

बिहार सरकार

PETITION - UNDATED, FROM MUSAMMAT <sup>(23)</sup> KOOISOOM OF MOHALLA ALAMGANJ,  
IN THE CITY OF PATNA, DETAILING THE ROLE OF HER HUSBAND NAMED  
MUHAMMAD BAQUR (FILE NO. NIL. B. PRDG. 73-74/JULY, 1860, JUDICIAL  
DEPARTMENT, JUDICIAL BRANCH, GOVERNMENT OF BENGAL.

To

The Honorable J. P. Grant  
Lieutenant Governor of Bengal -  
Fort William

The humble petition of Mussamant  
Koolsoom inhabitant of Mahulla -  
Alungunge in the City of Patna wife  
of Mahomed Bakur a prisoner.

Respectfully sheweth,

That your petitioner's husband Maho-  
med Bakur was tried by Mr. William Tayler late Com-  
missioner of the Patna Division under Act 14 of 1857 on  
an alleged charge of coming to Patna with arms to aid and abet  
the enemies of the State and sentenced to imprisonment for  
fourteen years with labor in irons, and has since been trans-  
ported beyond seas to some port or Country, of which your  
petitioner has no knowledge whatever.

2<sup>d</sup> Before his transportation, your petitioner's  
husband appealed for a remission of the sentence to the  
Supreme Government, and upon the petition being transfer-  
red to the Bengal Government, the late Lieutenant Governor  
of Bengal under orders dated the 7<sup>th</sup> December 1857 de-  
clined to interfere in his case.

3<sup>d</sup> Your petitioner has since learnt, that the  
records of most of the trials held by Mr. Tayler during the  
disturbances that prevailed in Behar, were made over by order  
of Government for revision to the Sudder Court, and that  
the said Court, failing to see any guilt in the prisoners in  
such trials, they have been released. Your petitioner is not

aware

12  
3

aware why the Record of the trial of her husband was not likewise referred among the rest, to the Sudder Court, and it is with the view to obtain such a revision by a high and respected Tribunal, that your petitioner has ventured to trespass on your Honor, with the following brief particulars of the Case.

4<sup>th</sup> Your Honor will observe, that the Charge against your petitioner's husband was, that "of Coming to Patna with arms to aid and abet the enemies of the State." But the record of the Case it will be perceived, nowhere shows his presence in Patna on the eventful night of the 3<sup>d</sup> July 1857, when, on a momentary rising in the City, the late Dr. Lyall lost his life. Your petitioner's husband was on that night, or before it, neither at Patna, nor at Barr, where Mr. Vincent then Deputy Magistrate of that place, initiated these proceedings against him.

5<sup>th</sup> The record of the Case being quite decisive on the point of the absence of your petitioner's husband from the scene of the crime, the charge against him must certainly fall to the ground. But should the charge imply, that he was on his way to Patna with a treasonable intent, and arms in his possession, the absurdity of the charge is still more manifest; inasmuch as since the record exhibits no complicity between your petitioner's husband and the leaders of the crime, nor any correspondence, or even relationship or connection with them, your petitioner submits, it is arbitrary in the extreme, to assume, that a man found on the River upwards of 30 miles below Patna "was coming to Patna with arms to aid and abet the enemies of the State."

6<sup>th</sup> The particulars connected with your petitioner's husband

12  
5

husband being found on the River at Barr are these. He was a trader in hides and Country produce, and godowns and store houses at Bhagulpore, Colgong, Loringpura, Salempore, Barr, and other places, where for the prosecution of his business he resided for the greater part of the year visiting his house for a few days only once in six or eight months.

7<sup>th</sup> That while residing at Bhagulpore your petitioner's husband received intelligence of the decease of his daughter, and sister-in-law, and set out on a visit of Condolence for his house at Alumgunge in Patna on the 26<sup>th</sup> June 1857 in a boat, intending, as he passed the several intervement-places to look for one Bahadour Ally a servant of his, who had a short time previously, absconded with Rs. 545 belonging to him.

8<sup>th</sup> That when setting out on his journey at Bhagulpore, your petitioner's husband's Gomashtha gave him for the purpose of being repaired 5 Old swords, 4 Guns and 3 gun barrels; the locks of 5 of these guns to prevent their being lost, were deposited in his Chest.

9 That your petitioner's husband arrived at Maroofgunge a place distant about a couple of miles from Alumgunge on the 5<sup>th</sup> July 1857, and from the Crew of the boats moored there, he heard, that a disturbance had taken place in Patna on the 3<sup>d</sup> idem; that several persons were apprehended; that more, especially Mahomedans, were being apprehended on suspicion; and that persons found with arms were incarcerated and their arms forfeited.

10<sup>th</sup> That your petitioner's husband naturally feeling alarmed for his own safety in consequence of the rusty and unseviceable arms in his possession, they were in compliance with the unanimous determination of the crew of the

the

12  
7

the boat, and his companions, tied into a bundle, for the purpose of being thrown overboard, should their progress be arrested, and their personal safety placed in any jeopardy in consequence of them. The river being too rough at the time for a boat to go coasting up to Patna, your petitioner's husband despatched his brother Shere Khan whom he had picked up at Soorajpura, and his servant Hoormut, to his house at Alumgunge, and himself went across the river as the safest means of reaching Alumgunge ghant.-

11<sup>th</sup>. That when your petitioner's husband was across the river, his servant Hoormut returned to him in a dinghee, confirming the rumours he had heard at Marowgunge, and suggesting the expediency of his returning to Bhagulpore. He accordingly turned his boat, and wended his way to his stone house at Baird intending to await there the receipt of further intelligence, and to proceed to Patna when it would be safer for him to do so. The boat accordingly drifted down the same evening the 5<sup>th</sup> July 1857, on the morning of the 6<sup>th</sup> idem a little before dawn, it was opposite the Cutcherry house of the Deputy Magistrate of Baird. It was here stopped by the peons on guard at the Cutcherry, and the crew of the boat finding that their worst apprehensions were realized, threw the bundle of arms overboard. Your petitioner's husband who was till then asleep, now awoke, and together with his companions, was taken into custody.-

12 That on the boat being searched, the five gunlocks which had been deposited in your petitioner's husband's chest were discovered, and enquiries being made, it was ascertained that the arms were, in consequence of an unfounded alarm, thrown into the river.-

13<sup>th</sup> Your petitioner's husband and his servant were here examined by Mr. Vincent then Deputy Magistrate of Barr, and committed to the Commission of Patna, with a letter dated 9<sup>th</sup> July 1857 which for facility of reference your petitioner has copied below.

" On Monday the 6<sup>th</sup> current at about 3 A. M.  
 " a small boat was seen by my river patrol hasten-  
 " ing down stream, it being very unusual for native  
 " boats to proceed by night, its progress was arrested,  
 " and the Circumstances reported to me in the  
 " following morning. The passengers (the two men  
 " above alluded to by me) gave a plausible reason  
 " for thus travelling by night and with such unwonted  
 " haste, that something in their manner and appearance  
 " raised my suspicion and by closely questioning the  
 " boatmen, ascertained that these two men had left  
 " Patna the previous evening Sunday the 5<sup>th</sup> and by  
 " travelling all night had made considerable progress,  
 " that on being stopped by my river patrol they had  
 " thrown seven Guns and five Shulwars over board. This  
 " the two Mahomedans eventually admitted declaring  
 " however that they had come from Bhagalpore and had  
 " not even landed at Patna on hearing that a disturbance  
 " had occurred at that Station and that the Native  
 " Community had been called upon by the Authorities to  
 " give up their guns and swords. —

" I had the statements of the Boatmen  
 " three in number, and the defence of the two Maho-  
 " medans carefully recorded and the papers of the  
 " Case (which I now forward) prove that the

defendants

11

"defendants left Bhagulpore about the 25<sup>th</sup> or 26<sup>th</sup>  
"ultimo for Patna with a cargo of Guns and Swords, that  
"owing to Contrary winds the boat did not reach Patna  
"till the 5<sup>th</sup> instant although in the ordinary Course  
"of river travelling they should have reached that Station  
"on the 1<sup>st</sup> or 2<sup>d</sup> of this month or even earlier. This I  
"think clearly shews, that Defendants were hurrying up  
"with Guns and Swords to join in the Mahomedan outbreak  
"that took place at Patna on the 3<sup>d</sup> Instant. The  
"appearance of Mahomed Bakur Khan confirms this  
"supposition. He being a stout Lucknow Mahomedan  
"and I cannot help thinking was actively engaged in  
"the disturbance of the 3<sup>d</sup>, but as the papers of this  
"Case do not prove that, we must confine ourselves to  
"what is on record, I would mention that Mahomed  
"Bakur Khan is a son-in-law of Jorawar Khan of  
(बिहार र) Patna with whom you are no doubt acquainted. —

14<sup>th</sup>. Upon this representation of the Deputy  
Magistrate, Mr. Taylor the Commissioner took up the  
Case on the 6<sup>th</sup> August 1857, and being of opinion that  
your petitioner's husband was guilty of the Crime "of  
"Coming to Patna with arms to aid and abet the enemies  
of the State", sentenced him to imprisonment with labor  
and irons for 14 years. —

15<sup>th</sup>. The Deputy Magistrate it will be observed  
by your Honor, argues from the discovery of the old  
and unfit guns and swords so fully described in  
paragraph 8 of this petition, that your petitioner's  
husband was carrying "a Cargo of guns and Swords"  
to Patna to aid in the outbreak. But upon merely glancing  
at the evidence, your Honor will perceive, that he never

entertained

entertained any such intention, nor had any such Cargo on board.

16<sup>th</sup> Some stress likewise appears to have been laid at the trial, upon the alleged fact of your petitioner's husband having first refused to give up, and subsequently having given up the key of his lock, and of his having made an offer of 100/ to Bhugwan Jewary the jamadar, not to open his lock, but to convey it to his store house at Barr. The depositions of the three burkundazes examined at the trial are your Honor will perceive conflicting on the first point. Furthermore it will appear from the report of the Darogha of Barr who was deputed to search the boat, that the lock in question was broken open by a Carpenter; hence all that has been said about the refusal and subsequent surrender of the key must be a fiction, for what necessity could there have been to break open the lock, if the key were surrendered. — As to the second point (विद्यमान) the least your petitioner need say of it, is, that it is too preposterous to be believed for a moment. It is highly improbable, that in the presence of three police Officers of his goods, your petitioner's husband would have had the temerity to offer a fourth one their superior Officer, a bribe in their presence. Your petitioner further begs permission to add, that Bhugwan Jewary was not examined at the trial, and her husband has not had the opportunity of cross-examining on this point, and eliciting the truth from him.

17 Your petitioner will not trouble your Honor with any repetition of the argument adopted by the Deputy Magistrate from the personal appearance of her husband. To argue that being "a stout Lucknow man" he "was actively engaged in the disturbance" when it is also

admitted

admitted " the papers of this case do not prove that, is to say the least, a mode of reasoning hitherto unknown in the annals of Criminal jurisprudence. -

18<sup>th</sup>

Under these Circumstances, your petitioner humbly prays, your Honor will be graciously pleased to direct, that the record of the trial of her husband be also laid before the Court of Nizamut Adawlut to the end that an opinion as to his guilt or innocence, may be recorded by that Tribunal. -

And your petitioner as in duty bound will ever pray. -

बिहार सरकार

मंत्रिमंडल सचिवालय विभाग

(बिहार राज्य अभिलेखागार निदेशालय)

JP 11 March / 50 - 54/8

Repts. 521  
17

Petitioner of Mufsumat  
Koolsoan, wife of Mooko-  
med Bakim a prisoner

Patna

12<sup>th</sup> Jan 50

Keep with 2.8.  
Pro 19 January

Prisoner

बिहार

States that her husband  
was tried by Mr. Taylor  
late Commr. under Act  
14 of 1857 on an alleged  
charge of coming to Patna  
with arms to aid the  
enemies of the State, and  
sentenced to 14 years  
imprisonment in trans-  
portation. Prays that  
the record of the trial of

मंत्रिमंडल सचिव  
(बिहार राज्य अधिलक्षक)