

A Crusade against the Just Rights of the Hindus in the Hyderabad State.

(An open letter to the Viceroy of India).

To,

**His Excellency the Viceroy & Governor--
General of India.**

The Right Honourable Viscount Willingdon P. C. G. M. S. I., G. M. I. E. C. P. E.

Your Lordship,

I the undersigned humbly beg to submit the following account for your favourable consideration.

Hindu population in the Nizam's territory has been subjected to untold disabilities for several years in religious matters. They are hardly given permission to erect new temples. Applications for the repairs of old temples remain unanswered for years together. No new Dharmashalas are to be built by the Hindus exclusively for the use of the Hindus unless a portion of them is reserved for the Mahomedans. State funds are made available in sacred places for poor Mahomedans while not a single pie is spent on the poor Hindus. The holding of age-old festivals and processions has been made impossible by the State authorities who systematically use their power against the Hindu community. I therefore reproduce here a case throwing a flood of light upon the oppressive policy pursued by H. E. H. Nizam's Government, as follows:--

Paithan is well known as having the Samadhi (tomb) of a great devotee of God known as Eknath Maharaj. Every year on the 6th day of Phalgun Vadya of the Hindu year (the sixth day after the full-moon) Dindi procession is taken out by the Hindu public of that place in commemoration of the anniversary of the Maharaj. As the procession is taken out in honour of the Maharaj, naturally out of respect towards his descendants the Dindi procession is taken from the Nath Mandir and it is well-known by the name of ' Eknath Dindi. '

Nearly 60 years ago i. e. in 1285 Hijri corresponding to 1868 A. D. or thereabout, the Mohammadan inhabitants of this place, on the occasion of the said public Dindi, for the first time, raised the question of stopping Baja music before the mosque.

In fact as it is essential according to the religious rules that processions in honour of deities, mahatmas and kings of cherished memory should be taken out on fixed dates, in the same way it is also essential to take out such processions by the public road in order that every member of the public may have the benefit of puja and darshan. Leading the procession by unfrequented roads or through lanes or stopping the Baja music in the course of the processions would, from a religious point of view, amount to an insult to the presiding deity, mahatma or the person in whose honour the procession is led.

Processions and Music.

In view of this time-honoured religious custom of the Hindus, the question of the stoppage of Baja music in connection with the procession became an important public question affecting the religious rights of the Hindus, and therefore Government as being responsible for deciding this question without hurting the religious feelings of the Hindus decided, with a view to enable the Hindus to take their processions without stopping Baja music on the way, to lay out at Government expense a new road for this purpose. This decision was arrived at with the consent of both the Hindu and Mohammadan inhabitants of the place. As it was necessary for this purpose to avoid the public road having mosques on its sides, this new road was laid through the Hindu locality of the place. There is not a single mosque on this newly laid-out procession road. There is, however, a

mosque situated adjacent to the first house situated at the point where a small path shoots in a different direction from the southern portion of the junction of the four roads which one has to cross while turning from the north to the west on this new road. This mosque is known as "Kordikas". After this where this new road takes a turn from the west to the north there is situated a house on the bank of the river situated to the west of junction of the four roads and then there is a lane adjacent to that house and beyond that there is a mosque known as 'Nowshidi'. It will thus be seen that as these two mosques are situated on a detached portion of the locality at a distance of 39 and 59 feet respectively from this new road, there was no cause for the Mohammadans on the basis of the rules relating to the stoppage of the Baja music, to raise any objection against leading procession with Baja Music on this road. In spite of this, Government with a view to avoid any disputes in future owing to changed circumstances drew up a map (flag-2) of the road newly constructed for this purpose (dated 1878 A.D.) showing the location of these two mosques and obtained the signatures of the leading representatives of the Hindu and Mohammadan inhabitants of the place. At the same time an agreement (flag 1) was taken from the Mohammadans (dated 1295 Hijri corresponding to 1878 A.D.) to the effect that there is no mosque on the newly constructed road and that no new mosque will be constructed in future. Both the map and the agreement have been recorded in Government offices as proof. In order to give effect to the above mentioned settlement; Government issued an order No. 389 & Date 15th Rabil-ul-Awal 1295 Hijari that no new mosque should be constructed on this new road, and this order was duly executed on the Mohammadan inhabitants through the Tehsildar.

Suspicious Arise.

After this all processions of the Hindus began to be led by this new road with Baja music in accordance with the above mentioned agreement. But this practice had not been in vogue for about 20 years when the Mohammadan inhabitants of this place began to look upon this legitimate right of the Hindus of taking processions with Baja music with feelings of jealousy and with a view to deprive them of this right the Mohammadan inhabitants of the place managed (in 1307 F. corresponding to 1897 A.D.) with the connivance of Government authorities and contrary to the agreement referred to above and the orders of Government mentioned above to construct a new mosque on this new road and that very year they raised the question of stoppage of music before that mosque on the occasion of the Dindi procession of Eknath Maharaj; and they obtained from Rani Laxmi Bai the then successor of Eknath Maharaj a private agreement (in 1308 Fasli corresponding to 1898 A. D.) to the effect that the Dindi procession of the Maharaj would be taken out from a distance from the newly constructed mosque. As this question of the stoppage of music was raised a second time on the occasion of Dindi procession only, it naturally gives rise to the suspicion as to whether no other processions were being led at the time or that if any processions were led, the same were not led by this road. But in taking this step the real object of the Mohammadans was to have the Dindi procession of the Nath Maharaj which was the cause of a right having been conferred upon the Hindu public through an agreement entered into between the Hindus and Mohammadans, regarded not as a public institution but as a personal institution of the Samasthan. At the same time their other object was to have the agreement taken from Rani Laxmi Bai in her individual capacity treated as a public agreement and thereby to have the Baja music accompanying other public processions stopped before the new mosque constructed on the new road; even if it were not possible to stop the Baja music accompanying the Dindi procession of the Nath Maharaj.

Subbedar's Policy of Suppression.

When the Hindu public came to know of this intention on the part of the officers of Government, they submitted a memorial to the then Madar-ul-Maham (Prime Minister). After enquiry into the case the Prime Minister passed decision in 1310 Fasli that the public agreement entered into in 1295 Hijri (1878 A.D.) was the correct one and that the new mosque was constructed contrary to the said agreement and that therefore Baja music should not be stopped in future before the mosque. But the then Subedar suppressed this order of the Prime Minister

and issued orders on his own authority for the stoppage of Baja music before the new mosque on the basis of the new agreement taken illegally from the Rani Sahiba. The Hindu inhabitants of Paithan again submitted a memorial on the subject to the Prime Minister on which the Prime Minister was again pleased to pass a final order in 1314 Fasli corresponding to 1904 A. D. to the effect that the Subedar had no power to take a new agreement from the Rani Sahiba contrary to the previous agreement of the public dated 1878 corresponding to 1295 Hijri and that therefore the previous agreement executed by the public and the orders of Government should be carried out. The second order of the Prime Minister was also suppressed by the Subedar in furtherance of his secret object and he again passed orders for Baja music being stopped before the new mosque in accordance with the new agreement taken from the Rani Sahiba which was contrary to law. And this illegal order of the Subedar is still in force. As the practice of stopping Baja music before the new mosque in accordance with the agreement taken from the Rani Sahiba continued to be in force for about 30 years, the Government authorities having found that their strategem adopted 30 years ago *i. e.* 1308 Fasli for treating the public agreement of 1295 Hijri corresponding to 1878 A. D. as null and void was successful, they went a step further by prohibiting in 1338 Fasli (1929 A. D.) Baja music accompanying Ganapati procession while passing on the new road at places where the two mosques referred to in the original public agreement were situated in lanes on the side of the said road, which was quite in contravention of the public agreement executed in 1295 Hijri. How they did this is detailed below.

Police Tactics.

For the first time in 1336 Fasli the local police authorities put obstacles in the way of the Ganpati procession on the grounds of its being an innovation. On that occasion *i. e.* 2nd September 1927, the Circle Inspector of Police Aurangabad held an enquiry in obedience to orders passed by the Deputy Director of Police on a petition submitted to him. The said officer managed to have the Ganpati procession taken on the fixed road in accordance with past practice along with Baja music. In 1337 Fasli however the Assistant Superintendent of Police prohibited Ganpati procession on the ground that the Taluqdar's permission should be obtained for the same. The Taluqdar, however, on being petitioned passed orders for the procession being duly taken under police management and it was done accordingly.

The Government of his Exalted Highness the Nizam have all along declared that equal treatment to all communities shall be their determined policy and it was professedly with a view to securing this privilege to their subjects that the said Government on the 1st Thir 1338 Fasli (6th May 1929) issued new rules for the guidance of religious festivals. Rule 1 requires that any one who wants to take out a religious procession shall make an application in that behalf to the Tahsildar concerned at least fifteen days prior to the date of the procession and rule 4 lays down that on receipt of this application the Tahsildar shall cause it to be proclaimed by beat of drum or otherwise that any member of the public who has any objection to the proposed procession shall state it in writing in his office within one week and that upon the expiry of that period no objection whatever shall be heard. Rule 5 lays down that if the Tahsildar is satisfied, after recording evidence or otherwise, that the proposed procession is not new he shall grant sanction therefor and that there-after his only duty is to give due notice to the Police so that they may be able to make proper arrangements for the carrying of the procession.

In accordance with these new rules the Secretary of the Vidyarthi Sangh applied on the 7 Meher 1338 Phasali (13th August 1929) to the Tahsildar for the necessary permission, to take out the procession on the 12th Aban 1338 Phasali (17th Sept. 1929). This application was made nearly five weeks before hand and the Tahsildar duly accorded his sanction on the 20th of Meher 1338 Fasli (26th August 1929).

On the 22-11-38 Fasli S. I. Police who had no authority according to the above mentioned Rule 5 asked the organiser of the Ganpati festival by his Office

letter No. 1370-71 dated 22nd Meher 1338 File No. 100 of 1338, certain particulars as to the time when the procession would start and the several routes through which it would pass. Next day, the queries were answered to the effect that the Ganpati procession would pass by the same route by which the palanquin of the Nath Maharaj passes. On that route there is no mosque and the procession passed by the same route every year.

Processions Prohibited.

Between this date and the date of actual procession no objection was raised by the police also. But on the 12th of Aban 1338 when the Ganpati procession had actually proceeded five hundred feet from its starting place, another order signed by the Tehsildar, Munsiff, Head Master of the local Middle School, the Sub-Inspector of Police and the Police Pairokar was served on the organisers of the Ganpati procession to the effect that as there were two mosques Kordikas and Nowshdhi on the road on which the procession was to pass, Baja music should be stopped at a distance of 40 ft. on each side. In fact at the time of laying out this new road it was conclusively decided that the two mosques in question were outside the pale of the rules relating to the stoppage of music before mosques and Government with a view to avoid disputes in future had pointed out the two mosques on the map, and in the agreement executed between the Hindus and the Mohammadans, it was clearly laid down that these two mosques were not situated on the road. In the circumstances, the order issued by the above mentioned officers in supercession of the previous order duly obtained from competent authority was unjust in every way. Therefore the organisers of the procession did not like to obey such an unjust order and they placed the idol of Ganpati on the way where the procession had been asked to stop the music and the procession was dispersed. From that date to this day all kinds of processions excepting the Dindi procession have been stopped by this order. When the long-standing practice of taking processions with Baja music on the new road for the past 60 years as decided by Government was thus put a stop to by the above mentioned officers, the organisers of the procession and the Hindu inhabitants went to Aurangabad to make a representation to the Taluqdar as the head of the Ecclesiastical Department of the district.

Note No. 1—In the first place the above mentioned officer had no power to pass an order of this kind in supercession of the order originally passed by the Tehsildar in his capacity as the head of the Ecclesiastical Department.

Note No. 2—If any breach of peace had been apprehended the Local Magistrate could have passed any order for the prevention of the same either on the basis of the report of the Police or on an application received from any section of the inhabitants of the place. In no case however the Tehsildar either himself or in consultation and with the signatures of unauthorised local officers could have passed another order in supercession of the previous one.

Note No. 3—The local police authorities and especially the police Pairokar who had signed the order knew full well that the procession was being taken on the same road on which it had been taken on the previous occasion and he himself had attended the procession in the previous year i. e. 1337 F., as the Sub-Inspector in charge, when baja music was not stopped at any place on the said road.

Subhedar's Mis-representation.

On 13-12-1338 F., the Taluqdar Mr. Viqar-ud-Din Ahmad and the Subedar Nawab Raza Nawaz Jung Bahadur Commissioner of the Division came to Pattan and visited the site in question and Subedar advised the processionists orally either to stop music at least before one of the mosques or to take the procession by the Dindi road situated outside the town. As this advise was contrary to the decision of the Government passed sixty years ago by the consent of both the Mohammadans and Hindus, the processionists declined to follow the advise. Thereupon the Taluqdar and the Subedar went back to Aurangabad.

But the Subedar appears to have misrepresented the facts to the Hon'ble the Executive Council on the basis whereof the Hon'ble the Executive Council passed orders that the procession should be taken by the route suggested by the Subedar, i. e. by the Dindi Road. (As shown in the Map flag No. 2.)

Appeal to the Executive Council.

Aggrieved by this order, the President of the Vidyarthi Sangh filed an appeal before the Hon'ble the Executive Council on 30th December 1929, in which it was pointed out that a special road for Hindu processions was constructed by Govt. at its own cost nearly sixty years ago in pursuance of an agreement between the Hindus and Mohamadans and that a map of the same was on record in the Secretariat. No action was taken on this appeal for about six months in the course of which the Vidyarthi Sangh went on sending reminders, very often by telegrams also. Finally the Vidyarthi Sangh sent a telegram to

Explanation of Dindi Road.

§ There are two Ekanth Temples at Paithan, namely Eknath Samadhi (tomb) and Eknath Mandir (temple) The Mandir is situated at the northern extremity of the town. The Samadhi is situated to the North of the Mandir, outside the town on an open Maidan at the bank of the Godavari. All the Warkaris (pilgrims) visiting Paithan for Wari i. e. monthly visit, ~~every month~~, and even at the Shashti fair stay at Samadhi. It is conventional with them to go to the Mandir for Darshan in Processions (Didi) performing Bhajan. At this entrance to the town there is also a mosque and in order to avoid it a special road from the Samadhi to the Mandir was built by Govt. for that purpose only, and so it is called The Dindi Road. People in the town never use it for their processions as it is laid by the outside of the town. The Ganapati procession is to be taken out by the Palanquin Road which is laid straight to the South to West throughout the town from its Uchav Place (as shown in the Map flag 2.)

of 1340 F. The President of the Sangh approached the Secretary of the Executive Council in person and they were informed that the Nazim and Secretary, Ecclesiastical Department (Nawab Akhtar Yar Jung Bahadur) had been ordered to proceed to Pattan and decide the case in consultation with the Subedar. The Nazim and Secretary, Ecclesiastical Department, the Subedar and the Police Superintendent came to Pattan on the day on which the Ganapati festival commenced. They sent for the leading men of the place and the President of the Vidyarthi Sangh, and the Subedar only asked them whether they would accept the route suggested by the commission. (i. e. Marked in Map the as proposed road by commission flag No. 2.) They declined to do so, as it was contrary to previous practice and decision.

No final orders were issued till the Ganapati festival was over. No procession was therefore led during that year also i. e. 1340 F. The President, Vidyarthi Sangh thereupon sent a telegram to H. E. H. the Nizam, the Hon'ble the President of the Executive Council and the Hon'ble the Police Member and the Nazim, Ecclesiastical Department requesting that justice might be done within three days failing which the Vidyarthi Sangh was resolved to sit at the doors of Government till the decision was given.

As no decision was received within the specified time, the President came to Hyderabad with some members of the Sangh to sit at the doors of the Council. But the Home Secretary issued in the name of the President of the Sangh, letter No. 13, dated 7th Azur 1341 Fasli, in which it was stated that the Executive Council decided on 22-12-40 F. that there was no necessity to amend the previous resolution dated 4-3-1339 F., in which it was decided that procession should be taken by the route suggested by Subedar.

Request to H. E. H. The Nizam.

As the above decision had been passed by the Executive Council on the basis of misrepresentation of facts by the Commission as well as the Subedar in spite

of the President of the Vidyarthi Sangh having pointed out in the appeal that a special road for Hindu procession was constructed by Government nearly sixty years ago etc., the President of the Vidyarthi Sangh had no other go but to approach his Sovereign with a prayer to grant him **brith right** as no third appeal or review lay in the case before the Executive Council under the law. The President accordingly submitted a memorial to His Exalted Highness on 24th October 1931. As the President did not come to know for about 15 days of the memorial, he sent a telegram to H. E. H. the Nizam intimating that he would observe Satyagraha at the palace till he got justice. The Commissioner of city Police then sent for the President on the very day and told him that H.E.H. the Nizam did not like that there should be any observance of Satyagraha at the gates of his palace that he would consider the case and that therefore the President of the Vidyarthi Sangh should wait for a week or so. As the President of the sangh did not come to know anything about the result of the case at the end of the week, he sent a telegram to the then Police Member (Hon'ble Mr. T. J. Tasker) informing him that he had not received any intimation about the case as the commissioner of city Police had orally said that an intimation would be given, the President would again be compelled to adopt Satyagrah and observe the same at the gates of the King Kothi. On the very day the Commissioner of City Police served the President of the Sangh with a notice to the effect that if he were to observe Satyagraha he would be arrested. On the next day the President of the Sangh made it clear through the Press that the Satyagraha which he intended to observe was only meant for the purpose of obtaining justice in his case and not as an act of Civil Disobedience and that if in spite of this Government intended to arrest him he would be compelled to adopt Satyagraha by way of Civil disobedience.

Question of Prestige .

After this the Home Secretary sent a letter No. 455 dated 26th Dai 1341 F. to the President of the Sangh intimating him that if he had to make a representation against the decision of the Executive Council, he should do so in the proper way by setting forth his reasons for the same. In reply thereto the President of the Sangh wrote to say that as a regular appeal filed before the Executive Council previously did not meet with success, he had to submit a representation to H. E. H. the Nizam for justice. After this the President of the Sangh received a letter from the Deputy Secretary on 11th Bahaman 1341 F. in which the President was asked to see him in his office at any time between 10 and 4. The President did so. In the course of conversation, the Deputy Secretary, among other things asked the President why he was unwilling to make a representation on the subject to the President of the Council. The President of the Sangh replied that as he had already submitted a representation to H. E. H. the Nizam, he did not now think it worth while to approach a subordinate authority. Subsequently the Hon'ble the officiating Police Member asked Mr. M. Hanmant Rao Vakil Andhra leader, to advise the President of the Sangh to submit a review petition and to inform him that Government was prepared to hear it as an intizami, (Administration) case and do justice. On the next day the Commissioner of City Police sent for the President of the Sangh and took him to the Hon'ble the Police Member. In the course of interview the Hon'ble the Police Member (Mr. T. J. Tasker) asked the President of the Sangh why he had declined to submit a petition to the Home Secretary. The President replied that as he was asked to submit a regular review petition which did not lie in law as the Council has already decided the case on two occasions he declined to submit another petition for review. The Hon'ble Mr. Tasker was then pleased to say that as this was an intizami case, he could file a review petition and that it would be duly considered. In the course of the interview the Hon'ble Mr. Tasker also asked the President of the Sangh whether he really wanted justice or propoganda. On the President's replying to him that he wanted justice and not propeganda, Mr. Tasker asked him why he had then printed the memorial instead of submitting it in type. The president replied that as the memorial was being submitted to the Ruling Sovereign of the State, it would be in conformity with decency to submit it in print instead of in type.

But as the Police member did not like to enquire into the case on the basis of the memorial submitted by us to H. H. the Nizam he insisted upon our submit-

ting a petition addressed to the Executive Council. However, as the President really wanted justice and not propoganda, he consented to submit a regular review petition through the proper channel as desired by the Hon'ble the Police Member. He accordingly submitted a regular review petition on 17th Bahman 1341 Fasali. A month after the said petition was filed the Home Secretary asked the President of the Sangha some questions about the case and all the questions were replied to and copies of the necessary data were duly furnished which were obtained from the Home Secretary Office.

Two important documents.

In this connection the two important documents are the map and the agreement executed by the Mahomedan inhabitants. Although these two documents were available in the Office, the Home Secretary at first declined to give copies of the same on grounds of their not being available in the Office. When this fact was brought to the notice of Mr. Tasker the then Police Member, the very next day the Home Secretary wrote to say that the said documents were traced. At the same time Mr. Hydari, the Finance Member Executive Council sent for us and after hearing the facts of the case was pleased to tell us "you have a right to say so". He was also pleased to assure us that the case would be duly considered when it came before the Council.

The most important question that was asked was that the record pertains to the Dindi Procession of the Sansthan and not of the public. With regard to this I submitted that the word Dindi means nothing but a procession with music and it is a general word. When Dindi is a religious procession public join performing Bhajan and the procession is accompanied by the palanquin of a Deity also. In view of the special religious characteristics connected with the procession or local circumstances, the procession or Dindi is taken out under the patronage of some religious leader and it is customary to call the Dindi by the name of the patron. The Dindi at Paithan is taken out on the occasion of Shasthi Utsava accompanied by a palanquin and all the classes of Hindu community join in it. As Eknath Maharaj was a famous Sadhu of this place, this Dindi in view of religious characteristics of the same is taken out under the patronage of his descendents. This Dindi is therefore known by the name of Nath Sansthan Dindi. It cannot therefore be right merely for this reason to say that the Dindi belongs to the Sansthan and the Hindu public in general have no connection with it. If the dispute did not involve a question of public right and if it were one relating merely to the Dindi Procession of Eknath Sansthan there was no necessity for Government to construct the road at Govt. cost and to obtain the consent of the Hindus in general. In that case the Eknath Sansthan would have been parties in the case and the responsibility of the costs would have been laid on them to some extent. From this it will be clear that it was a mere matter of chance that this dispute arose between Hindus and Mahomedans at the time of the Dindi procession of Eknath Maharaj.

Attitude of the Home Secretary.

Finally the Hon'ble the permanent Police Member (Lt. Col. sir R.H. Chenvix Trench) sent for the President and got all his doubts cleared. Subsequently the President of the Sangh submitted application to the Hon'ble the Police Member asking for the result of the case. In reply to his application dated 14th July 1932 he received from the Home Secretary faimaishnama No. 2643 dated 18th Shehrewar 1341 Fasli in which he was informed that the case was under consideration and that orders would be issued in due course. On 30th August 1932 when the President of the Sangh went to the Home Secretary and enquired of him about the case, the Home Secretary told him that the Council had decided that the procession should be allowed to be led by the new road proposed by the Departmental Commission and that the Subedar was addressed with a view to have the said road repaired for the purpose. On the President's asking for a copy of the decision, he was told that no copy could be granted without the permission of the Police Member. The President of the Sangh accordingly applied by telegram on the same day to the Police Member for a copy. As no reply was forthcoming and as the Ganpati festival had commenced in the meantime, the President of the Sangh sent a telegram to H. E. H. on 5th September 1932, stating

the facts and praying that commands might be issued permitting procession by the road which was in use for more than half a century so that justice might be done to the loyal Hindu subjects of Paithan. It was also stated in the telegram that a detailed memorial would be submitted subsequently. Two days after this when no reply was still received from the Hon'ble the Police Member, the President of the Sangh as he suspected that the Council were actuated by considerations of prestige and the matter would not be decided early, submitted a detailed memorial to H. E. H. the Nizam on 7th September 1932. As the last procession day was fast approaching, the President of the Sangh sent another telegram to H. E. H. the Nizam on 12th September 1932, the day previous to the procession, inviting the attention to telegram of the 5th September and memorial dated the 7th September and praying that as it was the fourth procession which was being disallowed contrary to 60 years practice commands might be issued allowing the procession to proceed by the usual road. On the same day the President of the Sangh received from the Home Secretariat Faimaishnama No.4073 stating, the case is still pending.

An Internment Order.

After this instead of receiving the decision of the Council, the President of the Sangh was served with an order of internment given by the Executive Council through the Commissiour of City Police. The President was accordingly handed over to the Deputy Director General of Police, who took him to Tuljapur. In this place the President of the Sangh had to suffer all privations, Government having not made any suitable arrangment for his boarding and lodging. Unable to put up with such troubles the President of the Sangha submitted an application to the Executive Council through the District Superintendent of Police Osmanabad. for permission to leave Tuljapur for British India, which was immediately granted. The President is since then living in Poona without any means and had applied to the Government for subsistence allowance which it is their duty to allow him under the internment order and which they have refused him point blank. Repeated requests and telegrams for a speedy decision of the case, having failed, the President went to Secunderabad on the 20th August 1933, and wired for an interview to the President of the Executive Council as well as the Hon. the Resident in the matter. The interview was not granted by the Nizam's Government. On the other hand the Resident served the President of the Sangh, with an order to the effect that he should not enter the British Administered Area without his Secretary's permission. Even before this a petition was submitted to the Honourable Resident to advise the State Government for justice in this matter of vital importance to the Hindu Community.

Request to the Viceroy.

The Hon'ble Resident was pleased to communicate that the matter was such in which he could not reasonably interfere. (Letter N. 644 of 1932). In this way the Honourable the Resident also supported the State Government in its attitude of injustice towards the loyal Hindu subjects of Paithan (Dist. Aurangabad).

The Hindus are groaning under the tyranny in this manner. It is only the Govt. of India that can better their lot. But they remain imperturbed in spite of the appeals made from time to time, under the pretext of the policy of non-intervention. Government of India however have of late exercised their paramount authority to set matters right so far as political affairs were concerned. Since the religious affairs are as important as political affairs it is the primary duty of the Government of India to use their special power for the protection of religious rights of the Hindus in the state Territory. The Ganapati procession of Paithan is one of the grievances agitating the minds of Hindu subjects of Nizam's dominions for several years. This year's Ganapati festival has just begun; therefore I pray that better counsels will prevail and the Government of India be pleased to use their power in such a manner that the State authorities will be enforced to grant permission to the Hindus of Paithan to take their Ganapati procession by their usual palanquin road.

Yours faithfully,
Vishwanath Ranganath Tuljapurkar.
 President,
Vidyarthi Sangh, Paithan.
 (District Aurangabad) Nizam State.

(Flag 1)

Copy of the agreement executed by the Mohammadan Community.

We the Qazi, Kateeb, Mullah, Inamdars, Mashaaikhs and Sajjadas of the Mohammadan community residing in the town of Pattan do hereby execute an agreement to the effect that for a long time past there was dispute between the Mohammadans and Hindus of the town of Pattan regarding the leading of the Dindi procession of Eknath Samasthan situated in the said town in the Ilaka of Rangnath Balkisham with Baja music from the Chowk mosque. Finally, for the purpose of removing the said dispute Government constructed a new road at considerable expense for the coming in and going out of the Dindi procession on which there is no mosque and the said road was set apart for this purpose. This agreement is therefore executed to the effect that there shall be no dispute whatever by the Mohammadan community in this connection and no new mosque will be constructed on this road constructed by Government. These few sentences are therefore written by way of an agreement so that that the same may be of use in time of necessity. Dated 14th Jamadi-us-Sani 1295 Hijri.

Sd/-Qasi Md. Amir-ud-din of Pattan
Pargana and other Mohaminadans.
Sd/- Zain-ud-Din Son of Syed Amin-ud-Din
Khatib of Pattan Qazba.
Sd/-Shaikh Chand son of Mohammad
Hussain weaver.
Sd/-Chhotu Bhai son of Abdul Rahman
Chowdhari.
Sd/-Ghulam Hussain.
Sd/-Gulab Khan son of Shair Khan
Tarkash (wire moker).

Copy granted to V. R. Tuljapurker as applied for by him.

Sd/-Registrar of the office of
the judicial Secretary.