14	37	75	88	Paid up to 12th July 1812.
Khoth or life pensioners.											
Sivaranjany of Tremoullin ..	34	5	20th Zilhaz Hijree.	Son	Do.	2	4	60	25	12	Do. do.
Khyroohussah of Phovanghur..	30	1	15th Shavval Hijree.	Granddaughter	Do.	4	9	61	60	25	Paid up to 12th Oct. 1812.
Syed Moocoolah Husseny of Gingoe.	43	1	1199 Isadi ..	Original	Do.	3	4	68	25	12	Paid up to 12th July 1812.
Aubach Faibah, &c., of Tremoullin.	61	5	1199 Isadi ..	Do.	Do.	..	38	45	10	12	Do. do.
Government pensioners.											
Mahomed Hussain Hussain ..	..	..	..	..	..	9	13	65	111	19	Paid up to 31st Dec. 1812.
Mahomed Ferree Khan ..	..	..	..	..	..	350	50	..	4,200	..	Do. do.
						400	..	..	4,800	..	
						415	27	25	4,987	12	

READ—also the following letter from G. W. FAWCETT, Esq., Acting Collector of Trichinopoly, to the Secretary to the Commissioners of Land Revenue, dated Trichinopoly, 11th April 1889, No. 140-4.

I have the honor to report on the subject of Board's Reference, dated 22nd January last, on General Register Nos. 2279, 1149 and 1887 of 1888.

2. I have ascertained, with the help of the references given me by the Board, viz., Board's letter to Mr. Lushington (Collector of Trichinopoly), dated 29th May 1815, No. 42, that the pension of 200 pagodas per mensem ordered to be paid and distributed to the grandsons of the Jaghiredar Syed Mukhdum Ali Khan was resumed under the orders of the Court of Directors—*vide* the following papers communicated with letter, dated 28th September 1818, from the Secretary to the Board of Revenue to this office, and has never been paid:—

- (1) Extract from a general letter from the Honorable the Court of Directors in the Political Department, dated 15th October 1817, paras. 29, 30 and 31.
- (2) Extract from the Minutes of the Right Honorable the Governor in Council, dated 28th July 1818.
- (3) The resolution of the Board on the above two orders.

RESOLUTION—dated 12th December 1889, No. 887.

In G.O., dated 21st July 1887, No. 707, Government, when passing orders regarding the continuance of a pension enjoyed by a deceased member of the family of the ex-Jaghiredar of Kistnapuram, North Arcot District, called on the Board to report what action was taken in regard to the other jaghires resumed along with it, as having been granted subsequent to the treaty of 1792. The Board, in its Proceedings, dated 2nd September 1887, No. 517, requested the Collectors of Nellore, Chingleput, North Arcot, South Arcot and Trichinopoly, to whom lists of the resumed jaghires had been forwarded with Board's circular letter of 10th July 1802, to furnish the information called for by Government.

2. The Board had not been able to find the original of the lists which accompanied the Government Order on Mr. Falconer's report, and by mistake an incorrect list of the jaghires was forwarded to the Collector. The replies therefore which were received did not furnish the information required, and the Board again made a reference to them on the subject in its Proceedings, dated 16th February 1888, No. 141. In reply to this, the Collectors of North Arcot, South Arcot and Trichinopoly reported that no information could be gleaned from their records; and the Collector of Chingleput, in forwarding copy of a list of the nine jaghires concerned, which he had received from the Paymaster of Carnatic Stipends, reported that none of them related to his district. It was ascertained by inquiry that the old names given in this list referred to the modern districts of North Arcot, South Arcot and Trichinopoly, and the Collectors of those districts were again addressed on the subject, and they were requested to make a further search of their records, and to submit such information as might be available—*vide* reference, dated 22nd January 1889, on General Register Nos. 2279, 1149, 1887 of 1888. Thereupon these Collectors have submitted the three reports last read above. The information in some cases is still incomplete, but the Board considers that what is furnished in regard to these cases sufficiently indicates the policy adopted in dealing with the pensions of the class under consideration.

3. Of the nine cases noted in the margin* in which pensions were granted†

- | | |
|-------------------------------|----------------|
| 1. Syed Shah Ali Khadiri ... | } Nellore. |
| 2. Syed Jamal-ud-din Khan ... | |
| 3. Syed Jalal-ud-din Khan ... | |
| 4. Mahomed Masum ... | South Arcot. |
| 5. { Moulvi Abdul Rub ... | } North Arcot. |
| 6. { Moulvi Imam Buksh ... | |
| 7. Kadir Navaz Khan ... | South Arcot. |
| 8. Mahomed Feroze Khan ... | } South Arcot. |
| 9. Family of Bahadur Ali ... | |
| 9. Syed Mukhdum Ali Khan. | Trichinopoly. |

† Letter from Government, to Board, dated 4th June 1892, paragraph 9.

6th September 1817, he addressed that officer asking what became of these two pensions subsequent to 1817, and that he received a reply from that officer to the effect that, as all the bill books on record in his office for the years prior to 1847-48 have been destroyed, the information asked for could not be furnished. The Board observes, however, from the tabular statement printed in G.O., dated 7th April 1888, No. 238, that the pension in case No. 3 was continued, on the death of the grantee, to his widow in 1828, on the understanding that it was to cease on her death, or that only a reduced portion would be continued at the pleasure of Government. She died in 1886, and Rs. 65 and odd, being one-half of her pension, was continued to her successor under the Government Order quoted.

4. When the pensioner in case No. 4 died, half of his allowance, viz., Rs. 87-3-0, was continued to his son Ghulam Hussain, and on his death two-thirds of his allowance, i.e., Rs. 6 per mensem, were granted in the name of his widow Garce Bee for the support of herself and her 8 children on the understanding that the pension would cease at her death. ‡ This fact does not appear to have been brought to the notice of Government when the Government Order under reply was passed.

5. In case No. 5, the Collector of North Arcot reports that it was a life-grant, and that the pension of one of the two original grantees, viz., Moulvi Abdul Rub, was continued up to fasli 1217 (1807), and that his name cannot be traced in the records of the next and succeeding faslis, owing probably to his death and the consequent lapse of his allowance, with reference to paragraph 9 of the G.O., dated 10th July 1802. The name of the other grantee, Moulvi Imam Buksh, also appears in the list only up to fasli 1223 (1813), when it altogether disappears. There is, however, a petition on record presented to the Board in 1812 in which the petitioner, as widow of the deceased Moulvi, asked Government to extend its bounty to her. The claim of the petitioner was, it is reported, rejected as the grant was not hereditary. But the Board observes from the papers quoted in the margin that a pension of 40 pagodas was granted to the petitioner. The Collector of Madras is now requested to report what became of this pension.

Board's letter to Government, dated 12th July 1813.
From Government, dated 30th July 1813, No. 1036.

6. No. 6 was granted a pension of Rs. 1,225 when his jaghire was resumed in 1802. He died in 1804, when his whole pension was continued to his son Mahomed Banker Hussain. On his death in 1843, the pension was claimed by his adopted son Ahmed Ali Khan, but his claim was rejected by Government on the ground that the Court of Directors had ruled against the continuance of pensions to adopted sons, and a reduced pension of Rs. 408-5-4 per mensem was continued, in equal shares, to the widow and 3 daughters of Banker Hussain, on the understanding that

their shares will revert to Government on their demise—vide Extract from Minutes of Consultation, dated 20th April 1843, No. 152, and Extract from Minutes of Consultation, dated 16th October 1848, No. 481. In G.O., dated 2nd January 1883, No. 2, in which the nature of these grants is clearly stated, the pension of one of the deceased daughters of Banker Hussain was continued to her husband after her death, with a distinct intimation that no further claims by the members of this family will be entertained. Besides the widow and three daughters, there appear to have been 13 other members of this family also receiving allowances—vide Extract from Minutes of Consultation, dated 7th July 1843, No. 264. Three of these died, and their allowances lapsed to Government. Five persons commuted their grants, but three of them outlived the number of years for which their pensions were commuted, and applied for their pensions being continued to them. Their prayer was granted by the Government of India in their order quoted in Board's Proceedings, dated 14th February 1884, Mis. No. 1355. One Nassa Begam, who was drawing an allowance of Rs. 120 per annum, died, and it is not known whether the pension enjoyed by her was continued to any one or not. The Deputy Collector of Madras reports that, on the 31st December 1868, there were only 6 persons belonging to the family of Banker Hussain drawing pensions from his office, and that, as the payment was afterwards transferred to the Accountant-General's office, under G.O., dated 11th August 1870, No. 1228, no further particulars are forthcoming in his office. It seems unnecessary to pursue this case further, by making a reference to the Accountant-General, as the history of the pensions of the rest gives an adequate idea of the manner in which the allowance to this family was dealt with.

7. The pension of No. 7 was a life-grant. On his death in 1822, Rs. 70 were resumed, and the remaining sum of Rs. 105 was continued in equal shares for the support of his two sons, Abdul Wahab and Ghulam Hussain, under G.O., dated 16th August 1822, No. 545. Ghulam Hussain died in 1827, and two-thirds of his allowance,

Rs. 35, were distributed as per margin under G.O., dated 17th November 1829, No. 822. On the death of Aiysha Bee and Mortuza Hussain, their allowances lapsed to Government, and on the death of Ghulam Hussain, his son Mahomed Abdulla applied for the continuance of his father's pension, and Government sanctioned, in its order, dated 3rd December 1875, No. 1739, a reduced pension of Rs. 7 per mensem. Abdul Wahab, the remaining son of Feroze Khan, died on the 20th June 1869, and two-thirds of his allowance, viz., Rs. 35, were distributed among his survivors as shown below, under G.O., dated 13th March 1873, No. 301:—

	RS.	A.	P.
(1) Mahomed Kassim	...	...	...
(2) Ghulam Hussain	...	...	...
(3) Ali Hussain	...	...	...
(4) Laila Bee Bee	...	...	...
	15	0	0
	7	8	0
	7	8	0
	5	0	0

Further particulars of the family of Feroze Khan are, it is reported, not available.

8. The pension in case No. 8 was Rs. 175 a month. It was held to have been a mutaliquan grant in which all the members of the family existing at the time of the grant had an equal share, and consequently that one-eleventh of it had lapsed on the death of the individual named on the margin of paragraph 3 *supra*, Bahadur Ali Shah. The remainder was, under instructions from the Board, dated 30th January

- | | |
|----------------------------|-----------------------|
| 1. Syed Isoraliul Hussain. | 6. Ameena Bee Bee. |
| 2. Syed Assurdowlah. | 7. Syed Hussainoolah. |
| 3. Syed Niperoolah. | 8. Syed Isoofanoolah. |
| 4. Syed Azeezoolah. | 9. Accany Begam. |
| 5. Manna Begam. | 10. Noor Bee Bee. |

1817, divided equally amongst the 10 members of his family, noted in the margin. When No. 1 died half of his pension was resumed and the other half was given to his widow. Nos. 3 and 7 having left the Presidency many years ago, their pensions were discontinued. Nos. 2, 6, 10 having died, their shares lapsed to

Government. The shares of the above said widow of No. 1 and those of Nos. 5 and 9, were commuted under Board's Proceedings, dated 2nd December 1859, No. 4974. Nos. 4 and 8, the remaining two individuals, appear to have been drawing their pensions in the Madras Deputy Collector's office on the 31st December 1864, under G.O., dated 17th March 1847.

Extract from a general letter from the Honorable Court of Directors in the Political Department, dated 15th October 1817, paragraphs 29, 30, 31.

Extract from Minutes of Consultation, dated 28th July 1818.

9. Case No. 9.—The pension in this case was first ordered to be paid to the grandsons of the original grantee, but was afterwards resumed under the orders of the Court of Directors—*vide* the papers noted in the margin.

(True Copies and Extract.)

Secretary.

To the Secretary to Government, Revenue Department,
with one enclosure in G. No. 1312 of 1888 (to be returned). ✓
„ Collector of Madras.

Copy to the Collector of Chingleput.
" " " of Nellore.
" " " of North Arcot.
" " " of South Arcot.
" " " of Trichinopoly.

Exd. W. J. Lewis.

Revenue (1890) Sept

21-7-88 No 238
21-7-87 No 707

REVENUE DEPARTMENT.

1889.


Board of Revenue

(Land Revenue),

MADRAS.

No 82

Printed January 1st, 1890.



Proceedings, 12th Dec. 1889, No. 887.

Recd 8 Jan

Submitting to Government report called for by it in regard to certain pensions allowed on account of the resumption of the jaghires granted subsequent to the treaty of 1792.

C19/2
H 25/2

c. n. 82 of 90

From the Commissioners of Land Revenue.
Dated 12-12-89.

For a despatch

With the Props read
above, the Board of Revenue
submit the report called
for in G.O. 21-7-87 No 707
on the action taken in re-
gard to the pensions given
in lieu of jaghires resumed
which were granted subsequent
to the treaty of 1792. The
cause of the delay in the
submission of the report is
explained by the Board in
2 of the above Props

The information which it has furnished in regard to the several cases seems, however, as is admitted to a

certain extent by the Board itself to be incomplete. A brief summary of the facts gathered from a careful search of the records in this office is given below.

2. The following is a list giving the names of the persons that were pensioned for life on the resumption of the jaghires granted subsequent to the year 1792 with the amount of pension allotted to

E.M.C 3-6. 1802 no 127
(Enc 1)

to each per month

No	Name	Amount in pagodas
I	Syed Shah Ally ^{Kadery} Kadery	100
II	Syed gemmal ud deen Khan	100
III	Syed jallal ud deen Khan	50
IV	Mahomed Masoom	50
V	The two Monlaries	100
VI	Kadir Nawaz Khan	350
VII	Mahomed Feerooz Khan	50
VIII	Family of Bahadur ally	50
IX	Syed Imchdoom	200

032 08 22 2 122 3 17 2

212 08 12 1 12 3 17 2

3. - No I. The jaghrie in this case was granted ^{Syed} ~~in~~ 1778 to Kootoboodin Kadery, the spiritual father of the Kabob Wallajah, and after his death was conferred by a new grant on his son Syed Shah ally Kadery. But

as the last grant was valid
Subsequent to the year 1792,
the lands were resumed by
the British Govt and a
pension of 100 pagodas granted
in lieu of them. On the death
of Shah Ally, in consideration
of the large family left by
the deceased, a pension of
50 pagodas per mensem was
in Aug 1822 allowed to his
eldest son Kurreem ood
Deen, and as he lived only
a very short time to enjoy
it, it was, in Sept 1824,
continued in full to his younger
brother Kuthboodeen Shah,
the Govt specially stating that
it would not on any account

E.M.C. 23-8-22 No 560

E.M.C. 21-9-24 No 613

E.M.C. { 4-11-25 No 641
28-3-26 No 171 191?

? E.M.C. 17-11-26 No 691

E.M.C. 28-11-26 No 750

he continued on his death to
his family. Kuthboodeen en-
joyed the pension for a year
and a half when a claim
to it was set up by one
Boorhan-ood-Deen as the son
of the late Kurreem-ood-Deen.
The matter was thereupon re-
ferred to Sh. H. the Naib Moh-
tamar, and as it was, then
satisfactorily proved that both
Kuthboodeen and Boorhan were
sons by different wives of
Shah Ally and Kurreem-ood-
Deen respectively, the Superior
Claim of Boorhan as the elder
son of Kurreem to the pension
of ~~100 pagodas~~ was established.
But as Boorhan at the same

him expressed his willingness
 to allow 20 pagodas out of
 his pension to his uncle, the
 Gout in Nov 1826 was pleased
 to direct the payment of 30
 pagodas per mensem to Boor-
 han and 20 to his uncle
 to be drawn on their separate
 receipts. But boodeen seems
 to have died sometime about
 1831 and his pension lapsed.
 Gout, the arrears outstanding
 at the time of his death having
 been allowed to be drawn by
 his family in Feb 1832
 Boorhan-ood-Deen drew his
 pension at the Madras Treasury
 till June 1836 when at his
 request, with the consent of the Govt of India, its payment was

E.M.C. 3. 2-32 20115

E.M.C. 9-8-36 20115

Who and its?
 The Agent for
 in its stead, who came
 to be under the name of
 the temple, the general

transferred to the office of the
 Resident at Hyderabad. When
 he came of it subsequently came
 traced from the records of this
 office. But it is submitted that
 it may be presumed that it
 lapsed to Gout as it was spe-
 cially stated by when the
 pension was originally given
 to Butboodeen in Sept 1824
 that it would not be continued
 to his family. The Collector
 of Mallore and the Board have
 been able to trace the pension
 in this case only up to 1808,
 when, they say, the Board refused
 to sanction its continuance
 to Khursem-ood-Deen son of
 Shah Ally.

4. No II + III

Syed Jemmal-ud-deen Khan
and Jilal-ud-deen Khan
1827² respectively
died in 1828, the former leaving
a son, named Cander Hussain
and some other relations who
were dependent on him and
besides a numerous list of
servants, slaves &c. and the
latter, a wife named Dool
Khan Begam, two daughters
his mother, and a son-in-law
who were all dependent on him
besides the usual retinue of
servants and slaves. as it
was thought that the stoppage
of the pension would plunge
the families into great distress
and that it would also be
inconsistent with the indul-
gence shown in the case of

E.M.C. 5-8-28 210554

the family of Syed ally Kadery
and others, the Govt was
pleased in 1828 on the Board's
recommendation to continue
to Syed Cander Hussain, son
of Syed Jemmal-ud-deen Khan
35 pagodas per mensem,
being a little more than $\frac{1}{2}$
of his father's pension from
the date of his father's death
and during his natural life,
and to the widow of Syed
Jilal-ud-deen Khan, one half
of the pension of the deceased
to be paid to her from the
date of her husband's death
and during her natural life,
each pension to cease entirely

28720 12-01-02 5.11.3

+ 100 pagodas
per mensem

102 22 12 01 5 2 113

+ 50 pagodas per
mensem

to be continued, at a reduced amount at the pleasure of Govt. on the death of the present grantee. Again on the recommendation of the Coll^l and the Board, the Govt, in Oct 1829, increased these pensions, that of Cander Hussam from 35 to 50 pagodas and that of Doolham Begam from 25 to 37 pagodas and 15 fms per mensem. In 1831 sanction was granted for the payment of these increased rates from the date of the decease of the late incumbents.

Cander Hussam otherwise known as Shwaja Kamal-ul-Deen Khan Bahadur

E.M.C. 20-10-29 No 726

E.M.C. 7-10-31 No 891

G.O. 15-7-76 No 416 Pol

G.O. 20-7-78 No 390 Pol

Where is this?

Ac of the Govt. in the month of Feb. being put up with another current.

G.O. 7-4-88 No 238
great freedom?

died in Jan^y 1877 and as she left a widow, Nazneen Begam in very straitened circumstances

the Govt in July 1878 resolved to continue to her two-thirds of the pension enjoyed by him. No further papers regarding this case could be traced

Her name does not appear in the list in G.O. 4-2-89 No 702.

Doolham Begam, the widow of Jallal-ud-Deen died in Dec 1886 and one half of the pension drawn by her was conferred on her grandson Ois Hazarath for life, the Govt. remarking that "on his death it shall entirely cease." The Board has referred to this point otherwise, the information from

ished by it ~~in~~ regard to
these two cases is nil.

5 IV. Para 4 of the
Board's Prof. is a little mis-
leading, ^{states} ~~where~~ The Board ~~says~~
that when the pensioner ^{in case of} died
"half of his allowance, viz. Rs
87-8-0 was continued to
his son Ghulam Hussain,
and on his death two-thirds
of his allowance, i.e. Rs 6
per mensem were granted in
the name of his widow Jaree
Bee for the support of herself
and her 8 children on the
understanding that the pension
would cease at her death.
This would make Rs 6 two-
thirds of Rs 87-8-0 and it

E.M.C. 13-8-33 No 883
(Vol put up pag 431B)

E.M.C. 29-4-34 No 318

The facts of the case are as
follows. On the death of
Mahomed Masum in or about
1929, Rs 87-8-0 or half
of his pension was granted
to his eldest son Gulam
Hussain "for the maintenance
of the ~~surviving~~ ^{surviving} members of the
family" and this was allowed
to be drawn by him from
the date of his father's death.
The Collector, however, on
receipt of the Govt. order
seems to have divided the
allowance into 9 equal shares
Gulam Hussain getting only
one of them. In para 9

of the Board's Prop. in G.O.
 17-6-57 No 604, it is said
 that out of these 9 shares
 payment of three including
 that of Gulam Hussain was
 transferred to the Collectorate
 of South Arcot and of 6
 to Madras under the author-
 ity of Govt. dated the 8th
 Nov: 1842. But from the
 Board's letter in this latter
 order, it would appear that
 the payment of only 5 was
 transferred to Madras. The
 following is a list of the
 persons referred to therein with
 the respective value of the
 share allotted to each.

4 shares in total

N	Name	Relationship to Gulam Hussain	Value of share		District
			Rs	P	
1	Gulam Hussain	Son	9	11	7
2	Mahomed Ally	Son	9	11	7
3	Afzeliah	Grandson	9	11	6
4	Mahomeda Bibi	wife	9	11	7
5	Basa Meah	Son	9	11	7
6	Mahomed Sheroyan	Son	9	11	7
7	Amziah Bibi	daughter	9	11	7
8	Rukaya Bibi	daughter	9	11	6

In all the Govt. subsequent to
 the one of 1842, the value of
 Gulam Hussain's share is given
 as Rs 9-11-6.
 = 91/11/6
 No 9-11-6 apparently to
 make the total of the 9
 shares equal
 to Rs 23-6-57 No 604.

Gulam Hussain died in
 1855 and Rs 6 i.e. about two-
 thirds of his share of the al-
 lowance was an account of
 the destitute circumstances of the
 family continued to his wife Gani-
 Bee on the distinct understand-
 ing that it was to cease on
 her death. Subsequently, in 1878
 this was raised to the original

G.O. 26-8-78 No 460 Pol.

amount (Rs 9-11-6) and was
on her death in December 1888
stopped altogether. In December
last, when a petition was
received from her, second son pray-
ing for the continuance of her
pension, the Govt declines to

comply with his request. ^{ally}
No 2. Mahomed ^{ally} seems to be
still in the enjoyment of his
pension. (vide No 15 in the
list of money allowances in No.

7-1-86 No 176. Misc. I.

No 3. Afzelimah (or more
correctly Mahammed Afzul
Mah. Saib) died on the 21st Feb.
1886. It was in connection
with the question of the conti-
nuance of this pension that
the report under consideration was

19-12-87 No 8208 Misc.

called for, the full pension having
been allowed to be continued (pending
the receipt of this report) in con-
sideration of the poverty of the
family and the no of souls ^{depending on the grant}

The exact of time of the death
of Mahommeda Bibi (No 4) or
the discontinuance of her pension
cannot be traced. But from a
Go of 1884 where the Govt re-
fused the continuance of her pension
pendant, it would appear that
that must have lapsed to Govt ^{a long}
time before 1884.

What became of (No 5) Gouse
Mah. pension cannot be traced.
In the death of when Mahomed
therogem ^(No 6) died in Feb 1875 leaving
a widow and 6 children permitted

the full pension enjoyed by him
was continued in the name of his
eldest son Kurnshu, thoolla, any
reduction being considered inad-
visable on account of the small-

ness of the amount and the num-
ber of persons dependent on it.

Hazarah Bibi (no 7) died in
march 1879, and her share of
the pension which is given in form

G.O. of the Board's Prop. 12-11-79
no 3163 as Rs 9-11-6 was

continued in full to her only son
Syed Mohideen Hussain, the

G.O. on the occasion remarking
that that being the fourth suc-

cession should, on its lapse,
be terminated. The grant of Rs 10,000

was made on the 10th of the 10th

G.O. 2-3-76 no 305

G.O. 12-12-79 no 2275

The 9th share is also
unaccounted for.

mentioned in the No. 10 is a
mistake for "third succession".

No papers could be traced to
show what became of the 8th
share. The pension enjoyed by
Ankeya Bibi (no 8).

6. V. The two Maulavis
were Maulavi Abdul Qutb and
Maulavi Suram Baksh. As

for Abdul Qutb, no papers sub-
sequent to the date of the grant of
the pension to him could be traced

among the records here. The
Collector says that his pension
was continued up to Fasli 1217

(1807) and that his name can
not be traced in the records of
the next and succeeding fasls.

owing probably to his death and
the consequent lapse of his all-

with reference to para 9 of the G.O.

"dated 10th July 1802". In the

case of Imam Baksh who

had been in receipt of 50 pa-

godas per mensem under the

G.O. above mentioned, the Board

has been able to trace him

up till his death in or about

1812, when the Govt. when the

was pleased to grant to his

widow Jayamah Sahiba a

pension of 40 pagodas per month.

to take effect from the 1st July

1813. From the records here

the following additional in-

formation has been collected:

Jayamah Sahiba died in 1845

none of her children surviving

but leaving a daughter in three

22.11.52.1.2.3.11.3

60-17-12-2

E.M.C. 17-12-47 No 1348

E.M.C. 25-1-48 No 81

1831-2.22.3.11.3

22.11.52.1.2.3.11.3

grand children and their mother.

These latter petitioned the Govt.

to have the pension continued

to them and the Govt. with

its recommendation that one-

fourth of the allowance, enjoyed

by the deceased, might be con-

tinued to them in the proportion

of Rs 8/12 per mensem sent it

up to the Govt. of India for

sanction. But the Govt. of

India, however, was of opinion

that as the pension

was granted only for life, it will

be sufficient to grant the proposed

allowance to the widows for

life to the son till he is 18

years of age and to the daughters

till they are married. His pension was authorised to be disbursed to them in arrears from the 29th December 1845, the date of Tayanah Saliba's death. No further papers information on the subject is forthcoming here. The Board has asked the Coll^r of Madras to send in a report regarding this pension and it is submitted his report might be awaited.

On the death of Kadir Nawaz Khan in 1804, his full pension was continued to his son Mahomed Banker Kinsami and on his death in 1843, Rs 408-5-4 only. Pension was granted

E.M.C 2. 5. 48 n 432

E.M.C 26. 6 - 1804

(No 117 of 1804)

E.M.C 20-4-43 n 152

E.M.C 17-6-43

E.M.C. 7-7-43

to his widow and three daughters for their life. But subsequently as it was found that some others also related to the deceased had been in receipt of pensions from him, the amount granted to the widow and daughters was ordered to be distributed among the several members of the family as follows (in the same proportion in which the pension was originally enjoyed by them).

Name	Relationship	Amount per mensem
Fathima Begam	Widow of Banker Kinsami	63 9 4
Rahmooloon Mosa Begam	Daughter of do	63 9 4
Abbassa Begam	do do	63 9 4
do	do	do

Name	relationship	amount per mensem
Sharbann Begam	Shadi ^{widow} wife of Hadir Nawaz	33 5 4
Lail Beebe	nieka do do	14 " "
Lail, Sambut Jung's widow and sister	?	40 " " 1 3 11.3
Hakmah Begam & her two sisters	Daughters of Begam Begum the younger daughter of Hadir Nawaz	23 5 4
Saraff Ali Khan	Son of Begam Begum the younger daughter of Hadir Nawaz	23 5 4
Gulam Hussam	Son of Hadir Beebe, the nieka daughter of Hadir Nawaz	10 " "
Musaa Begam	?	10 " "

From the records in this office
there is no means of tracing
the two sisters of Hatoonah Begam or
what the names of the late
Sambut Jung's widow, and
sister ~~Beetle~~ ^{Beetle} ~~widow~~ ^{of} ~~Beetle~~
~~Beetle~~ were. But from the
Madras Dy Collector's letter of
8th July last (in the current) it
may be inferred that ^{the} ~~names~~
former were: ~~Habibah Beebe~~
~~Hammamissa Begam, Rymamissa~~
~~Begam Hafiz Begam, and Sa~~
~~bin Beebe~~ ~~Habibomissa~~

Begam and Mahaboomissa
Begam, and the latter Habeeb
Beebe, Hammamissa Begam
Rymamissa Begam, Hafiz
Begam and Faltima Beebe
though in this case the Dy
Collr seems to have omitted
to mention the name of one
other lady who should have
been in receipt of the remaining
Rs. 80 out of the total of Rs
480 per annum granted for
their branch of the family.

The pensions allotted to
Sharbann Begam and Lail
Beebe and the immediate
family of Banker Hussam
were subsequently raised.

E.M.C. 15-5-46 no 213
E.M.C. { 27-11-46 no 429
 { 16-9-47 no 419
E.M.C. { 15-8-48 no 433 369
 { 19-9-48 no 432
 { 16-10-48 no 481
 { 18-11-48 no 482

the orders of the Court of
Directors to Rs 100; 42; and
408-5-4 respectively, the
Court in one case remarking
that when a pension was granted
or renewed, the amount should
be divided to be drawn on Sepa-
rate receipts, the shares of
those not closely related to
the family ceasing at their
death & those of the principal
representatives of a branch of
the family being continued if
necessary without the Court
fixing any ^{proportion to be} ~~arbitrarily~~ deducted
from the amount but only dis-
continuing so much as a de-
ceased holder might have expended
in own pension or dis-

E.M.C. 18-7-49. (Company's letter
nos of 49)

E.M.C. 15-5-46 no 213

This course they thought would
lead to the gradual extinction
of the pensions without subjecting
individuals to hardship.

It appears from the
by Collyer's letter above referred to
dated 31st Dec 1868
that all these pensions either
lapsed to govt on the death
of the recipients or were com-
mitted to the ~~trustee~~ (as per instructions
contained in E.M.C. 15-3-59
no 305) with the exception of
those ~~which~~ ^{of} enjoyed by the widow and
the 3 daughters of Bunker
Hussain and that of Bunker
Sarraf Ali Khan whose pension
granted to him as the husband
of a daughter of the original
grantee was on his death

Continued in full to his two sons
Mahomed Saïyad-ud-din and
Ahmad ali as heirs to their
mother,

G.O. 21-1-60 No 104

of those whose pensions were

conferred Naboonah Begam, Habi-

loomisa Begam & Mahabooobissa

Begam ^{who} antient the no of years

for which this pensions were

conferred had ^{allowance} their pensions

continued to them ^{for their life} under the

order ^{by} of the Govt of India at

the recommendation of the

Govt.

G.O. 7-7-83 No 1086

" 30-1-84 No 464 ^{Sub}

Rahmatoon Mosa Begam

one of the daughters of Banker

Hussain died in Feb 73 leaving

her husband and 8 young children

and the Govt therefore sanctioned

G.O. 7-1-75 No 17

an amount of Rs 600 per annum

G.O. 10-11-77 No 3225

G.O. 2-1-83 No 2

family of the deceased
to them. And ~~it was~~ subsequently
ordered that this sum need not
be reduced on the occurrence
of a casualty among them
on the death of Abbas
Begam, another daughter of
Banker Hussain, ^{the full} ~~her~~ husband
and first cousin Ahmad ali
~~Tham~~ was granted the full
pension enjoyed by her late wife
granted as a special case
was continued to her husband
and first cousin Ahmad ali
Khan, the Govt remarking that
sufficient weight was not given
to his relationship with the
original grantee at the re-
appointment of the Govt Comy
in 1843. This ^{pension} ~~sum~~ seems
to have died in March last

and his pension lapsed to
in Oct. last
Bost who declined to comply
with his son's request to have
the pension continued to him.

No other papers relating
to pensions No 11 could be
traced here except one of 1884
in which the Govt. sanctioned
the payment of arrears of pension
under an order by Ahmad Ali Khan
the son of Saraf Ali Khan
during his absence of 4 years
at Hyderabad. The Collector
of Madras who has furnished an a
complete history of this case
says that as the payment
of these pensions was trans-
ferred to the Accountant General
under G.O. 11-8-70 No 1228,
further particulars regarding this
family are not traceable in his

G.O. 1-10-87 No 6261 Nisee

G.O. 9-1-82 No 81.

Certainly
at
in 1884

23
records. The Board considers
that it is unnecessary to make
any reference to the Acc. Genl as
the history of the pensions of the
past gives an adequate idea of
the manner in which the all
to this family was dealt with
But it is submitted that as
this seems to be a good opportunity
to settle finally every thing connected
with the question of these pensions
the Accountant General and the
Collectors concerned should be
asked to report on the several
points for which no information
is available and this they
will be easily able to do from
the information which the

the Govt ^{can} furnish them

8. The history of pension
no VII as given by the Collt and
the Board is complete as far as
it could be gathered from the
records here and does not it
is submitted call for any remarks
except that the statement that
on the death of Terw Khan the
sum of Rs 105 was continued in
equal shares for the support of
his two sons, Abdul Wahab and
Gulam Anwar under GO. D
16th August 1922 No 545ⁿ is not
quite correct. In that order
Govt simply sanctioned its grant
for the support of the family, the
division of the pension having been
reported to Govt ^{only} in 1929.

9. No information further
than what has been already

17

furnished by the Board is ad-
able here in regard to Cases
VIII and IX.

10. It will be seen from the
above paras and the statement
appended hereto that in none of
the subdivisions of the above
Cases was the pension continued
to the third man in succession to
the original grantee except in
some instances, that in two of
these latter it was continued be-
cause the successors seemed to
have as much right as, or even
greater right than, their predecessors
to its receipt and that in the
other two cases the reason
for the continuance seems to

have been simply the distressed
condition of the recipients, and
probably also the cause of the full
facts of the case were not
before Govt at the time. It
is submitted that it is high
time that some final decision
was come to with regard to these
pensions and it would never
do to continue them ad in-
finitum. It is accordingly
suggested that the pension to
Gulam Hussain Meah to whom
his father's pension was granted
provisionally under G.O. 21-7-57
no 707 might be continued for his
life and that in every other
case where the pension has been

Please see Case No IV.
Mahomed Ali still lives and no-
thing is known of Ghouse Meah
nkeer Bilal and another.

granted to the third man in
succession to the original grant
(i.e. the third pensioner) the
allowance granted should
absolutely cease with his death
and that the question whether
it should be continued to the
third in succession in the few
remaining instances should be
left to the option of Govt.

This subject has been carefully
worked out and it
would be well to print the
information contained in the
note and ask the Hon. Secy
General & Education Com.
to direct to the Director to
print the information
and have it printed by the
Govt.
As regards the policy to be
adopted in future in these

to the persons. They were
 originally granted for life.
 in the President's house
 in London in June 1802
 and they have been continued
 since as compensation
 allowances owing to the
 poverty of the family
 of the deceased recipients,
 in some cases in full, in
 others as reduced amounts.
 The statement which
 has been drawn up shows
 clearly the history of
 each case, so far as
 the records go. I only
 to cases to see. They have
 continued beyond the
 3rd life and in some
 be noted that in no
 further cases are they to
 continue beyond the 3rd
 life. There are very
 few cases in which the
 persons have not been
 continued beyond the
 3rd life and nothing
 is known about most of
 them. If any claims are
 presented to any other persons
 and can be considered as such.
 The whole system is to be continued.

C. N. 52 of 1st
 G.O. 287
 24-4-77

For Orders

Re. certain jaghirs pensions

There were 8 to some extent
 27/12/07 N. 507 - 23/1/87. 0. 0
 58. 5. 4 and N. 6. 0. 0
 This is explained in the
 paper 5 of the 2nd of
 containing for order. Ch
 248 2672
 11/11/23/20
 27 Feb

245 Jaghirs
 14/11/20 11/11/20
 27/11/20 25/12/20

Read C. N. 82 of 1890

Order of 21 April 1890
 no. 287

With the Rep. read above
 the Board of Revenue sub-
 -mits the report called for
 in G.O. 21st July 1887 N. 707
 to the action taken in refer-
 to the pensions assigned
 to certain jaghirs who
 were assumed as having be
 granted subsequent to the
 treaty of 1792. The informa-
 -tion furnished after a
 delay of nearly two years
 or half is, as admitted by
 the Board itself, incomplete
 in many cases. A brief sum-
 -mary of the facts as gathered
 from the records of the four
 is therefore, given below

2. The following statement gives the names of persons who were pensioned for life on the assumption of the jaghires in question with the amount of pensions assigned to them:—

Name	Amount of Pension in Rupees
Syed Shah ^{Ali} Kadery	100
I. Syed Jamal-ud-din Khan	100
Syed Jalal-ud-din Khan	50
Mahomed Madam	50
Moulvi Abdul Rabi Moulvi Inam Bakhsh	100
Kadi Hameez Khan	350
Mahomed Feroze Khan	50
Family of Bahadur Ali	50
Syed Fakrudin Ali Khan	200

3. I. The jaghires in this case was granted in 1777 to Syed Koorboodin Kadery, the virtual father of the Nabob of Bengal, and after his death

granted on his son Syed Shah Ali Kadery. But as the grant was dated subsequent to the year 1792, the jaghires resumed by the British Government and a pension of 100 pagodas assigned instead. On the death of Shah Ali, in consideration of the large family left by him, a pension of 50

E. M. C. 23rd Aug. 1822 No. 56

E. M. C. 21st Sep. 1824 No. 613

E. M. C. 4th Nov. 1840 No. 641
28th March 1841 No. 191

pagodas per mensem was allowed to his eldest son Kureem-ud-din, and as he lived only a few months, to enjoy it, it was continued in full to his youngest brother Khatboodin Shah on the express condition that it would not on any account be continued on his death to his family. Khatboodin enjoys the pension for a year & a half when a claim to it was set up by one Boorhan-ud-din a son of the late Kureem. The matter was then

family of Syed Shajahan
 Kader and others, the report
 was placed to continue to
 Syed Cander Husseini 55 p. 1/2
 per annum being a little more
 than 1/3 of his father's pension.
 To be paid to him from the
 date of his father's death
 during his natural life.
 To Boolhan Begum 1/2 of the
 pension enjoyed by the deceased
 to be paid to her from the
 date of her husband's death
 during her natural life.
 Each of these pensions are
 to cease entirely
 to be continued at the
 usual amount at the
 order of Government.
 Consequently, on the recommendation
 of the Collector and
 the Board, the Government
 renewed these pensions.
 1. Cander Husseini from 35 p. 1/2
 2. Begum and Boolhan
 from 12 p. 1/2 each

E.M.C. 25th Oct 1829 No. 726

E.M.C. 17th Dec 1847 No. 134

L.P.C. 25th Jan 1848 No. 57

P.O. 25th April 1848 No. 419
L.P.C. 25th Jan 1848 No. 57

29
 recommendation that
 if his allowance enjoyed
 by the deceased might be
 added to them at the
 rate of Rs. 8-12-0 each per
 annum. That Government
 was of opinion that
 the pension had been
 granted only for life and
 sufficient to grant the
 same allowances to
 for life, to the son
 who was 18 years of age,
 and his wife. The pensions
 mentioned were authorized
 to be disbursed in August
 29th Dec 45, the
 Begum Sahiba's death
 other information
 subject being at present
 little, the report called
 by the Board from
 the Collector of Madras is

Kadi Hany Khan
 1804, his full pension is
 continued to his son, ^{Khan}
 Banker Hussain, and on
 his death in 1873, 1/3 of
 pension (i.e. Rs. 408-5-) was
 granted to his wife
 three daughters for life in
 subsequently as it was not
 that come others, also let
 to the deceased, had
 in receipt of allowance for
 him, the pension for
 to the widow and daughters
 as order to be divided
 among the several members
 of the family in the same
 proportions in which it is
 respectively enjoyed by the as
 shown below:—

E. M. C. 26th June 1804

E. M. C. 20th April 1843 No. 152

E. M. C. 17th June 1843 No. 232

E. M. C. 7th July 1843 No. 267

Name	Relationship	Amount per annum		
		Rs.	as	p
Haima Begam	Wife of Banker Hussain	63	9	4
Rahima Khatun Begam	Daughter of do.	63	9	4
Umayy Begam	do.	63	9	4
Sumra Begam	do.	63	9	4
Begam	Wife of Kadi Hany Khan	33		

to be collected of south
 West and of six to make
 under the authority of Govt.
 of 8th Nov/42. But from
 Board's letter in their letter
 it would appear that
 fragment of only five shares
 transferred to Madras. The
 following is a list of the pr.
 referred to therein with
 the respective value of the
 shares allotted to each.—

Name		Relationship	Value of each share	District in which held
1	Ghulam Hussain	Son	9 " 7	South West
2	Mahomed Ali	Son	9 " 7	
3	Afzalminah	Grandson	9 " 6	
4	Mahomada Bibi	Wife	9 " 7	Madras
5	Ghouse miah	do.	9 " 7	
6	Mahomed Eberayem	Son	9 " 7	
7	Hazrat Bibi	Daughter	9 " 7	
8	Rukya Bibi	Daughter	9 " 6	
9	Kadi Hussain	Wife	9 " 6	
			87	8

(1) died in 1855 and son
 of 2/3 of this share
 is now

names of the family
 continued to his widow
 See on the distinct understand-
 ing that it was to cease on
 her death. Subsequently the
 pension was raised to the
 usual amount and was
 paid until her death in Decr 1884
 paid altogether. In Decem-
 ber when a petition was
 received from her son
 asking for the continuation
 of her pension, the government
 declined to comply with his
 request.

No. 12) seems to be entitled to
 enjoyment of his pension (No.
 15 in the list of money allow-
 ances in P. P. 14th Decr 1885 No. 3

No. 13) died on the 21st Feb. 1886
 his share was ordered to be contin-
 ued ^{to his family} pending the receipt of
 the report now under consideration.

No. 14). The exact time of her
 death is not known. The discontinuance
 of her pension is not known
 an order of 1884 in which
 was refused the con-
 tinuation of her pension

17th
 22nd June 1857 No. 6

G.O. 26th Aug. 1878 No. 460 Pol.

G.O. 19th Decr 85 No. 8205 Misc.

G.O. 21st July 1887 No. 707

G.O. 18th March 1884 No. 314 Misc.

descendant
 that his pension
 was to be paid to his
 son before 1884.
 No. 15, 181, 191. No inform-
 ation coming as to what
 came of these shares.
 No. 16) died in Feb. 1875 leaving
 widow and six children.
 The amount of the pension was small
 and the number of con-
 siderable on it, it was
 not undiminished.
 eldest son
 No. 17) died in March
 the government
 share to be continued
 to her only son
 she is still alive, but
 some time that
 during the 4th succession
 it has been terminate
 sent. The pension
 ability, contin- 1 only
 3rd life. 1
 over the

G.O. 2nd March 1876 No. 305

G.O. 12th Decr 79 No. 227

1. V. As regard
 sion presented to me
 about Rub, as per
 formation should be
 furnished by the Board
 traceable from the
 of the government
 the death of the other
 Moulvi Luman Bahadur
 had been in receipt
 50 rupees per month
 for maintenance was re-
 sent to his wife
 Sahiba a monthly
 sum of 50 rupees from
 the Govt.
 (1) a daughter-in-law
 (2) a grandson (son of
 (3) two granddaughters
 (4) a son
 her the
 matter was

E. M. C. 35th July 1813 no. 314

E. M. C. 7th Oct. 1831 no. 891

G.O. 15th July 1876 no. 416 Pl.

G.O. 20th July 1878 no. 390 Pl.

G.O. 7th April 1888 no. 238

Indeed their payment
 enhanced rates from
 dates of demise of the late
 incumbents. Cauda Hussa
 otherwise known as Kwaja Khan
 Sah-din Khan Bahadur, died
 in January 1877 and as he left
 widow, Razwan Begum, in very
 straitened circumstances the
 Government resolved to con-
 tinue to her 2/3rd of the pen-
 sion granted by him. The papers
 Government do not give any
 further information as to
 the pension. Doolah Khan
 son of Jalal-ud-din, died
 in 1866 whereupon a widow
 pension was conferred
 upon his widow. But
 with the lapse of the Special
 understanding that it should
 cease entirely on his death.
 Para 4 of the Board
 of Rs. and above contain
 an apparent inconsistency
 This

continued to have...
 d that the amount...
 was Rs 6 per mensem.
 Ghulam Hussain's allowance...
 of Rs 87-0-0, 2/3 of it...
 of Rs 58-5-4 & not Rs...

Each of the case, however...
 as follows:—
 On the death of Mahomed...
 in or about 1829,
 of this pension, was...
 Rs 87-0-0, was...
 from the date of...
 to his eldest...
 Ghulam Hussain for...
 maintenance of the...
 members of the family...
 receipt of...
 order, seems to have...
 the allowance in...
 shares, Ghulam Hussain...
 thing only one of them. In the...
 the Board's Rep. in 1857...
 1857 no. 607 it is stated...
 of these orders...

No. C. 13th Aug. 1833 No. 583
 27th April 1834 No. 318

Persons	Description	Rs	
		40	0
Broughton	Begam, the Elder	23	5
	very Khan		
daughters of	Begam, the younger	23	5
	very Khan		
Hind and	Widow daughter	10	
	son of the		
daughter	Widow daughter	10	
	son of the		

does not appear from the...
 before Government...
 the names of the two...
 of Katumak Begam &
 of the late Saubak...
 which are. But from...
 Madras Deputy Collector's...
 8th July last No. 737...
 it is...
 could see that the former...
 is Habibunnissa Begam & her...
 Habibunnissa Begam, and the...
 latter Habeeba Beebe, Karim...
 Begam, Rymunnissa Begam, Ha...
 Begam, & Fatima Beebe. The...
 Deputy Collector's letter appears...
 the name of one other...
 who should have been...
 receipt of the remaining...
 out of the total of Rs 45

amount for 75th Jan 4.
 entirely allotted to
 again, Gaur Beker, an
 immediate family of B.
 Hussain were subsequently
 raised under the order
 of the Comd^r of Directors to
 42, & 408.5-4 per 1 and
 respectively. It appears
 the Deputy Collector's letter
 referred to that, by the 31st
 Jan 1868, all these per-
 sons were referred to for
 the death of the wife
 been commuted.

in
 M.C. 15th March 1859 No. 35
 the exception of those of
 widow and three daugh-

Bunker Hussain and his
 wife Ali Khan.

The commuted pension
 the case of Rahmat Begam,
 aliboomia Begam, and
 Begam, after the death of
 granted to them for life with

sanction of the Government
 as the parties have

M.C. 15th May 1856
 27th Nov/46 No. 429 }
 16th Sep/47 No. 419 }
 M.C. 15th Aug. 1848 No. 364
 19th Apr 1848 No. 432
 16th Oct. 1848 No. 411
 M.C. 15th Nov/48 No. 20
 M.C. 19th July 1849 (Comptroller's
 No. 57/1849).

S.O. 7th Sep: 1883 No. 1086
 30th Jan 1884 No. 464

for which their allowance
 were commuted.

The pension granted to
 Saif Ali Khan as the husband
 of a daughter of the original
 grantee was on his death
 continued in full to his son
 Mahomed Sydoodeen
 Ahmed Ali as heir to their
 mother.

Rahmatoomia Begam,
 one of the daughters of
 Bunker Hussain, died in
 Feb^r 1873 leaving her husband
 and eight young children.

The Government then
 sanctioned the grant of
 100 per annum to the
 family of the deceased &
 subsequently ordered that this
 sum should not be reduced
 on the occurrence of any
 contingency.

On the death of Abbassy
 Begam, another daughter of
 Bunker Hussain, the full
 pension enjoyed by her
 was granted as a pension

S.O. 21st Jan 1860 No. 109

S.O. 7th Jan 1875 No. 17

S.O. 10th Nov/77 No. 3225

S.O. 2nd Jan 1880 No. 2

his husband and first
son, Ahmed Ali Khan
Government obtaining that
official report had not been
made to his relationship to
original grantee at the
appointment of the
Government in 1871.
This pensioner appears to have
died in March 1889 and
his son's request for the
continuance of the pension
was refused in G.O. dated
1st Oct/89 as per order.

The Government is not
in possession of any other
papers relating to this case
except G.O. 9th Jan 1882 and
those in which the payment
of arrears of pension was ordered
by Ahmed Ali, the younger
son of Saif Ali Khan, during
his absence of seven years
at Hyderabad was sanctioned.
The Deputy Collector of Hyderabad
states that, as the pensioner
is deceased in the

Case was transferred to
Accountant - General under
G.O. 11th Aug. 1890 No. 1228, his
records do not show what
became of them afterwards,
the Board considers it un-
necessary to make any ap-
plication to the Accountant-
General because, in its
opinion, the history of the
pensions of the rest gives
an adequate idea of the
manner in which the ad-
vance to this family was
dealt with. As it appears,
however, that no uniform
principle has been observed
in dealing with the several
cases, the Government con-
siders it very desirable that
all the information available
on the subject should be
collected together and that
the present is a suitable
opportunity for doing so.
The Board will therefore

9. From the foregoing Summary and the tabular Statement appended hereto, it will be seen that the pensions under consideration were originally granted for life; that they have been continued since as compassionate allowances, owing to the poverty of the family of the deceased recipients; in some cases in full, in others at reduced amounts; and that in some cases have been

been continued beyond the 3rd life. His Excellency the Governor-in-Council is accordingly pleased to rule that in no further cases will the pension be continued beyond the 3rd life and that, in the few instances in which they have not been continued beyond the 2nd life, should any claims be preferred hereafter, it will be considered whether they shall lapse or be continued at a reduced amount. The allowance provisionally sanctioned in G.O. dated 21st July 1887/21707 will be continued to Ghulam Hussain Mirza Sahib for life and will cease entirely on his death.

17/4

From orders

2. The Chief Clerk for Communicating
with respect to the concluding part of

1814 To the Com^{rs} of the RR with send
accts & "al
Politeness

P. 70

Apprentice

Statement showing the amount of yearly pensions assigned in 1850 with the names of original grantees and their successors.

1850

1st life
(original grantees)

2nd life

3rd life

Remarks

I. Syed Shah Altikadog 2500 . Kurram ud-din 2100 .

II. Syed Jemmal ud-din Khan 2500 . Syed Bander Hussein (Khivaja Kamal-ud-Din Khan Khadi) 2500 .

III. Syed Jellal ud-din Khan 2100 . Gulham Begum 1500 .

IV. Mahomed Masum 2100 .
Gulam Hussain 116 15
Mahomed Ali 116 11
Afzeluniah 116 10
Mahomeda Bibi 116 11
Gouse Ali 116 1
Mahomud Ali Cherayem 116 11
Nazarah Bibi 116 11
Rukya Bibi 116 10
Another (name not given) 116 15

V. { Mou Lavi Abdul Sub 2100 .
Diam Bakh 2100 . Joyanah Sahiba 1600 .

VI. Hader Nawaz Khan 14750 . Bander Hussain 14750 .

has married as having been subsequent to the year 1850

Shah. ud. Din 1250 .

ed. Kullindun Kadog 840 . X

Shah. Begum 1400 .

Nazarah 784 .

Shah. 116 10 X

family 116 10

Shah. 116 11

Shah. Hussain 116 10

daughter-in-law 105 .

grandson (son of 1850) 105 . (a)

granddaughter (daughter of 1850) 105 . (b)

granddaughter (son) 105 . (b)

Shah. Begum 1225 .

Shah. Begum 1225 . Shah. Begum 500 .

Shah. Begum 1225 . Shah. Begum 1225 . X

Shah. Begum 1225 .

Shah. Begum 1225 .

(a) This has been granted to her 18 years ago. She has therefore been by this time.

(b) This has been granted to her 18 years ago. She has therefore been by this time.

12

12

10

(original grants)

2nd list

3rd list

1. Mahomed Feroze Khan

Epulam Hussain

Abdul Wahab

Bahadur Ali Shah

Sasara Aliyab Hussainy

Eyed Adoolah

Eyed Nasroollah

Eyed Azizollah

Masnah Begam

Amnah Buler

Eyed Hassinoollah

Eyed Kifannollah

Achana Begam

Abul Buler

190

150

190

190

190

190

190

190

190

190

190

190

Bannor Buler

95

Begam

S Buler

Bula Buler

Amnunnisa Begam

morunnisa do

afiz do

Lima Buler

Am Lal (Mute)

Am Begam

Amnunnisa Begam

Abulbannisa do

af Ali Khan

Balam Hussain

Lisa Begam

Amir Bui

Balam Hussain

Yusuf Buler

Faraja Hussain

Abulmud N. Hussain

Balam Hussain

Amir

Amir Buler

1200

504

80

80

80

80

80

80

93

93

93

280

120

120

126

126

84

84

180

90

90

80

* Commuted

+ commuted after 10 years

Amir Buler 140
Amir Buler 140

Mahomed Abdulla 84

Eyed

1st life
(orig. - granted)

2nd life

3rd life

4th life

Remarks 40

Speed Snuck down

840

Continued to his

ambulance hut

afterwards ordered

to be stopped.

1
14/4

Subsequent
to 1792

of the Successors
of the original franchise

Remarks

(a) - This was from the the house of George & Mary
the son - James - was a black man
(b) - This was from the the house of James & Mary
have heard of their house.

† Commented but oblivious
to the no of names for which they
persecuted these communists and
continued to them

7/2 Concurrence

1875
 1876
 1877

96 7/8

X
X

tt

18. *Chamaecrista*

Draft No.

In re jaghire pensions

21st APRIL 1890, No. 287, REVENUE.

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS.
REVENUE DEPARTMENT.

Read—the following Proceedings of the Board of Revenue (Land Revenue), dated 12th December 1889, No. 887:—

Mr. H. W. BLISS.

Read—again Proceedings of the Board of Revenue (Land Revenue), dated 2nd September 1887, No. 517.

ABSTRACT.—Requesting certain Collectors to report how many of the yeomiah allowances granted in compensation for the resumption of the jaghires granted by the Nabob of the Carnatic subsequent to the treaty of 1792 have lapsed, and how many are still continued in whole or in part.

Read—also the following paper from the Collector of Nellore, dated 15th May 1888, No. 1830-Acc.:—

REVISRD statement of jaghires resumed having been granted subsequent to the treaty of 1792 and pensions allowed instead, Nellore district.

Names of persons.	Annual value of the jaghires resumed according to the Kamil beriz with names of the villages forming the jaghires.	Amount of pension granted per mensem.	Remarks.
1. Syed Shawally Kadiry ..	STAR PAGODAS. Labour in the Pargana of Nellore. Circar Sarvapally, commonly called Nellore. 2,920	STAR PAGODAS. 100	1. The pensioner first refused to receive the pension and withdrew that refusal sometime before his death on 20th December 1807. According to Government Order conveyed in Board's Proceedings, dated 20th April 1808, the arrears of Star Pagodas 6440, or Rs. 22,540, were paid (letter to Board, dated 19th July 1809) to the eldest son of the deceased. In Board's order of 7th July 1808, the application of the eldest son to continue the pension was rejected on the ground that the allowance was a life-grant.
2. Syed Jammal-ud-Jeen Ahmed Khan.	Coorgoondah in the Pargana of Cudved, Circar Sarvapally. 1,170	100	2 and 3. It appears that these pensions continued to be paid till end of April 1887. With reference to the Board's order of 15th September 1814, the Provincial Accountant-General was addressed in the matter of paying these pensioners in Madras, and the pensions were regularly paid to the recipients in the general treasury office at the Presidency from 1st May 1814 to 30th April 1817. The last advice of payment received from the Accountant-General was dated 6th September 1817. I have now asked the Accountant-General to state what became of these two pensioners subsequently, and his reply will be communicated on receipt. No more information is available in the records of this office.
3. Syed Jellal-ud-deen Khan ..	Chelamatoor in the Pargana of Cudved, Circar Sarvapally. 514	50	

Submitted to the Secretary to the Board of Revenue (Land Revenue), Madras, with reference to their Proceedings, dated 4th May 1888, Mis. No. 2809.

Read—also the following letter from H. H. O'FARRELL, Esq., Acting Collector of Nellore, to the Secretary to the Commissioners of Land Revenue, dated Nellore, 18th June 1888, No. 2374-Acc. :—

In continuation of this office No. 1830-Acc., dated 15th May 1888, I have the honor to state that the Accountant-General has, in his letter, dated 2nd June 1888, No. I.A.D.-349-P., stated that the information called for cannot be furnished, as all the bill books on record in his office for the years prior to 1847-48 have been destroyed.

Read—also the following letter from J. LEE-WARNER, Esq., Collector of the Chingleput District, to the Secretary to the Commissioners of Land Revenue, dated Saidāpet, 17th April 1888, No. 761-Ind. :—

In continuation of my letter, Reference on No. 336-L.R.-G. & B., dated 4th instant, I have the honor to forward, herewith, a list (in original) received from the Paymaster of Carnatic Stipends showing the districts to which the jaghires (mentioned in the list forwarded with Board's circular of 10th July 1802) appertained. It would appear therefrom that none of these jaghires relate to this district.

Read—also the following letter from W. J. H. LE FANU, Esq., Acting Collector of North Arcot, to the Secretary to the Commissioners of Land Revenue, dated Wāljāpet, 10th July 1888, Reference on Government No. 17 :—

With reference to G.O., dated 7th April 1888, No. 238, Revenue, paragraph 2, calling for a report as to how lapses among the other jaghiredars, who are granted pensions in the resumption of their jaghires, have been dealt with, I have the honor to state that this information so far as it was available was furnished to the Board in my letter, No. 701, dated 31st December 1887, referred to in Board's Proceedings, dated 10th February 1888, No. 141.

Read—also the following letter from H. SEWELL, Esq., Collector of South Arcot, to the Secretary to the Commissioners of Land Revenue, dated Cuddalore, 5th April 1888, No. 108 :—

With reference to Board's Proceedings, No. 141, dated 16th February last, I have the honor to state that the records in this office do not show that any one of the pensioners named in the list circulated with the Board's circular of 10th July 1802 has ever been paid his pension from this treasury. Apparently none of them belongs to this district.

2. The Kistnapuram pensioners who now draw their pensions at this treasury were transferred from the North Arcot district (*vide* G.O., No. 1327, dated 8th November 1842), communicated with Board's Proceedings, No. 187, of 14th November 1842. Full particulars about these men are already before Government. They are the descendants of Mahomed Masum, the original grantee.

Read—also the following letter from W. A. WILLOCK, Esq., Acting Collector of Trichinopoly, to the Secretary to the Commissioners of Land Revenue, dated Trichinopoly, 8th June 1888, No. 274-4 :—

Adverting to paragraph 3 of Board's Proceedings, No. 141, dated 14th February 1888, I have the honor to report that on causing both the English and Vernacular records of my office to be carefully examined, I do not find any papers showing the

payment of any pension at any time in this district either to Hussain-ul-Mulk* and Nazir-ul-Mulk,† the 4th and 5th legitimate sons of the Nabob Walajah, or to Amir-ul-Omra, the 2nd legitimate late son of the Nabob Walajah.

* No. 37.
† No. 38.

Reference on the above, dated 22nd January 1889.

In a list furnished by the Paymaster of the Carnatic Stipends to the Collector of Chingleput, copy of which will now be forwarded to the Collectors of North Arcot, South Arcot and Trichinopoly, it is observed that the 5th jaghire therein mentioned belongs to the Vellore taluk in the North Arcot district, and the 6th, 7th and 8th jaghires to South Arcot district (Belbore being said to be in South Arcot district and Nusrutghur to be another name for

Letter from the Board, to Government, dated 20th February 1815.

Letter from the Board, to Mr. Lushington (Collector of Trichinopoly), dated 29th May 1815.

Gingee, also in South Arcot). The 9th appears, from the list as well as papers quoted in the margin, to belong to the Trichinopoly district. Yet these Collectors have reported that no papers relating

to those pensions could be found. They are now requested to have a careful search made of the records of their offices with the aid of the information now afforded, and to report fully at an early date on the pensions in question.

(Signed) M. HAMMICK,
Secretary.

To the Collector of North Arcot, with copy of list.

" " of South Arcot, with do.

" " of Trichinopoly, with do.

Copy to the Secretary to Government, Revenue Department.

Read—also the following letter from W. J. H. LE FANU, Esq., Collector of North Arcot, to the Secretary to the Commissioners of Land Revenue, dated Chittoor, 9th April 1889, Reference on Acctt. Eng. No. 34 :—

With reference to the correspondence noted in the margin, I have the honor to report that papers connected with the lapse of one of the other eight jaghire pensions, referred to in para. 2 of G.O., dated 7th April 1888, No. 238, Revenue, have been since discovered. These are

Board's letter to Government, dated 24th June 1857, No. 2170, and Extract from Minutes of Consultation, dated 17th June 1857, No. 604. These papers appear to relate to the lapse of a share of the allowance originally granted to Mahomed Masum on the resumption of the jaghire of Kistnapuram in 1802.

2. Further search is being actively made for papers connected with the other allowances, and the result will be reported shortly.

Read—also the following letter from W. J. H. LE FANU, Esq., Collector of North Arcot, to the Secretary to the Commissioners of Land Revenue, dated Kuppam, 28th June 1889, No. 65-In. :—

In continuation of my letter, No. 34, Reference on Acc. Eng., dated 9th April 1889, I have the honor to report the result of the further search made for records connected with the lapse of the jaghires, referred to in G.O., No. 238 (Revenue), dated 7th April 1888, and in Board's Reference on General Register Nos. 2277, 1149 and 1887, dated 22nd January 1889.

2. The first paper on record in connection with the jaghires is the Proceedings of Government, dated 10th July 1802, with the marginally-noted lists. The Proceedings convey the order of Government directing the resumption of all the jaghires granted subsequent to the treaty of 1792 on the principle that such grants could not be binding with respect to the Nabob's right of alienation under that treaty. The Seynoor jaghire, specially referred to in Board's memorandum above, dated 22nd January 1859, being one of the nine jaghires so resumed, a cash allowance of 50 pagodas was granted in lieu to each of the two Moulvies named in the list, viz., Moulvi Abdul Rub and Moulvi Imam Buksh. The former appears to have been in the enjoyment of his pension only up to fasli 1217 as appears from a Mahratta mohinzapitha of that period, and his name ceased to be borne in the mohinzapitha of the next and succeeding faslis. To trace the cause of this omission appears extremely difficult, as all possible and careful search was made in the records of the earlier years without avail, and the only conclusion that can be come to, is that the recipient had died, and that, therefore, the allowance had altogether lapsed in pursuance of the orders of Government conveyed in the 9th para. of the order quoted above.

3. As regards the pension of the other Moulvi, Imam Buksh, his name appears in the Mahratta mohinzapitha of all the earlier years until fasli 1223 when it altogether disappears. There is, however, a petition on record in the Persian language, presented to the Board in 1812, in which the petitioner stated that she was the widow of Moulvi Imam Buksh and was reduced to great poverty, and requested Government to extend their bounty to her. The petition was referred by the Board to the Collector in their letter, dated 2nd November 1812, with orders to report on the circumstances of the family; and on the 17th November 1812, the Collector reported that neither she nor any one on her behalf appeared before him to give any information respecting her family and their means of support. The claim of the widow was, however, rejected as the grant was not hereditary. This allowance, therefore, appears to have lapsed on the death of the incumbent.

4. As reported in my letter No. 34, Ref. Acc. Eng., dated 9th April 1889, the marginally-noted papers on record here relate to the lapse of a share of the allowance originally granted to Mahomed Masum on the resumption of the jaghire of Kistnapuram (No. 4 in the list) in 1802. Board's letter to Government, dated 24th Jano 1857, No. 2170, and Extract from Minutes of Consultation, dated 17th June 1857, No. 604.

5. Regarding the jaghire of Chelamattur (No. 3 in the list), a full account is given in a statement submitted by me on the 19th July 1887, No. 84, and also in my letter, No. 146, dated 21th December 1887, both of which are embodied in G.O., No. 238, dated 7th April 1888.

6. The name of Mahomed Feroze Khan, No. 7 in the list, also appears in the Mahratta mohinzapithas of faslis 1218 and 1219.

7. Saving the above, the records do not afford any information respecting the lapses of the remaining jaghires. A reference was also made on the subject of the said jaghires to the Collector of Chingleput, and I submit a copy of his reply with enclosures for the information of the Board. From this it will be observed that the pension of the grandson of No. 1 was transferred to Hyderabad, that the son of No. 6 died on the 29th June 1869, and that no information exists in his office as regards the other pensioners.

Read—also the following letter from H. H. O'FARRELL, Esq., Acting Collector of South Arcot, to the Secretary to the Commissioners of Land Revenue, dated Cuddalore, 28th August 1889, No. 1316-Indexed:—

Adverting to paragraph 2 of my letter, dated 1st April last, Reference on Register No. 48-B.L., I have the honor to inform that the long expected report from the Collector of Madras on the subject of jaghire pensions has come, a copy of which is herein enclosed. The pensioners in question having been transferred to the Collector of Madras where they received payment of their pensions, I have nothing to add to the report made by the Deputy Collector of that district.

ENCLOSURE No. 1.

From C. E. PLUNKETT, Esq., Deputy Collector of Madras, to the Collector of Madras, dated Madras, 8th July 1889, No. 737.

Adverting to paragraph 1 of the South Arcot Collector's letter, dated 14th March 1889, No. 48-B.L., forwarded with your endorsement, dated 2nd April 1889, Ref. on No. 832-Genl., I have the honor to enclose copy of the letter, dated the 11th March 1813, with its enclosure, from the Principal Collector of the Southern Division of Arcot, to the Collector of Madras.

2. Referring to paragraph 2 of the South Arcot Collector's letter, I have the honor to state that under the sanction of Government, dated 20th June 1804, Mahomed Banker Hussain was granted a monthly jaghire pension of Rs. 1,225, and on his demise, on the 12th February 1843, one-third of the amount of his pension, i.e., Rs. 408-5-4 per mensem, was allowed by order of Government, dated 7th July 1843, to the whole of the family—seventeen in number—for their lives. Subsequently the widow, Fatima Begam, and her three daughters—Abbassy Begam, Azeezoonissa Begam, Rahinatoonissa Begam—having petitioned the Government for an increase of their allowances, one-third of the original amount of pension, i.e., Rs. 408-5-4 per mensem, was granted them to be distributed into equal shares of Rs. 102-1-4 each under Extract from the Minutes of Consultation, dated 16th October 1848, No. 481. After that, Laul Beebee and Sharbonoo Begam, widows of the original jaghiredar Khadar Navaz Khan, who were drawing Rs. 42 and 100, respectively, from his son, Mahomed Banker Hussain, also petitioned for additional allowances, and their previous amounts were continued to them under the orders of the Court of Directors. Thereupon, the allowance of each of the seventeen members of the family stood as shown against their names in the margin.

				Per Annum.
				Rs. A. P.
1. Goolam Hussain	..	..	..	120 0 0
2. Fatima Begam	..	..	..	1,225 0 0
3. Abbassy Begam	..	..	..	1,225 0 0
4. Azeezoonissa Begam	..	..	..	1,225 0 0
5. Rahinatoonissa Begam	..	..	..	1,225 0 0
6. Sheriff Ali Khan	..	..	..	280 0 0
7. Katooma Begam	..	..	..	93 5 0
8. Habiboonissa Begam	..	..	..	93 5 0
9. Mahabooboonissa Begam	..	..	..	93 5 0
10. Massa Begam	..	..	..	120 0 0
11. Habeeba Beebee	..	..	..	80 0 0
12. Karimoonissa Begam	..	..	..	80 0 0
13. Rymoonissa Begam	..	..	..	80 0 0
14. Hafiz Begam	..	..	..	80 0 0
15. Fatima Beebee	..	..	..	80 0 0
16. Sharbonoo Begam	..	..	..	1,200 0 0
17. Laul Beebee	..	..	..	504 0 0

3. Karimoonissa Begam, Rymoonissa Begam and Hafiz Begam dying, their respective shares of Rs. 80 each lapsed to Government. Katooma Begam had her allowance of Rs. 93-5-0 commuted for a bonus under G.O., dated 2nd December 1859. Habiboonissa Begam had likewise her pension of Rs. 93-5-0 commuted under Board's Proceedings, No. 3091, dated 13th June 1861. Mahabooboonissa Begam had her pension also commuted for a sum of Rs. 1,027-2-0 under Board's Proceedings, dated 20th July 1860. Massa Begam, who was drawing an allowance of Rs. 120 died, but it is not known whether the pension enjoyed by her was continued to any one or not. Habeeba Beebee and Fatima Beebee, who were each drawing Rs. 80, commuted their pensions under the G.O., dated 2nd December 1859. The three ladies—Katooma Begam, Habiboonissa Begam and Mahabooboonissa Begam, who, as said above, commuted their pensions, subsequently applied for a continuance of their pensions on the ground that they had outlived the number of years for which their pensions were commuted, and the matter was reported upon in this office letter, dated 9th June 1883, No. 478, and their request was eventually granted by the Government of India in their order quoted in the Board's Proceedings, dated 14th February 1884, Mis. No. 1355, communicated with Collector's endorsement, dated 22nd February 1884, No. 156.

4. The following members of the family of Mahomed Bauker Hussain appear from the records in this office to have been drawing on the 31st December 1863, the pensions noted against each:—

Fatima Begam, Rs. 1,225, under G.O., dated 16th October 1843.
 Abbassy Begam, Rs. 1,225, under do. do.
 Azeezoonissa Begam, Rs. 1,225, under do. do.
 Rahinatoonissa Begam, Rs. 1,225, under do. do.
 Ahmed Ali, Rs. 140, under dated G.O., 21st January 1865.
 Mahomed Sydoodeen, Rs. 140, under do. do.

As the payment of pensioners was transferred from this to the Accountant-General's office under G.O., dated 11th August 1870, No. 1228, Revenue, further particulars regarding this family are not traceable in the records of this office.

5. Mahomed Feroze Khan, referred to in paragraph 3 of the South Arcot Collector's letter, was granted a pension of Rs. 175 a month for life only, in lieu of a resumed jaghire. On his death in 1822, Rs. 70 lapsed to Government, and the remaining sum of Rs. 105 was allowed in equal shares to his sons, Abdul Wahab and Ghulam Hussain, under G.O., dated 16th August 1822, No. 545. Ghulam Hussain died in 1827 and Rs. 17-8-0 lapsed to Government, and the remainder Rs. 35 was distributed as per margin, under G.O., dated 15th November 1829, No. 822. On the death of Aiyesha Beebee and Murtuza Hussain, their allowances lapsed to Government; and on the death of Ghulam Hussain (the younger), his son Mahomed Abdulla applied for the continuance of his father's pension, and Government sanctioned in their order, dated 2nd December 1875, No. 1739, a reduced pension of Rs. 7 per mensem.

6. Abdul Wahab, the remaining son of Feroze Khan, died on the 20th June 1869, and Rs. 17-8-0 lapsed to Government. The remainder, viz., Rs. 35, was distributed among his survivors as shown below, under G.O., dated 13th March 1873, No. 301:—

	Rs.	A.	P.
(1) Mahomed Kasim	...	...	...
(2) Ghulam Hussain	...	...	...
(3) Ali Hussain	...	...	...
(4) Iaul Beebee	...	...	...
	15	0	0
	7	8	0
	7	8	0
	5	0	0

Further particulars regarding the family of Feroze Khan are not available.

7. Bahadur Ali Shah, mentioned in the letter under report, was drawing a monthly allowance of Rs. 175, and when he died, one-eleventh of it, viz., Rs. 15-14-6, lapsed to Government, and the remainder was, under instructions from the Board, dated 30th January 1817, divided equally amongst the ten members of his family, viz.:—

(1) Syed Iscooraliul Hussain.	(6) Ameena Beebee.
(2) Syed Assurdowlah.	(7) Syed Hussainoolah.
(3) Syed Niperoolah.	(8) Syed Iscoofanoolah.
(4) Syed Azeezoolah.	(9) Accamy Begam.
(5) Manna Begam.	(10) Noor Beebee.

Syed Iscooraliul Hussain dying, one half of his pension, viz., Rs. 7-15-3 per mensem, lapsed to Government; and the balance was allowed to his widow, Bannoo Beebee. Syed Niperoolah and Syed Hussainoolah having left the Presidency many years ago, their pensions were discontinued. Syed Assurdowlah, Ameena Beebee and Noor Beebee having died, their shares also lapsed to Government. Bannoo Beebee, widow of Syed Iscooraliul Hussain, Manna Begam and Accamy Begam had their respective pensions commuted under G.O., dated 2nd December 1859. Syed Azeezoonallah, Syed Iscoofanoolah, the remaining two individuals, appear to have been drawing their pensions in this office on the 31st December 1864, under G.O., dated 17th March 1847. No more particulars are traceable in the records of this office.

8. I regret the delay in the submission of this report, which was partly due to having waited for a reply to this office letter, No. 530, dated 23rd May 1889, which reply was received only on the 3rd instant, and partly also to having had to wade through a map of old records bearing on the subject.

Ref. on No. 2035.

Forwarded to the Collector of South Arcot with the enclosures, with reference to his letter of the 14th March last, No. 48-B.L.

2. Copies of the Deputy Collector's letter of the 9th June 1883, No. 478, referred to at paragraph 3 and of the connected correspondence are also enclosed for reference.

3rd August 1889.

(Signed) R. W. BARLOW,
Collector.

To the Collector of South Arcot.

ENCLOSURE No. 2.

From M.R.Ry. R. RAGHOONATHA ROW, Deputy Collector of Madras, to the Collector of Madras, dated Madras, 9th June 1883, No. 478.

I have the honor to submit the report called for in your endorsement, dated 13th March 1883, No. 321, on the petition presented by three Mahomedan ladies praying for the revival of their jaghire yeomiah pensions and to raise the grants to amounts suitable to their rank and descent.

2. Under G.O., dated 7th July 1843, No. 264, a monthly jaghire yeomiah pension of Rs. 7-12-6 was granted to each of the three sisters, Kantumah Begum, Abulemnissa Begam and Mahabooboonissa Begam, on account of their close relationship to Mahomed Bauker Hussain, they being the daughters of his sister Pyarea Begam, but for some reason or other they had all commuted their pensions to lump money grants so far back as 1859 to 1861 and Revenue Board's Proceedings of 2nd December 1859, of 20th July 1860 and of 13th June 1861, show that Kantumah Begam received Rs. 933-2-0, Abulemnissa Begam Rs. 979-12-6 and Mahabooboonissa Begam Rs. 1,027-2-0, being equivalents to 10, 10 $\frac{1}{4}$ and 11 years' purchase money of their pensions.

3. Copy of G.O. of 7th July 1843, No. 264, under which pensions were sanctioned to the three sisters is enclosed for your perusal, but the Revenue Board's Proceedings under which the pensions were commuted cannot be traced, and this does not matter much as the petitioners themselves and their vakil stated, both in the petition and in the statement given in this office, that the commutation of their pensions did take place on their own motion.

4. What the petitioners now contend is that having lived considerably longer than the number of years for which their pensions were commuted, and having grown old and very poor with age, their pensions should not only be revived, but that some additions should be made to them, as under G.O., dated 2nd January 1883, No. 2, Revenue, a large monthly pension of Rs. 102-1-4 was sanctioned to Ahmed Ali Khan, which was vacated by his deceased wife Abbassy Begam, simply because he traced his descent from the same Bauker Hussain, of whom the three petitioners are the nieces.

5. The evidence taken in this office shows that the petitioners are the nieces of Bauker Hussain; that they sold their pensions to Government; that they are now very old and very poor, so much so that they depend for food on the charity of neighbours; and that with the exception of Abubunissa Begam, the middle sister, they are encumbered with large families.

6. Bearing, however, in mind that Government, in their recent order, dated 18th September 1882, No. 244, Revenue Department, declined to receive a commuted pension in favor of one Chand Beebee alias Asunt Beebee, a much more distressing case than that of the three petitioners, and that the continuance of the pension of deceased Abbassy Begam to her surviving husband Ahmed Ali Khan, under G.O. of 2nd January 1883, No. 2, Revenue, was owing to the present recipients being the adopted son of Bauker Hussain and the grandson of Kadir Navaz Khan, the petitioners, I think, have no claims upon Government.

7. If, however, you are disposed to view the petitioner's case favorably by reason of their old age and poor circumstances, Government may be moved to revive their pensions.

8. The petition under report and the three statements taken in the case, together with the futwah filed by the petitioners are forwarded for your perusal.

Enclosure No. 3.
List of the pensioners and yemialdars paid by the Collector in Southern Division of Arcot transferred to the Collector of Madras.

Names of the pensioners and place of residence.	Age.	Number of pensioners participating in the pension.	Date of the pension being granted.	Relation of the present to the original pensioners.	Abstract of the reasons on record for granting the pension.	Amount of the pension per month.				Amount of the pension per year.				Remarks.
						Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	
<i>Madras.</i> Moolaloo Kanes or hereditary Bubber Hussein of Gingee.	34	9	7th Shalan Hijree.	Grandson	For their sub- sistence.	6	14	37	75	39	44			Paid up to 12th July 1812.
<i>Khadak or life pensioners.</i> Sivaramaswamy of Tenomallie ..	34	6	20th Zillazo Hijree.	Son	Do.	2	4	66	25	12	72			Do. do.
Khyroobuswah of Dhovanaghir..	30	1	15th Shavaul Hijree.	Granddaughter	Do.	4	9	51	50	25	62			Paid up to 12th Oct. 1812.
Fyod Meemooliah Husany of Gingee.	45	1	1129 fash Hijree.	Original	Do.	2	4	66	25	12	72			Paid up to 12th July 1812.
Aubad-Salab, &c., of Treno- mallie.	61	5	1129 fash	Do.	Do.	..	38	45	10	12	60			Do. do.
<i>Government pensioners.</i> Mahomed Bunker Husain ..	..	..	..	..	..	9	12	68	111	19	16			
Mahomed Feroze Khan ..	..	..	..	..	..	330	..	..	4,200	..	..			Paid up to 31st Dec. 1812.
						50	..	..	600	..	..			Do.
						400	..	..	4,800	..	..			
						415	27	25	4,957	12	60			

Read—also the following letter from G. W. FAWCETT, Esq., Acting Collector of Trichinopoly, to the Secretary to the Commissioners of Land Revenue, dated Trichinopoly, 11th April 1889, No. 140-4 :—

I have the honor to report on the subject of Board's Reference, dated 22nd January last, on General Register Nos. 2279, 1149 and 1887 of 1888.

2. I have ascertained, with the help of the references given me by the Board, viz., Board's letter to Mr. Lushington (Collector of Trichinopoly), dated 29th May 1815, No. 42, that the pension of 200 pagodas per mensem ordered to be paid and distributed to the grandsons of the Jaghiredar Syed Mukhdum Ali Khan was resumed under the orders of the Court of Directors—*vide* the following papers communicated with letter, dated 28th September 1818, from the Secretary to the Board of Revenue to this office, and has never been paid :—

- (1) Extract from a general letter from the Honorable the Court of Directors in the Political Department, dated 15th October 1817, paras. 29, 30 and 31.
- (2) Extract from the Minutes of the Right Honorable the Governor in Council, dated 28th July 1818.
- (3) The resolution of the Board on the above two orders.

Resolution—dated 12th December 1889, No. 887.

In G.O., dated 21st July 1887, No. 707, Government, when passing orders regarding the continuance of a pension enjoyed by a deceased member of the family of the ex-Jaghiredar of Kistnapuram, North Arcot District, called on the Board to report what action was taken in regard to the other jaghires resumed along with it, as having been granted subsequent to the treaty of 1792. The Board, in its Proceedings, dated 2nd September 1887, No. 517, requested the Collectors of Nellore, Chingleput, North Arcot, South Arcot and Trichinopoly, to whom lists of the resumed jaghires had been forwarded with Board's circular letter of 10th July 1802, to furnish the information called for by Government.

2. The Board had not been able to find the original of the lists which accompanied the Government Order on Mr. Falconer's report, and by mistake an incorrect list of the jaghires was forwarded to the Collector. The replies therefore which were received did not furnish the information required, and the Board again made a reference to them on the subject in its Proceedings, dated 16th February 1888, No. 141. In reply to this, the Collectors of North Arcot, South Arcot and Trichinopoly reported that no information could be gleaned from their records; and the Collector of Chingleput, in forwarding copy of a list of the nine jaghires concerned, which he had received from the Paymaster of Carnatic Stipends, reported that none of them related to his district. It was ascertained by inquiry that the old names given in this list referred to the modern districts of North Arcot, South Arcot and Trichinopoly, and the Collectors of those districts were again addressed on the subject, and they were requested to make a further search of their records, and to submit such information as might be available—*vide* reference, dated 22nd January 1889, on General Register Nos. 2279, 1149, 1887 of 1888. Thereupon these Collectors have submitted the three reports last read above. The information in some cases is still incomplete, but the Board considers that what is furnished in regard to these cases sufficiently indicates the policy adopted in dealing with the pensions of the class under consideration.

3. Of the nine cases noted in the margin* in which pensions were granted†

- * 1. Syed Shah Ali Khadari ... } Nellore.
- 2. Syed Jamal-ud-din Khan. }
- 3. Syed Jalal-ud-din Khan ... }
- 4. Mahomed Masum ... South Arcot.
- 5. { Moulvi Abdul Rub ... North Arcot.
- { Moulvi Imam Buksh ... }
- 6. Kadir Navaz Khan ... South Arcot.
- 7. Mahomed Feroze Khan ... }
- 8. Family of Bahadur Ali ... }
- 9. Syed Mukhdum Ali Khan. Trichinopoly.

† Letter from Government, to Board, dated 4th June 1802, paragraph 9.

on the resumption of their respective jaghires to be enjoyed during their natural lives, Nos. 1, 2, 3 relate to Nellore. The Collector of this district reports that the pension of No. 1 was a life-grant, and that the application of his eldest son for the continuance of it, after the death of his father, was, on that ground, rejected in Board's Proceedings, dated 7th July 1808, No. 481; that Nos. 2 and 3 were paid their pensions up to 1817; and that, as the last advice of payment received from the Accountant-General was on 6th September 1817, he addressed that officer asking what became of these two pensions subsequent to 1817, and that he received a reply from that officer to the effect that, as the bill books on record in his office for the years prior to 1847-48 have been destroyed, the information asked for could not be furnished. The Board observes, however, from the tabular statement printed in G.O., dated 7th April 1888, No. 238, that the pension in case No. 3 was continued, on the death of the grantee, to his widow in 1828, on the understanding that it was to cease on her death, or that only a reduced portion would be continued at the pleasure of Government. She died in 1886, and Rs. 65 and odd, being one-half of her pension, was continued to her successor under the Government Order quoted.

4. When the pensioner in case No. 4 died, half of his allowance, viz., Rs. 87-8-0, was continued to his son Ghulam Hussain, and on his death two-thirds of his allowance, i.e., Rs. 6 per mensem, were granted in the name of his widow Garee Bee for the support of herself and her 3 children on the understanding that the pension would cease at her death. ‡ This fact does not appear to have been brought to the notice of Government when the Government Order under reply was passed.

5. In case No. 5, the Collector of North Arcot reports that it was a life-grant, and that the pension of one of the two original grantees, viz., Moulvi Abdul Rub, was continued up to fasli 1217 (1807), and that his name cannot be traced in the records of the next and succeeding faslis, owing probably to his death and the consequent lapse of his allowance, with reference to paragraph 9 of the G.O., dated 10th July 1802. The name of the other grantee, Moulvi Imam Buksh, also appears in the list only up to fasli 1223 (1813), when it altogether disappears. There is, however, a petition on record presented to the Board in 1812 in which the petitioner, as widow of the deceased Moulvi, asked Government to extend its bounty to her. The claim of the petitioner was, it is reported, rejected as the grant was not hereditary. But the Board observes from the papers quoted in the margin that a pension of 40 pagodas was granted to the petitioner. The Collector of Madras is now requested to report what became of this pension.

6. No. 6 was granted a pension of Rs. 1,225 when his jaghire was resumed in 1802. He died in 1804, when his whole pension was continued to his son Mahomed Bauker Hussain. On his death in 1843, the pension was claimed by his adopted son Ahmed Ali Khan, but his claim was rejected by Government on the ground that the Court of Directors had ruled against the continuance of pensions to adopted sons, and a reduced pension of Rs. 408-5-4 per mensem was continued, in equal shares, to the widow and 3 daughters of Bauker Hussain, on the understanding that

their shares will revert to Government on their demise—vide Extract from Minutes of Consultation, dated 29th April 1843, No. 152, and Extract from Minutes of Consultation, dated 16th October 1848, No. 481. In G.O., dated 2nd January 1883, No. 2, in which the nature of these grants is clearly stated, the pension of one of the deceased daughters of Bauker Hussain was continued to her husband after her death, with a distinct intimation that no further claims by the members of this family will be entertained. Besides the widow and three daughters, there appear to have been 13 other members of this family also receiving allowances—vide Extract from Minutes of Consultation, dated 7th July 1843, No. 264. Three of these died, and their allowances lapsed to Government. Five persons commuted their grants, but three of them outlived the number of years for which their pensions were commuted, and applied for their pensions being continued to them. Their prayer was granted by the Government of India in their order quoted in Board's Proceedings, dated 14th February 1884, Mis. No. 1355. One Nassa Begam, who was drawing an allowance of Rs. 120 per annum, died, and it is not known whether the pension enjoyed by her was continued to any one or not. The Deputy Collector of Madras reports that, on the 31st December 1868, there were only 6 persons belonging to the family of Bauker Hussain drawing pensions from his office, and that, as the payment was afterwards transferred to the Accountant-General's office, under G.O., dated 11th August 1870, No. 1228, no further particulars are forthcoming in his office. It seems unnecessary to pursue this case further, by making a reference to the Accountant-General, as the history of the pensions of the rest gives an adequate idea of the manner in which the allowance to this family was dealt with.

7. The pension of No. 7 was a life-grant. On his death in 1822, Rs. 70 were resumed, and the remaining sum of Rs. 105 was continued in equal shares for the support of his two sons, Abdul Wahab and Ghulam Hussain, under G.O., dated 16th August 1822, No. 545. Ghulam Hussain died in 1827, and two-thirds of his allowance,

	RS.	A.	P.	
Cauder Bee ...	10	8	0	viz., Rs. 35, were distributed as per margin under G.O., dated 17th November 1829,
Ghulam Hussain ...	10	8	0	No. 822. On the death of Aiysha Bee
Aiysha Bee Bee ...	7	0	0	Bee and Mortuza Hussain, their allow-
Mortuza Hussain ...	7	0	0	ances lapsed to Government, and on the
				death of Ghulam Hussain, his son Maho-
				med Abdulla applied for the continuance

of his father's pension, and Government sanctioned, in its order, dated 3rd December 1875, No. 1739, a reduced pension of Rs. 7 per mensem. Abdul Wahab, the remaining son of Feroze Khan, died on the 20th June 1869, and two-thirds of his allowance, viz., Rs. 35, were distributed among his survivors as shown below, under G.O., dated 13th March 1873, No. 301:—

	RS.	A.	P.
(1) Mahomed Kassim ...	15	0	0
(2) Ghulam Hussain ...	7	8	0
(3) Ali Hussain ...	7	8	0
(4) Lail Bee Bee ...	5	0	0

Further particulars of the family of Feroze Khan are, it is reported, not available.

8. The pension in case No. 8 was Rs. 175 a month. It was held to have been a mutaliquan grant in which all the members of the family existing at the time of the grant had an equal share, and consequently that one-eleventh of it had lapsed on the death of the individual named on the margin of paragraph 3 *supra*, Bahadur Ali Shah. The remainder was, under instructions from the Board, dated 30th January 1817, divided equally amongst the 10 members of his family, noted in the margin. When No. 1 died half of his pension was resumed and the other half was given to his widow. Nos. 3 and 7 having left the Presidency many years ago, their pensions were discontinued. Nos. 2, 6, 10 having died, their shares lapsed to

- 1. Syed Isooraliul Hussain.
- 2. Syed Assurdowlah.
- 3. Syed Niperoolah.
- 4. Syed Azeezoolah.
- 5. Mauna Begam.
- 6. Ameena Bee Bee.
- 7. Syed Hussainoolah.
- 8. Syed Isoofanoolah.
- 9. Accany Begam.
- 10. Noor Bee Bee.

Government. The shares of the above said widow of No. 1 and those of Nos. 5 and 9 were commuted under Board's Proceedings, dated 2nd December 1859, No. 4974. Nos. 4 and 8, the remaining two individuals, appear to have been drawing their pensions in the Madras Deputy Collector's office on the 31st December 1864, under G.O., dated 17th March 1847.

Extract from a general letter from the Honorable Court of Directors in the Political Department, dated 15th October 1817, paragraphs 29, 30, 31.

Extract from Minutes of Consultation, dated 28th July 1818.

9. Case No. 9.—The pension in this case was first ordered to be paid to the grandsons of the original grantee, but was afterwards resumed under the orders of the Court of Directors—*vide* the papers noted in the margin.

(True Copies and Extract.)

(Signed) M. HAMMICK,
Secretary.

To the Secretary to Government, Revenue Department,
with one enclosure in G.O. No. 1312 of 1883 (to be returned).
Collector of Madras.

Copy to the Collector of Chingleput,
" " " of Nellore.
" " " of North Arcot.
" " " of South Arcot.
" " " of Trichinopoly.

ORDER—dated 21st April 1890, No. 287, Revenue.

Miscellaneous.

With the Proceedings read above, the Board of Revenue submits the report called for in G.O., dated 21st July 1887, No. 707, as to the action taken in regard to the pensions assigned in lieu of certain jaghires which were resumed as having been granted subsequent to the treaty of 1792. The information now furnished after a delay of nearly two years and a half is, as admitted by the Board itself, incomplete in many cases. A brief summary of the facts, as gathered from the records of the Government office, is, therefore, given below.

2. The following statement gives the names of persons who were pensioned for life on the resumption of the jaghires in question with the amounts of pensions assigned to them:—

No.	Name.	Amount per mensem in pagodas.
I.	Syed Shah Ali Kadery	100
II.	Syed Jamal-ud-din Khan	100
III.	Syed Jalal-ud-din Khan	50
IV.	Mahomed Masum	50
V.	Moulvi Abdul Rub; Moulvi Imam Buksh	100
VI.	Kadir Navaz Khan	350
VII.	Mahomed Feroze Khan	50
VIII.	Family of Bahadur Ali	50
IX.	Syed Mukhdum Ali Khan	200

3. I.—The jaghire in this case was granted in 1778 to Syed Kootoboodin Kadery, the spiritual father of the Nabob Wallajah, and after his death, was conferred by a new grant on his son, Syed Shah Ali Kadery. But, as the last grant was dated subsequent to the year 1792, the jaghire was resumed by the British Government and a pension

of 100 pagodas assigned instead. On the death of Shah Ali, in consideration of the large family left by him, a pension of 50 pagodas per mensem was allowed to his eldest son, Kurreem-ud-din, and, as he lived only a very short time to enjoy it, it was continued in full to his younger brother, Kutboodin Shah, but on the express condition that it would not, on any account, be continued on his death to his family.

E. M. C., 23rd August 1822, No. 560.

E. M. C., 21st September 1824, No. 613.

Kutboodin enjoyed the pension for a year and a half when a claim to it was set up by one Boorhan-ud-din as the son of the late Kurreem-ud-din. The matter was thereupon referred to the Naib Muktiar and as it appeared from his reply that both Kutboodin and Boorhan were sons by *nikka* wives of Shah Ali and Kurreem-ud-din, respectively, the superior claim of Boorhan, as the eldest son of Kurreem, was established. But as Boorhan at the same time expressed his willingness to allow 20 pagodas out of the pension to his uncle, the Government was pleased to direct the payment of 30 pagodas per mensem to Boorhan and 20 to Kutboodin to be drawn by them separately. Kutboodin appears to have died about the year 1831, when his pension would seem to have lapsed to Government, but the arrears of it outstanding at the time of his death were allowed to be drawn by his family in February 1832. Boorhan-ud-din drew his pension at the Madras Treasury till June 1836 when, at his request, its payment was, with the consent of the Government of India, transferred to the office of the Resident at Hyderabad. The records before Government do not show what became of it subsequently. The Resident will, therefore, be requested in the Political Department to afford information on the point.

E. M. C., 4th November 1825, No. 641.

E. M. C., 28th March 1826, No. 191.

E. M. C., 17th November 1826, No. 691.

E. M. C., 28th November 1826, No. 750.

E. M. C., 3rd February 1832, No. 115.

E. M. C., 9th August 1836, No. 885.

E. M. C., 5th August 1828, No. 554.

E. M. C., 20th October 1829, No. 726.

E. M. C., 7th October 1831, No. 891.

* G.O., 15th July 1876, No. 416, Pol.

G.O., 20th July 1878, No. 390, Pol.

Government increased these pensions, that of Cauder Hussain from 35 to 50 pagodas and that of Doolham Begam from 25 pagodas to 37 pagodas and 15 fanams per mensem, and ordered their payment at the enhanced rates from the dates of demise of the late incumbents. Cauder Hussain, otherwise known as Kwaja * Kamal-ud-din Khan Bahadur, died in January 1877 and as he left a widow, Nazneen Begam, in very straitened circumstances, the Government resolved to continue to her $\frac{2}{3}$ of the pension enjoyed by him. The papers before Government do not give any further information regarding this pension.

4. II and III.—Jamal-ud-din Khan and Jalal-ud-din Khan died in 1827 and 1828, respectively, the former leaving a son named Cauder Hussain and a number of relations, servants and slaves, and the latter a widow named Doolham Begam, two daughters, his mother and a son-in-law besides the usual retinue of servants and slaves. As it was thought that the stoppage of the pensions would subject the families concerned to great distress and that it would also be contrary to the policy adopted in the case of the family of Syed Shah Ali Kadery and others, the Government was pleased to continue to Syed Cauder Hussain 35 pagodas per mensem, being a little more than $\frac{1}{3}$ of his father's pension, to be paid to him from the date of his father's death and during his natural life, and to Doolham Begam $\frac{1}{2}$ of the pension enjoyed by the deceased to be paid to her from the date of her husband's death and during her natural life; each of these pensions on lapse was to cease entirely or to be continued at a reduced amount at the pleasure of Government. Subsequently, however, on the recommendation of the Collector and the Board, the

Government increased these pensions, that of Cauder Hussain from 35 to 50 pagodas and that of Doolham Begam from 25 pagodas to 37 pagodas and 15 fanams per mensem, and ordered their payment at the enhanced rates from the dates of demise of the late incumbents. Cauder Hussain, otherwise known as Kwaja * Kamal-ud-din Khan Bahadur, died in January 1877 and as he left a widow, Nazneen Begam, in very straitened circumstances, the Government resolved to continue to her $\frac{2}{3}$ of the pension enjoyed by him. The papers before Government do not give any further information regarding this pension.

Government increased these pensions, that of Cauder Hussain from 35 to 50 pagodas and that of Doolham Begam from 25 pagodas to 37 pagodas and 15 fanams per mensem, and ordered their payment at the enhanced rates from the dates of demise of the late incumbents. Cauder Hussain, otherwise known as Kwaja * Kamal-ud-din Khan Bahadur, died in January 1877 and as he left a widow, Nazneen Begam, in very straitened circumstances, the Government resolved to continue to her $\frac{2}{3}$ of the pension enjoyed by him. The papers before Government do not give any further information regarding this pension.

Government increased these pensions, that of Cauder Hussain from 35 to 50 pagodas and that of Doolham Begam from 25 pagodas to 37 pagodas and 15 fanams per mensem, and ordered their payment at the enhanced rates from the dates of demise of the late incumbents. Cauder Hussain, otherwise known as Kwaja * Kamal-ud-din Khan Bahadur, died in January 1877 and as he left a widow, Nazneen Begam, in very straitened circumstances, the Government resolved to continue to her $\frac{2}{3}$ of the pension enjoyed by him. The papers before Government do not give any further information regarding this pension.

Government increased these pensions, that of Cauder Hussain from 35 to 50 pagodas and that of Doolham Begam from 25 pagodas to 37 pagodas and 15 fanams per mensem, and ordered their payment at the enhanced rates from the dates of demise of the late incumbents. Cauder Hussain, otherwise known as Kwaja * Kamal-ud-din Khan Bahadur, died in January 1877 and as he left a widow, Nazneen Begam, in very straitened circumstances, the Government resolved to continue to her $\frac{2}{3}$ of the pension enjoyed by him. The papers before Government do not give any further information regarding this pension.

Government increased these pensions, that of Cauder Hussain from 35 to 50 pagodas and that of Doolham Begam from 25 pagodas to 37 pagodas and 15 fanams per mensem, and ordered their payment at the enhanced rates from the dates of demise of the late incumbents. Cauder Hussain, otherwise known as Kwaja * Kamal-ud-din Khan Bahadur, died in January 1877 and as he left a widow, Nazneen Begam, in very straitened circumstances, the Government resolved to continue to her $\frac{2}{3}$ of the pension enjoyed by him. The papers before Government do not give any further information regarding this pension.

Government increased these pensions, that of Cauder Hussain from 35 to 50 pagodas and that of Doolham Begam from 25 pagodas to 37 pagodas and 15 fanams per mensem, and ordered their payment at the enhanced rates from the dates of demise of the late incumbents. Cauder Hussain, otherwise known as Kwaja * Kamal-ud-din Khan Bahadur, died in January 1877 and as he left a widow, Nazneen Begam, in very straitened circumstances, the Government resolved to continue to her $\frac{2}{3}$ of the pension enjoyed by him. The papers before Government do not give any further information regarding this pension.

Government increased these pensions, that of Cauder Hussain from 35 to 50 pagodas and that of Doolham Begam from 25 pagodas to 37 pagodas and 15 fanams per mensem, and ordered their payment at the enhanced rates from the dates of demise of the late incumbents. Cauder Hussain, otherwise known as Kwaja * Kamal-ud-din Khan Bahadur, died in January 1877 and as he left a widow, Nazneen Begam, in very straitened circumstances, the Government resolved to continue to her $\frac{2}{3}$ of the pension enjoyed by him. The papers before Government do not give any further information regarding this pension.

Government increased these pensions, that of Cauder Hussain from 35 to 50 pagodas and that of Doolham Begam from 25 pagodas to 37 pagodas and 15 fanams per mensem, and ordered their payment at the enhanced rates from the dates of demise of the late incumbents. Cauder Hussain, otherwise known as Kwaja * Kamal-ud-din Khan Bahadur, died in January 1877 and as he left a widow, Nazneen Begam, in very straitened circumstances, the Government resolved to continue to her $\frac{2}{3}$ of the pension enjoyed by him. The papers before Government do not give any further information regarding this pension.

Government increased these pensions, that of Cauder Hussain from 35 to 50 pagodas and that of Doolham Begam from 25 pagodas to 37 pagodas and 15 fanams per mensem, and ordered their payment at the enhanced rates from the dates of demise of the late incumbents. Cauder Hussain, otherwise known as Kwaja * Kamal-ud-din Khan Bahadur, died in January 1877 and as he left a widow, Nazneen Begam, in very straitened circumstances, the Government resolved to continue to her $\frac{2}{3}$ of the pension enjoyed by him. The papers before Government do not give any further information regarding this pension.

Government increased these pensions, that of Cauder Hussain from 35 to 50 pagodas and that of Doolham Begam from 25 pagodas to 37 pagodas and 15 fanams per mensem, and ordered their payment at the enhanced rates from the dates of demise of the late incumbents. Cauder Hussain, otherwise known as Kwaja * Kamal-ud-din Khan Bahadur, died in January 1877 and as he left a widow, Nazneen Begam, in very straitened circumstances, the Government resolved to continue to her $\frac{2}{3}$ of the pension enjoyed by him. The papers before Government do not give any further information regarding this pension.

Government increased these pensions, that of Cauder Hussain from 35 to 50 pagodas and that of Doolham Begam from 25 pagodas to 37 pagodas and 15 fanams per mensem, and ordered their payment at the enhanced rates from the dates of demise of the late incumbents. Cauder Hussain, otherwise known as Kwaja * Kamal-ud-din Khan Bahadur, died in January 1877 and as he left a widow, Nazneen Begam, in very straitened circumstances, the Government resolved to continue to her $\frac{2}{3}$ of the pension enjoyed by him. The papers before Government do not give any further information regarding this pension.

Government increased these pensions, that of Cauder Hussain from 35 to 50 pagodas and that of Doolham Begam from 25 pagodas to 37 pagodas and 15 fanams per mensem, and ordered their payment at the enhanced rates from the dates of demise of the late incumbents. Cauder Hussain, otherwise known as Kwaja * Kamal-ud-din Khan Bahadur, died in January 1877 and as he left a widow, Nazneen Begam, in very straitened circumstances, the Government resolved to continue to her $\frac{2}{3}$ of the pension enjoyed by him. The papers before Government do not give any further information regarding this pension.

Doolham Begam, widow of Jalal-ud-din, died in December 1886, whereupon a moiety of her pension was conferred on her great grandson, Pir Hazarath, on the express understanding that it should cease entirely on his death.

G.O., 7th April 1888, No. 238.

5. IV.—Paragraph 4 of the Board's Proceedings read above contains an apparent inconsistency. It is there stated that $\frac{2}{3}$ of Ghulam Hussain's allowance was continued to Garee Bee and that the amount of it was Rs. 6 per mensem. Ghulam Hussain's allowance being Rs. 87-8-0, $\frac{2}{3}$ of it would be Rs. 58-5-4 and not Rs. 6. The facts of the case, however, are as follows:—

On the death of Mahomed Masum in or about 1829, a moiety of his pension, namely, Rs. 87-8-0, was continued from the date of his demise to his eldest son, Ghulam Hussain, for the maintenance of the surviving members of the family.

E. M. C., 13th August 1833, No. 883.

E. M. C., 29th April 1834, No. 318.

The Collector, on receipt of the Government order, seems to have divided the allowance into nine equal shares, Ghulam Hussain getting only one of them. In paragraph 9 of the Board's Proceedings in G.O., dated 17th June 1857, No. 604, it is stated that out of these nine shares payment of three, including that of Ghulam Hussain, was transferred to the Collectorate of South Arcot and of six to Madras under the order of Government, dated 8th November 1842. But from the Board's letter in this latter order, it would appear that the payment of only five shares was transferred to Madras. The following is a list of the persons referred to therein with the respective value of the shares allotted to each:—

No.	Name.	Relationship to Mahomed Masum.	Value of each share.	District in which payment was to be made.
1	Ghulam Hussain	Son	RS. A. P.	South Arcot.
2	Mahomed Ali	Do.	9 11 7	
3	Afzelmiah	Do.	9 11 7	
4	Mahomeda Bibi	Grandson	9 11 6	
5	Ghouse Miah	Wife	9 11 7	Madras.
6	Mahomed Eberayem	Son	9 11 7	
7	Hazarah Bibi	Do.	9 11 7	
8	Rukeya Bibi	Daughter	9 11 7	
9	Not known	Do.	9 11 6	
		Not known	9 11 6	
	Total		87 8 0	

No. (1) died in 1855 and Rs. 6, being about $\frac{2}{3}$ of his share, was, on account of the destitute circumstances of the family, continued to his widow, Garee Bee, on the distinct understanding that it was to cease on her death. Subsequently, the pension was raised to the original amount and was, on her death in December 1888, stopped altogether. In December last, when a petition was received from her second son praying for the continuance of her pension, the Government declined to comply with his request.

G.O., 17th June 1857, No. 604.

G.O., 26th August 1878, No. 460, Pol.

G.O., 19th December 1889, No. 8205, Mis.

No. (2) seems to be still in the enjoyment of his pension (*vide* No. 15 in the list of money allowances in Board's Proceedings, dated 14th December 1885, No. 3380).

No. (3) died on the 21st February 1886 and his share was ordered to be continued in full to his family, pending the receipt of the report now under consideration.

G.O., 21st July 1887, No. 707.

No. (4).—The exact time of her death or of the discontinuance of her pension is not known. But from an order of 1884, in which the Government refused the continuance of her pension to her descendants, it would appear that this pension must have lapsed to Government long before 1884.

Nos. (5), (8) and (9).—No information is forthcoming as to what became of these shares.

No. (6) died in February 1875, leaving a widow and six children penniless.

G.O., 2nd March 1876, No. 305.

As the amount of his pension was small, considering the number of souls dependent on it, it was continued undiminished to his eldest son Kurushuthoola.

No. (7) died in March 1879, when the Government allowed her share to be continued in full to her only son, Syed Mohideen Hussain, but ordered at the same time that that being the 4th

succession should, on its lapse, terminate the grant. The pension was in reality, however, continued only to the 3rd life.

6. V.—As regards the pension granted to Moulvi Abdul Rub, no further information than what is furnished by the Board is traceable from the records of the Government office. On the death of the other grantee, Moulvi Imam Baksh, who had been in receipt of 50 pagodas per mensem, the Government was pleased to grant to his widow, Jayanah Sahiba, a monthly pension of 40 pagodas from 1st July 1813. She died in 1845 leaving—

E. M. C., 30th July 1813, No. 314.

- (1) a daughter-in-law (a widow);
- (2) a grandson (son of No. 1); and
- (3) two granddaughters (daughters of No. 1).

When these persons petitioned for the continuance of the pension, the matter was referred for the orders of the Government of India with the recommendation that

E. M. C., 17th December 1847, No. 1348.

of India with the recommendation that $\frac{1}{4}$ of the allowance enjoyed by the deceased might be continued to them at the rate of Rs. 8-12-0 each per mensem. That Government, however, was of opinion that as the pension had been granted only for life, it would be sufficient to grant the proposed allowances to the widow for life, to the son till he was 18 years of age, and to the daughters till they were married. The pensions thus sanctioned were authorized to be disbursed in arrears from 29th December 1845, the date of Jayanah Sahiba's death. No further information on the subject being at present available, the report called for by the Board from the Collector of Madras is awaited.

G.O., 25th January 1848, No. 97.

G.O., 20th April 1848, No. 419.

7. VI.—On the death of Kadir Navaz Khan in 1804, his full pension was continued to his son, Mahomed Banker Hussain, and on his death in 1843, $\frac{1}{3}$ of his pension (*i.e.*, Rs. 408-5-4) was granted to his widow and three daughters for life. But subsequently as it was found that some others, also related to the deceased, had been in receipt of allowances from him, the pension granted to the widow and daughters was ordered to be distributed among the several members of the family in the same proportions in which it was originally enjoyed by them as shown below:—

E. M. C., 26th June 1804.

E. M. C., 20th April 1843, No. 152.

E. M. C., 17th June 1843, No. 232.

E. M. C., 7th July 1843, No. 264.

Name.	Relationship.	Amount per mensem.
Fathima Begam	Widow of Banker Hussain	Rs. A. P. 63 9 4
Rahinatounissa Begam	Daughter of do.	63 9 4
Abbassy Begam	Do. do.	63 9 4
Azeezonissa Begam	Do. do.	63 9 4
Sharbanu Begam	Shadi widow of Kadir Navaz Khan	33 5 4
Laul Beebee	Nikka do. of do.	14 0 0
Late Sanbut Jung's widows and sisters.		40 0 0
Katumah Begam and her two sisters ...	Daughters of Peyari Begam, the elder daughter of Kadir Navaz Khan.	23 5 4
Saraf Ali Khan	Husband of Janu Begam, the younger daughter of Kadir Navaz Khan.	23 5 4
Ghulam Hussain	Son of Kadir Beebee, the nikka daughter of Kadir Navaz Khan.	10 0 0
Massa Begam		10 0 0

It does not appear from the records before Government what the names of the two sisters of Katumah Begam and of the late Sanbut Jung's widows and sisters are. But from the Madras Deputy Collector's letter, dated 8th July last, No. 737, printed in the Board's Proceedings read above, it would seem that the former are Habiboonissa Begam and Mahabooboonissa Begam, and the latter Habeeba Beebee, Karimoonissa Begam, Rymoonissa Begam, Hafiz Begam, and Fatima Beebee. The Deputy Collector's letter apparently omits the name of one other lady who should have been in receipt of the remaining Rs. 80 out of the total of Rs. 480 per annum granted for the late Sanbut Jung's family. The pensions allotted to Sharbanu Begam, Laul Beebee, and the immediate family of Banker Hussain were subsequently raised under the orders of the Court of Directors to Rs. 100, 42 and 408-5-4 per mensem, respectively. It appears, from the Deputy Collector's letter above referred to, that, by the 31st December 1863, all these pensions had either lapsed to Government owing to the death of the recipients or been commuted according to the instructions contained in E. M. C., 15th March 1859, No. 305, with the exception of those of the widow and three daughters of Banker Hussain and of Saraf Ali Khan.

The commuted pensions were, in the case of Katumah Begam, Habiboonissa Begam and Mahabooboonissa Begam, afterwards revived and continued to them for life with the sanction of the Government of India as the parties had outlived the number of years for which their allowances were commuted.

The pension granted to Saraf Ali Khan as the husband of a daughter of the original grantee was, on his death, continued in full to his two sons, Mahomed Sydoodeen and Ahmed Ali, as heirs to their mother.

Rahinatounissa Begam, one of the daughters of Banker Hussain, died in February 1873, leaving her husband and eight young children. The Government thereupon sanctioned the grant of Rs. 600 per annum to the family of the deceased and subsequently ordered that this sum should not be reduced on the occurrence of any casualty.

On the death of Abbassy Begam, another daughter of Banker Hussain, the full pension enjoyed by her was granted as a special case to her husband and first cousin, Ahmed Ali Khan, the Government

observing that sufficient weight had not been given to his relationship to the original grantee at the re-apportionment of the Government bounty in 1843. This pensioner appears to have died in March 1889, and his son's request for the continuance of the pension was refused in G.O., dated 1st October 1889, No. 6261, Mis.

The Government is not in possession of any other papers relating to this case, except G.O., dated 9th January 1882, No. 81, Mis., in which the payment of arrears of pension undrawn by Ahmed Ali, the younger son of Saraf Ali Khan, during his absence of seven years at Hyderabad, was sanctioned. The Deputy Collector of Madras states that, as the payment of the pensions in this case was transferred to the Accountant-General under G.O., dated 11th August 1870, No. 1228, his records do not show what became of them afterwards, and the Board considers it unnecessary to make any reference to the Accountant-General because, in its opinion, the history of the pensions of the rest gives an adequate idea of the manner in which the allowance to this family was dealt with. As it appears, however, that no uniform principle has been observed in dealing with the several cases, the Government considers it very desirable that all the information available on the subject should be collected together and that the present is a suitable opportunity for doing so. The Board will, therefore, endeavour, in communication with the Accountant-General and the Collectors concerned, to supplement, where deficient, the information herein given in regard to the several cases dealt with.

8. VII, VIII and IX.—As regards these cases, the records of the Government office do not afford further information than what the Board has been able to furnish.

9. From the foregoing summary and the tabular statement appended hereto, it will be seen that the pensions under consideration were originally granted for life; that they have been continued since as compassionate allowances owing to the poverty of the family of the deceased recipients, in some cases in full, in others at reduced amounts; and that in only four cases have they been continued beyond the third life. His Excellency the Governor in Council is accordingly pleased to rule that in no further cases will the pensions be continued beyond the third life, and that, in the few instances in which they have not been continued beyond the second life, should any claims be preferred hereafter, it will be considered whether they shall lapse or be continued at a reduced amount. The allowance provisionally sanctioned in G.O., dated 21st July 1887, No. 707, will be continued to Ghulam Hussain Miah Sahib for life and will cease entirely on his death.

(True Extract.)

(Signed) C. A. GALTON,
Secretary to Government.

To the Commissioners of Land Revenue, with one enclosure.
" the Accountant-General.
" the Political Department.

Exd. P. L. Pereira.

60 Copies.

APPENDIX.

STATEMENT showing the amount of yearly pensions assigned in lieu of jaghires resumed as having been granted subsequent to the year 1792, with the names of original grantees and their successors.

Case No.	First life (original grantees).	Second life.	Third life.	Fourth life.	Remarks.
I	Syed Shah Ali Kadory .. 4,200 0 0	Kurrem-ud-din .. 2,100 0 0	Boorian-ud-din .. 1,200 0 0	..	..
II	Syed Jamal-ud-din Khan .. 4,200 0 0	Syed Cauder Hussain (Kwaja Kamal-ud-din Khan Bahadur) .. 2,100 0 0	Syed Kutubdeen Kadory .. 840 0 0	..	..
III	Syed Jalal-ud-din Khan .. 2,100 0 0	Doolham Begam .. 1,508 0 0	Fir Hazarath .. 784 0 0	..	..
IV	Mahomed Masum .. 2,100 0 0	Ghulam Hussain .. 1,116 11 0	Gareo Bee .. 1,116 10 0	..	..
V	Mouvi Abdul Rob .. 2,100 0 0	Mahomed Ali .. 1,116 11 0	His family .. 1,116 10 0	..	..
VI	Mouvi Inam Batab .. 2,100 0 0	Atcedinah Bibi .. 1,116 11 0	Kurshubholla .. 1,116 11 0	..	..
		Mahomed Elerayem .. 1,116 11 0	Syed Mohideen Hussain .. 1,116 10 0	..	..
		Hazarah Bibi .. 1,116 10 0	..	..	..
		Rukaya Bibi .. 1,116 10 0	..	..	..
		Another (name not given) .. 1,116 10 0	..	..	..
		Jaymah Sahiba .. 1,680 0 0	(1) A daughter-in-law of No. 1.	..	..
			(2) A grandaughter (daughter of No. 1).	..	..
			(3) A grandaughter (daughter of No. 1).	..	..
			(4) A grandaughter (daughter of No. 1).	..	..
			Fathima Begam .. 1,225 0 0	Her family .. 600 0 0	..
			Rahmatunnissa Begam .. 1,225 0 0	Ahmed Ali Khan .. 1,225 0 0	..
			Abhassy Begam .. 1,225 0 0	..	..
			Azeemunnissa Begam .. 1,200 0 0	..	..
			Sharlana Begam .. 804 0 0	..	..
			Laul Beebe .. 80 0 0	..	..
			Habeela Beebe .. 80 0 0	..	..
			Karimunnissa Begam .. 80 0 0	..	..
			Rymunnissa do. .. 80 0 0	..	..
			Hidiz Begam .. 80 0 0	..	..
			Fatima Beebe .. 80 0 0	..	..
			Another lady (omitted by the Dy. Collector).	..	..
			Katunah Begam .. 83 5 0	..	..
			Habibunnissa Begam .. 83 5 0	..	..
			Mahaboonnissa Begam .. 83 5 0	..	..
			Sarif Ali Khan .. 280 0 0	Mahomed Saied-ud-din .. 140 0 0	..
			Ghulam Hussain .. 120 0 0	Ahmed Ali Khan .. 140 0 0	..
			Masum Begam .. 120 0 0	..	..

(e) This was to continue till he was 18 years of age and must, therefore, have been by this time.

(f) This was to continue till they were married, and have probably lapsed by this time.

Statement showing the amount of yearly pensions assigned in lieu of jaghires resumed as having been granted subsequent to the year 1792, with the names of original grantees and their successors—cont.

Case No.	First life (original grantees).	Second life.	Third life.	Fourth life.	Remarks.
VII	Mahomed Feroze Khan .. 2,100 0 0	Ghulam Hussain .. 630 0 0	Cauder Bee .. 126 0 0	Mahomed Abdulla .. 84 0 0	..
			Ghulam Hussain .. 84 0 0	..	..
			Alysha Beebe .. 84 0 0	..	..
			Murtaza Hussain .. 180 0 0	..	..
			Mahomed Kassim .. 90 0 0	..	..
			Ghulam Hussain .. 90 0 0	..	..
			Ali Hussain .. 60 0 0	..	..
			Laul Beebe .. 60 0 0	..	..
VIII	Bahadur Ali Shah .. 180 14 0				..
	Issara Aliyul Hussain .. 180 14 0				..
	Syed Asurkollah .. 180 14 0				..
	Syed Nipercollah .. 180 14 0				..
	Syed Azeecollah .. 180 14 0				..
	Mannah Begam .. 180 14 0				..
	Ameenah Beebe .. 180 14 0				..
	Syed Hassanoolah .. 180 14 0				..
	Syed Isacunnoolah .. 180 14 0				..
	Akany Begam .. 180 14 0				..
	Noor Beebe .. 180 14 0				..
IX	Syed Mahdum .. 8,400 0 0				Continued to his grandsons, but afterwards ordered to be stopped.

* Lapsed.

* Committed.

0228

5/19/47
4787
5-12-94
G.O., 21st April

APRIL.

Passing orders on the report of the Board of Revenue as to the action taken in regard to the — assigned in lieu of certain jaghires which were resumed as having been granted subsequent to the treaty of 1792.

19/8/03
30.10.05 ✓
4.12.05 ✓
24/4/07 ✓
6-6-08 ✓
11-6-08 ✓
16.3.09 ✓
2-8-09 ✓
11-2-10 ✓
27-9-10 ✓
28-7-11 ✓
7-11-19 ✓
16-10-09 ✓
16-2-22 ✓
7-2-21 ✓
6-12-21 ✓
16-2-22 ✓
9/4/22 ✓
8.10.36 II ✓
8.11.41 I ✓