

No. 87.

4-13

To the Secy, Fort Poyde
9th ~~February~~ ^{March} 1863

For I have the honor to be
proudly acknowledge the receipt of your
packet No. 874 of the 8th of Decr
last containing copy of letter from
under Secy Fort No. 1318 of 27
Novr 1862.

2^d From a document received
from the Civil Auditor at Allahabad
that the undermentioned ladies
received pensions from the Fort
Treasury at Delhi for the
months of Novr & Decr 1862
viz names

Mohabub-un-nissa Begum Rs 266-11-0
Kadri Gurnam Begum Rs 183-5-0
Pensions

and that these pensions were
paid up to the 30th of April
1863.

From a document
received from ^{Allahabad} the
the further appear to have re-
ceived the following allow-
ances from the Treasry
Mohabub-un-nissa Begum Rs 44-9-0
Kadri Gurnam Begum Rs 26-13-9
and that the above Begum
the same source received

Roll 2-0 Perennarium

3^d The ladies whose names
were are not those of
the names mentioned in the
list alluded to in the 3^d Form
of the Under Dept Letter as they
and not made any applica-
tion at the same time but
were drawn out and were
then being at P. 200000.
The names in case
said by the Agent for
Genl. Messers in letter
No 59 of the 26th ulto

4th In regard to the
any other names occurred
in the list of names of their
clerks by the ladies above
mentioned in Form No
is added in the account
of the Under Dept from the
Agent for Genl. Messers
No 13 of the 4th of August
and enclosure.

5th I must find that
in the names the
female members of the
Delhi family have re-
ceived back the names
persons with names

A-15

From the day 1867
of the Supreme Court
but from your predecessors
to find error
No 391 of the 23^d March
1860. ^{it appears} but such a course
was pursued in regard
to certain ladies of the
Delhi family by order
of the 9^d March 1860
Nos 96, 97 & 98 of the 11th. The
cases under consideration
appear to be analogous.

J. M. W. B.

Recd

1865

Sept

2037

To.

The Secretary
to Govt Punjab
Lahore.

I
Reports on petitions of Mo-
hutoomasa, Kaidi Jussana
Beyun & Hagee Beyun
the restoration of which is
claimed by them.

Reply to No 1318 of 27 Nov/65