

ROLE OF A SIKH MAHANT DURING THE REVOLT OF 1857 IN AGRA . (CAPITAL OF THE NORTH-WESTERN PROVINCES)

**ANIL JESSOP CHAUHAN (SENIOR LECTURER), DEPT. OF HISTORY,
ST. JOHN'S COLLEGE, AGRA.**

I

The revolt of 1857 was a bolt out of the blue for the British, who may not have ever dreamt of a rebellion, on such a magnitude; and it goes without saying, that without the aid and support of loyal Indians¹, the British had almost lost Agra, the erstwhile capital of the North-Western Provinces. A pertinent question that has baffled the minds of Historians is in regard to the attitude of the Sikhs towards the rebellion and the rebels. It is observed that, the Sikhs, adopted an attitude of neutrality against the rebels, and at some places were colluding partners of the British,² playing a vital role in suppressing the rebellion, and sometimes their actions aroused indignation among the victims³, though there were notable exceptions also.⁴ Various theories have been attributed, either to condemn or defend the action of the Sikh Community during the revolt. One theory about the weak and vacillating attitude of the Sikhs is that the Anglo-Sikh Wars had left them leaderless, hence they could not effectively participate in the revolt,⁵ but this argument cannot be accepted in its entirety, because there were notable exceptions, when the Sikhs did take an active part.⁶ Another theory put forward is that the Sikhs nursed a grudge against the *purabia* soldiers and held them responsible for the annexation of the Punjab, and were naturally looked down upon, due to 'their betrayal and other overt and covert acts' which bred 'a natural hatred' against them among the Sikhs.⁷ Kavi Khazan Singh in his work *Jangnama-i-Dilli*, written in 1858, mentions that the Sikh participation against the *purabia* soldiers was in reaction to the latter's claim that they had vanquished the Sikhs in 1845-46, and again in 1848-49.⁸ But this argument cannot be accepted on the ground that the revolt in 1857 was against a common enemy, a foreigner. Why it did not transpire to them, that in the eventuality of the defeat of the British, both would have lost their bondage? Perhaps, the fear of the resuscitation of the Mughal Empire must have played its part in the logical conclusion, that the community was safe from trepidations under the British, than it would be under the Mughals⁹. William Darlymple has argued that the Sikhs had proved to be keen recruits "for although they had themselves fought

two major wars with the British.....any dislike which they may have felt for the British was outweighed by their long hatred of the Mughals who had martyred two of their greatest gurus....(besides) there was also the lure of the celebrated wealth of Delhi.”¹⁰ Be that as it may, the present paper attempts to look upon the activities of a Sikh religious head (*Mahant*), Mauj Prakash, who helped the British in Agra, not only during the revolt, but whose rendezvous with the British started, as early as 1841. This paper is based upon a copy of the petition, which he forwarded to the Governor-General-in-Council, seeking compensation for the services rendered by him, at the time of the revolt of 1857, as well as, the correspondence conducted by the Government of the North-Western Provinces, with various departments. These records are available with the Regional Archives Office, Agra.¹¹

II

Mauj Prakash was the **mahant** (religious head) of **Gurdwara Maithan**, situated at a very strategic location, in the heart of the city of Agra. It belongs to the *udasin* sect of the Sikhs.¹² Legends state that Guru Teg Bahadur himself laid the foundation of this Gurdwara, (It may have added to the *mahant's* natural hatred against the perpetrators of atrocities against their Guru). In the correspondence Mauj Prakash is referred to as the '**Guru**' of the Sikhs of Agra, and it appears that the petition was sent sometime during the early months of 1858.¹³ The purpose of the petition was to bring to the notice of the Government his loyal and faithful services to the British, both before and during the Revolt, and to exhort the Government to grant him a piece of land in Agra, over which he wanted to construct 'an almshouse for the indigent traveller.' His anxiety can be gauged from the fact that he wanted to perpetuate his erstwhile charities.¹⁴ The petition is appended with testimonials received by him from various British officials who were confined in the Agra Fort in those crucial days. From the petition it appears that Mauj Prakash Singh had not become a collaborator overnight, but, as early as 1841-42, C.G.Jackson, the magistrate of Agra had requisitioned his services, to obtain the release of Colonel Lawrence, his wife and children, who were captured and kept in confinement by the Sikhs in the Punjab. On that occasion Mauj Prakash had written to Chatter Singh, remonstrating against the act and exhorting the chief "to afford them (Lawrence and his family) every help and to treat them with consideration."¹⁵ His implorations had the

desired effect and the prisoners were released. He proudly asserts in the petition that the fact could be verified from a number of witnesses.

While describing his activities during the revolt, Mauj Prakash ventured to show how he “had laboured day and night to render the authorities every assistance,” by way of procuring information regarding the rebels, or by providing *cossids* (*Qaasids* or messengers) and rescuing the Christians. He further asserts that two of his *chelas* (disciples) were caught by Nana Sahib and blown away by guns. Besides, he refers to his taking part in the two battles fought between the British and the rebels, at Agra. In the battle of Shahganj, (a locality in Agra, about 5 kms. from the fort) fought on July 5, 1857, he received a wound on his forehead and he asserts that he also took part in the second battle fought at Agra on October 10, 1857. Mauj Prakash obtained a large number of testimonials from the beleaguered British officials during his many forays into the fort. Further extolling his activities, Mauj Prakash states that his *chelas* (disciples) escorted ‘three gentlemen’ along with Rs. 17,000/- and forty muskets from Mainpuri, for which he was offered Rs. 1400/- and also a village, by Charles Raikes, and the Chief Commissioner had conferred on him a village by an order dated February 12, 1858. But, “he steeply declined all such offers,” since he firmly believed that he was merely “doing his duty to the state as a loyal subject and that such a duty should be conscientiously performed without hope of personal advantage.”¹⁶ However, it so occurred that after the restoration of peace, Mauj Prakash appealed to the Governor-General-in-Council, “to endow in perpetuity an alms house at Agra, either by an annual or monthly payment, or by the grant of land, in the vicinity of Agra, in which food and pecuniary assistance maybe given to indigent traveller or residents without reference to their caste or creed. The institution (could) be placed under the charge of my successors, but, subject to the inspection and supervision of the Magistrate or any other local official.”¹⁷ Ostensibly, he wanted to project the “honesty of the Government and also to see that the objects of the charity were not abused.”¹⁸

The testimonials appended with the petition make an interesting reading. In all there are sixteen testimonials given by those officials who were residing in the Agra

Fort in those critical times. The testimonial of Captain H. Watson stated that Mauj Prakash had been loyal and active in serving the Government, and that he provided useful information regarding the movement of the “mutineers.”¹⁹ Brigadier Thomas Polewhele also testified that Mauj Prakash exerted himself to procure information regarding the ‘mutineers and our other enemies,’ and in saving the lives of several Christians.²⁰ In his testimonial S. Harriot, calls Mauj Prakash “a tried friend to the English,” who gave him a guard of Sikhs, and had offered six of his men to escort him on his way from Delhi to Lahore.²¹ Similarly, Captain A.G. Forsyth, of the Third European Regiment, in his testimonial, dated July 26, 1857, calls Mauj Prakash, the Bishop of the Sikhs, (this was perhaps because of the influence which Mauj Prakash had over his community in the erstwhile Agra region) and testifies to his taking part in the action of July 5, 1857, in which the latter was wounded. He further gave evidence to his saving the lives of “a gentleman and two ladies at the hands of the insurgents.”²² He further stated that the “*Guru*” offered good services, when the former commanded the Jail Guard for nearly three weeks; and therefore, ‘commends that whosoever meets him should be kind to him’.²³ The testimonial of Lieutenant Forbes shows that the “*Guru*” always gave “true and valuable information when such could not be obtained, providing messengers for carrying letters from the Government when the roads were not safe even for the natives.”²⁴ He certifies his presence, in both the engagements, which occurred at Agra, and also in his saving the lives of several Europeans by hiding them in his own house. Captain W. Alexander states that Mauj Prakash assisted him in raising a Corps of Irregular Cavalry, by procuring men from the Punjab through his friends.²⁵ The testimonial of A. Milford, a consignee of the 3rd European Regiment also testifies that Mauj Prakash was most useful when the former was on guard at the Central Jail at Agra, and that he exerted himself in saving the lives of several Europeans from the insurgents.²⁶ Similarly E. Wyllie calls him ‘noble guru’ who exerted himself in aiding several Christians and in procuring information regarding the movement of the “mutineers.”²⁷ Major R.W. Raikes testifies to the faithful services of Mauj Prakash on the night of July 5, 1857, when the Sikhs were released from the Jail and were placed under the charge of the former. The retinue had to pass through the city of Agra, which was a difficult task, because of the firing taking place in the Civil Lines, and moreover, they were unarmed.²⁸ From the testimonial of H.

Unwin, we learn that Mauj Prakash was the “*Guru*” of the Sikh residents for a long time at Agra, and that he exerted himself to the best of his ability and influence.²⁹ Charles Raikes in his testimonial certifies that “Guru” Mauj Prakash “evinced zeal and loyalty during the late disturbances.”³⁰ J.P.Walker, Assisstant Surgeon and Superintendent of the Agra Central Jail, states that he had several interviews with Mauj Prakash about the time of the outbreak of the rebellion at Agra, and he sincerely believed him “to be the well wisher of the Government and most willing to render any assistance in his powers.”³¹ He also indicates that on the day of the outbreak (of rebellion) at Agra “he tried to assist the *Daroga* at the prison, and later during the day accompanied the testator with a number of liberated Sikh prisoners in an unsuccessful attempt to hold the prison”. R. Drummond in his testimonial states that Mauj Prakash had done ‘good service to the Government during the past two months.’³² William Muir also testifies that Mauj Prakash had “done his best during the late disturbances.”³³ The testimonial of E. Wylly, Judge of Agra, stated that Mauj Prakash had “done singularly good service at Agra during the rebellion, having saved the lives of Europeans, exposed his own life in action, and having been most active in providing information to the authorities and procuring spies and messengers”³⁴ He recommends Mauj Prakash’s case for the consideration by the authorities of his loyal services. Lastly, we have the testimonial from Lt. Col. J. Glassford testifying the services of Mauj Prakash and of his having taken part in the two engagements at Agra.³⁵

III

Acting upon the petition, the Government of the North-Western Provinces ordered that the ‘Guru’ should be bestowed upon with a ‘confiscated’ village, as soon as Government arrangements in respect to such property were matured.³⁶ The petition, in original, was then forwarded to the Commission of Investigation, Agra, comprising R.B. Morgan, R.Money and E.A.Reade, by William Muir to ascertain their opinion, as to how the services of the petitioner were to be acknowledged.³⁷ The Commission of Investigation was of the opinion that Mauj Prakash had a good claim and deserved a reward. But, it warned the Government ‘to abstain from being mixed up with any endowment, which avowedly was for charitable purposes, and would entail the performance of some superstitious rites.’³⁸ The Commission recommended that a

‘confiscated’ estate near Agra be bestowed upon him, the average profit of which would not be less than Rs.500/- per annum, and that ‘the management and full license to dispose of the profits as he may deem fit’, may be given to him.³⁹ On May 17,1858 the ‘Sudder’ Board of Revenue (N.W.P.) instructed the Commissioner, Agra Division, to ‘arrange for the assignment of a ‘confiscated estate’, bearing a *Juma*(assigned revenue) of Rs. 1000/-, to be given to Mauj Prakash.’⁴⁰ The Commissioner wrote to the Collector, A.L.M.Phillips, to arrange for a ‘confiscated estate’ bearing a *Juma* of Rs.1000/- close to Agra and as near the Jamuna, as possible.⁴¹ As per orders of May 6,1858, the Commissioner and the Collector of Agra, selected a ‘confiscated’ estate on the ‘other side of Chambal’ close to the Dholpur border of Agra District, which was to be conferred on Mauj Prakash, with proprietary rights, bearing an annual revenue of Rs.1000/-. However, it was brought to the notice of the Government by the Board (of revenue?) that the estate was ‘one of notoriety of bad characters’, and Mauj Prakash petitioned for an exchange, and the Government relented. Orders were passed on October 6,1858 sanctioning, the grant of an estate, which was nearer to Agra, than the previous one. Now this was not a “confiscated” estate. It was a small piece of land measuring 8.75 *biswas*(about 1205 sq.yrds. or 1008 sq.mtrs.) in *mauzah* Kiraoli, in *pergunnah* Fatehpur which was assessed at Rs.One thousand and ten and thirteen *annas*, and “its proprietary rights had been purchased at auction sale for arrears of revenue and belonged to the Government”.⁴² It seems that in this case the Government was inclined to bend its own rules in order to placate one of its die-hard loyalists, because on numerous other occasions we find that similar petitions were rejected on the ground that such rewards in land were to be made only through ‘confiscated properties.’⁴³ The question naturally arises as to why the Government was ready to modify its policy? It seems that the British were indebted to Mauj Prakash and were eager to relent.

What might have been the reason for the British, first to seek the help of the Sikh *mahant*, and then to go out of the way to concede his request, and later to dump him, as the subsequent treatment meted out to him shows? The clue may be found in William Muir’s records of the Intelligence Department, as to why the Government sought the services of the loyal Indians. He has criticized the policy of Drummond for reposing ‘too

much trust in the local Mohammedans and employing them exclusively in the Government service, both Revenue and Police, in both high and low office'. He states that "the whole police, officers and men (all Moslems) quitted their posts.... the *Burkundazees* committed enormities against us in the city... while some of the influential Muslim citizens are supposed of connivance... Mohammedans, both high and low fled in multitudes from Agra.... Our Police, thus, vanished and it became necessary on the return of tranquility to make new constabulary arrangements."⁴⁴ At another place, he remarks, "our position at Agra was in some degree complicated, by having to guard the Master Jail, (It was the Central Jail, established in 1846, for the North-Western Provinces, containing a vast collection of the worst prisoners in the land) by European troops. For the Jail *Nujeeps* (armed guards) had gone off in a body towards the end of the month. If the 3rd European should be required in the field, it would be necessary to draw off the men employed on this duty, and the only recourse left was to make over the Jail to the Sikh prisoners, who were to be released and armed for the purpose."⁴⁵ Perhaps, this was the reason for the British to turn for help, to their 'trusted and tried friend' Mauj Prakash.

IV

From a different file⁴⁶, (which was found accidentally), we learnt that the person who had risked his own life, and had played a significant role in saving the British rule in the North-Western Provinces, and rendered 'meritorious services', was latter given a prison sentence of five years, although we are unable to ascertain the reason for it. In a letter written by G.H.M.Batten, Secretary, Sudder Board of Revenue, to G.Couper, who was Secretary to the Government of the North-Western Provinces, regarding the statement of settlement of *chuck huftun, sawad shahar, pergunna Huzoor tehsil, zila* Agra, he informs the latter, that a plot of *Nazul* land, situated across the river Yamuna and called the *Bagh* (garden) of Sultan Pervez,(Son of Jahangir) measuring 9 *bighas* and 14 *biswas* (about 22,353 sq.yrds.) was made over in free-gift to Mauj Prakash, in recognition of his services "during the mutiny," by Government Order No. 366, dated April 30,1860.⁴⁷ In the letter it is also mentioned that before his death, Mauj Prakash, acknowledged as his heir, one *fakir* (mendicant), by the name of Deendayal, and the plot had been settled with him at half the *jama* asset rate viz.Rs.11. Now instead of *mafee* land, (rent-free), the heir

had to pay, half the *jama*. We further learn that Deendayal repaired the tomb of Sultan Pervez and put the wells to working order and also planted a large number of fruit trees.⁴⁸ The reply to the letter further confounds the subject. In reply to the query of the Sudder Board of Revenue, J.D.Sandford, the Under Secretary to the Government of the North-Western Provinces replied, that the *bagh* was given to Mauj Prakash who “was sentenced to imprisonment for five years, and whose release has just been ordered by the Government. It is presumed that there is some misapprehension about his death.”⁴⁹ He further states that “if the younger ‘*guru*’ Mauj Prakash is dead, than there is some error in proposing to assess the garden, which was granted not him, but to the elder ‘*guru*’, whose release from imprisonment has just been directed.”⁵⁰ From the memorandum of Leeds, Deputy Collector, for the year 1874, we further learn that one Ganga Pershad had applied to the Assistant Settlement Officer for the entry of his name in the *khiwat* of *chuck haftun, sawad shahar, pergana, sudder tahsil*, district Agra, which had been mortgaged by Deendayal to him. It appears that the land in question was cultivated by Kuufa and Rupa, tenants with occupancy rights since long and in 1874 they were still cultivating it. It is stated that the land was granted to Mauj Prakash in 1860, free from any payment for his life and that until his death in 1861, he continued to enjoy the rent at Rs.23.4.0 payable by the actual cultivators. On the death of Mauj Prakash the holding was resumed and settled with his *chela* (disciple) and heir, Deendayal, at an assessment of Rs.11/, who mortgaged his rights to Ganga Pershad. The question before the settlement officer was: What was the status of Ganga Pershad? Was he the proprietor of the said plot of land, or was he a superior tenant or an assignee of a share of the rent payable by the actual cultivators? It was decreed, that since Ganga Pershad, as mortgagee, was in possession of the interests and rights of Deendayal, hence he should be allowed to have his name, and that of his mortgager, entered in the *khiwat*.⁵¹

The above file added to our woes and left many questions unanswered, viz. why was a second plot given to Mauj Prakash? Did he ask for it, or the Government in its magnanimity gave him another plot? Certainly, he did not return the earlier assignment of land allotted to him in Kiroali, near Fatehpur Sikri, because in 1918, *Mahant* Lal Singh, of *Akhara Panchaiti*, Haridwar, applied in the Court of the Collector of Agra, to procure the

copies of all the correspondence, which took place between Mauj Prakash and the Government, because some third party had laid claims over it. Lal Singh asserted that it was still with the community.⁵² Therefore, it is clear that Mauj Prakash had not returned back the Government its land. We also know that the Government was never magnanimous when a question of revenue was concerned. It was perhaps this reason that Deen Dayal the heir of Mauj Prakash was unable to pay even half the *jama* rate of the assigned revenue and was, therefore, forced to mortgage the land to Ganga Pershad. Perhaps, the most likely reason appears to be the sinister plan of the Government, to drive a wedge between the Sikhs and the Muslims, by deliberately playing the communal card. It is a well known fact, that the British authorities believed, that the Revolt had occurred due to the conspiracy hatched by the muslims to oust them from power in India. The plot of land given to Mauj Prakash was the garden of Sultan Pervez, son of Jahangir, who had died in 1626 and was buried at Agra in his own garden.⁵³ The question that rankles is why was this piece of land given to Mauj Prakash when there was surplus land available with the Government under *nazul* properties?

We also do not know on what pretext the Sikh prisoners were kept in the Agra Central Jail. Perhaps they were prisoners of war. But why they did not take advantage of the uprising to free themselves from the clutches of their oppressors and create further danger for the administration will never be known? Probably, it was due to the influence of Mauj Prakash that they fought on behalf of the British.⁵⁴ Nevertheless, they played a significant part in the two battles fought at Agra.⁵⁵ We are also at a loss to explain as to why Mauj Prakash was given another plot of land, that too a *nazul* plot, when he had already been compensated earlier. Did he apply for it, or, was it deliberately given to him, to rub salt on the wounds of the Muslims of Agra? Then, a further problem in this connection is, why was Mauj Prakash imprisoned? In which year was the order for his imprisonment passed? We may safely presume that the order for imprisonment must have been passed after the allotment of the second piece of land, i.e., sometime after April 1860. Now if the term of his imprisonment was five years, why was he released earlier? It is stated that he died in the year 1861, but the letter from J.D.Sandford cited earlier, dated March 31, 1862 states that Mauj Prakash's release "has just been ordered." If he was dead

in 1861, then whose release was ordered in the year 1862? Who was the other person, by the name of Mauj Prakash Junior? Who installed him and what was the reason behind it? We may once again presume that this must have been done to avoid the embarrassment caused both to the British Government, as well as, to the Sikh community. He was definitely not the successor of Mauj Prakash senior, because we know that before his death, Mauj Prakash had acknowledged Deendayal as his heir. These, and similar other questions baffle our minds, and the answers to these queries may never be found,⁵⁶ but this incident will always be remembered, whenever the incidents pertaining to the revolt of 1857 in the Agra District, which was the erstwhile capital of the North-Western Provinces will be discussed. It is interesting to note that the first *Satsang* of the Radha Soami Sect was held in the *Haveli* of Mauj Prakash Singh in 1862.⁵⁷ In a recent study⁵⁸ it has been mentioned that the Sikh prisoners who got released from the prison at Agra fought on the side of the rebels against the British, but has not cited any reliable authority to corroborate the theory. In the Narrative of Events, the role of the ‘Sikh Gooroo,’ has been especially quoted by A.L.M. Phillips from the Memo of W.Muir, para133, p.19. In the same report, Phillips has mentioned the sending of 100 Sikh *Sowars* to assist the police at Futtehabad and the loss of six Sikh soldiers who died fighting the rebels, besides 28 who were wounded.⁵⁹ The purpose of the paper is not to condemn any individual or community but to make an objective analysis of the events which occurred then and to draw inferences. In **India’s struggle for Independence**, chapter IV, Bipan Chandra has brought out correctly Wedderburn’s assessment of Indian religious leaders who passed secret information to A.O.Hume regarding the impending dangers to the British Empire in India which was one of the reasons for the establishment of the Indian National Congress. Perhaps Mauj Prakash Singh was one such “Guru” who was passing information to the British authorities from the times of the Uprising, alongwith the horde of ‘chelas.’⁶⁰

REFERENCES

- 1 Meerut University History Alumni (special issue), vol. vii, Meerut, 2006, pp.147-156, see article by A.J. Chauhan, *Collaborators of the Raj: A study of the rewards conferred on Indians for rendering meritorious services in the district of Agra, during the revolt of 1857.*
- 2 The Sikh rulers of the cis-sutlej areas were treaty-bound to assist the British in times of crisis.
- 3 Jagdish Chandra; 1857 ki kahaniyaan, Hindi translation of Khwaja Hasan Nizami's; Begammat ke aansoo, by NBT, New Delhi, 2005, p.24.
- 4 Prof. Abdul Haq; Ghadar-1857, Hindi translation of Kotwal Moinuddin Hasan Khan's; Khadanghe Gadar, New Delhi, 1999, see chapter on the Punjab. pp.80-98.
- 5 S.N. Sen; Eighteen Fifty Seven, Delhi, 1957, p.24
- 6 Saul David; The Indian Mutiny 1857, London, 2003, pp., 134-35; 145.
- 7 Sikh Spectrum.com. Quarterly, issue no. 17, August 2004, article by Ganda Singh, entitled, *Truth about the Indian Mutiny of 1857.*
- 8 Sikh Spectrum. Com. quarterly Issue No. 20, May 2005, article by Harbans Singh Noor, entitled, *Sepoy Mutiny of 1857: Punjab and the Sikhs.*
- 9 S.N. R. Rizvi, *The Muslim revivalist Movement in U.P. during the 19th century*, in the U.P.Historical Review, (Edited by S.N.R.Rizvi and S.Z.H.Jafri) vol. I, New series, Gorakhpur, 2004, pp 124-129. Also see in P.C.Joshi. (Ed.); Rebellion 1857, A symposium, K.M.Ashraf's article '*Muslim Revivalists and the Revolt of 1857*', New Delhi, Rp.1986, pp.71-102, for the attitude of the Wahabis against the Sikhs and the declaration of *jihad* against them in 1826. The call of *jihad* again, in 1857, must have reminded the Sikhs of its application against them and must have triggered a reaction which must have been exploited by the British.
- 10 William Darlymple, The Last Mughal, The fall of a Dynasty, Delhi, 1857, New Delhi, 2006, p.207.

- 11 List No. 5, Box No. 257, File no. 29/1858; Regional Archives Office, Agra.
(Hereafter, R.A.O., Agra).
- 12 The eldest son of Guru Nanak started this sect, its headquarters are presently
situated at Kankhal, Haridwar, Uttar Pradesh.
- 13 There is no date on the copy of the petition and from the correspondence
available an inference can be drawn that the petition was sent on February 12,
1858; also see reference 36.
- 14 See copy of the Petition, Box No. 257, op.cit. R.A.O., Agra.
- 15 See Petition, op.cit.
- 16 Ibid.
- 17 Ibid. p.3
- 18 Ibid. p.3.
- 19 Testimonial of H.Watson dated December 27, 1857.
- 20 Testimonial of Brigadier Thomas Polewhele undated.
- 21 Testimonial of S.Harriot dated December 11,1857.
- 22 Testimonial of Captain A.G.Forsyth dated July26, 1857.
- 23 Ibid.
- 24 Testimonial of Lieutenant A.Forbes dated February 12, 1858.
- 25 Testimonial of Captain W.Alexander dated January1, 1858.
- 26 Testimonial of A.Milford dated January 5, 1858.
- 27 Testimonial of E.Wylly dated December 27, 1857.
- 28 Testimonial of Major R.W.Raikes dated December 11, 1857.
- 29 Testimonial of H. Unwin dated December 30, 1857.
- 30 Testimonial of Charles Raikes dated December 30,1857.
- 31 Testimonial of J.P.Walker, dated January 25,1858.
- 32 Testimonial of R.Drummond dated July 10, 1857.
- 33 Testimonial of William Muir dated February 1, 1858.
- 34 The testimonial of E. Whyly is dated March 12, 1858.
- 35 Testimonial of Lt.Col.Glassford dated

- 36 No.4440 of 1858, General Department, North-Western Provinces, dated Agra Fort- February 12, 1858, signed by C.B. Thornhill, Officiating Secretary to the Govt. of the North-Western Provinces.(List 5, R.A.O., Agra, op.cit.)
- 37 No. 157 of 1858, from William Muir, Secretary to the Govt. of the North-Western Provinces, dated Allahabad, April 5 1858 to the Commission of Investigation, (see the same file op.cit.)R.A.O., Agra.
- 38 No. 5 of 1858, From W.H.Dashwood, Secretary to the Commission of Investigation at Agra, dated April 12,1858,(Same file op.cit.) R.A.O., Agra.
- 39 Ibid.
- 40 Copy of the letter of letter No. 139 of 1858, dated May 17,1858 from W.H.Lowe, Secretary Sudder Board of Revenue, North Western Provinces, to G.F.Harvey, Commissioner, Agra Division, (List 5, Box No. 258, file no. 29/1858 op.cit.) R.A. O., Agra.
- 41 No. 135, (undated) from G.F. Harvey, Commissioner, Agra Division to A.L.M.Phillips, Collector of Agra, (List 5, Box No. 258, File No. 29/1858) R.A.O., Agra.
- 42 No. 1138 from F.B.Outram, officiating Secretary, Government of the North Western Provinces to W. H. Lowe, Secretary to the Sudder Board of Revenue, dated Allahabad July6, 1859, (Box No. 258, File No. 29/1858), R.A.O., Agra.
- 43 A.J.Chauhan's, article '*Collaborators of the Raj: A study of the rewards conferred on Indians for rendering meritorious services in the district of Agra during the revolt of 1857,*' op.cit. pp.147-156.
- 44 William Muir Records of the Intelligence Department of the Government of the North Western Provinces during the Mutiny of 1857, vol.1, pp.7-13, cited in S.S.A.Rizvi's, Freedom Struggle in Uttar Pradesh, vol.V, Lucknow, 1960, p.724.
- 45 Letter to the Bombay Times by William Muir, quoted by S.S.A.Rizvi in Freedom Struggle in Uttar Pradesh, vol.V, Lucknow, 1960, p.718.
- 46 List 5, Box No. 262, File No. 1/B of 1862, R.A.O.,Agra.

- 47 No. 172/1862, from G.H.Batten to Sir G.Couper, dated Allahabad March10, 1862. File No 1B/1862 op.cit, R.A.O., Agra.
- 48 No. 366A/1860, File No 1B/1862, op.cit. R.A.O., Agra.
- 49 No.230/1862 from J.Sandford to G.H.M.Batten dated Nainital, March 31, 1862. File No 1B/1862 op.cit. R.A.O., Agra.
- 50 Ibid. para 2.
- 51 Memo of Mr. Leeds Settlement Officer dated December 4, 1874, File No 1B/1862 op.cit. R.A.O. Agra.
- 52 Beni Prasad, History of Jahangir, Allahabad, 1962 V edition, p.393.
- 53 Narrative of Events attending the Outbreak of the disturbances and the restoration of Authority in the Agra District in 1857-1858, No.—of 1858 From A. L. M. Phillips, Magistrate of Agra, to the Commissioner, Agra Division, pp.19-20, U.P.State Archives, Lucknow.
- 54 ibid. p.
- 55 ibid. p.
- 56 The reason for which is that the Sikh Community has not preserved its records at local levels and the Granthi of Gurudwara Maithan has informed his helplessness in the matter.
- 57 A.P.Mathur, present head of the Radha Soami Sect Peepul Mandi Branch Agra, in an interview to a local daily.
- 58 Harpal Singh ‘Arush’ article, *Sikhon par Tohmat Kyon*, in Udhhawna, year 22 No.76-77, Delhi, 2007, pp.214-217.
- 59 Narrative of Events attending the Outbreak of the disturbances and the restoration of Authority in the Agra District in 1857-1858, No.—of 1858 From A. L. M. Phillips, Magistrate of Agra, to the Commissioner, Agra Division, pp.19-20, U.P.State Archives, Lucknow.
- 60 Bipan Chandra, et al, India’s Struggle for Independence, New Delhi,1988, pp.65-66.