

LEPEL HENRY GRIFFIN'S *THE RAJAS OF PUNJAB*: A HISTORICAL ANALYSIS

**A
THESIS**

Submitted to the
Faculty of Social Sciences
PUNJABI UNIVERSITY, PATIALA
In Partial Fulfillment of the Requirement
for the Degree of
**DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY
IN
HISTORY**

Supervisor

Balraj Singh

Dr. Balraj Singh

Assistant Professor

Department of History

Punjabi University, Patiala

Researcher

Pushpinder Singh

Pushpinder Singh



(Established Under Punjab Act No.35 of 1961)

**DEPARTMENT OF HISTORY
PUNJABI UNIVERSITY, PATIALA
NOVEMBER, 2021**

CERTIFICATE

This is to certify that this dissertation entitled "**Lepel Henry Griffin's *The Rajas of Punjab: A Historical Analysis***" submitted by Mr. Pushpinder Singh for the award of the degree of Doctor of Philosophy of this university is an original work done under my supervision and has not been submitted elsewhere for any other degree. I consider it worthy of submission for the award of the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

Dated. 15-11-2021


Dr. Balraj Singh

Assistant Professor

Department of History,

Punjabi University, Patiala.

DECLARATION

I, **Pushpinder Singh** certify that the work embodied in this Ph. D. thesis is my own bonafide work carried out by me under the supervision of **Dr. Balraj Singh, Department of History, Punjabi University, Patiala**. The matter embodied in this Ph.D. thesis has not been submitted for the award of any other degree/ diploma. I declare that I have faithfully acknowledged, given credit to and referred to the research workers wherever their works have been cited in the text and the body of the thesis. I further certify that I have not willfully lifted up some other's work, para, text, data, results, etc. reported in the Journals, books, magazines, reports, dissertations, thesis and cited as my own work. I also declare that I have adhered to all principles of academic honesty and integrity and have not misrepresented or fabricated or falsified any idea/ data/ fact/ source in my submission. I understand that any violation of the above will be cause for disciplinary action by the University.

Date: 15/11/2021

Place: Patiala

Pushpinder Singh
Pushpinder Singh

This is to certify that the above statement made by the candidate is correct to the best of my knowledge.

Supervisor

Balraj Singh
Dr. Balraj Singh
Assistant Professor
Department of History,
Punjabi University Patiala

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

It is with Divine grace that the long awaited opportunity in my life has come to express my sincere and heartfelt gratitude to my mentors and well wishers who inspired me, instilled confidence and courage in me and supported me throughout my period of research. My indebtedness to my supervisor Dr. Balraj Singh, Assistant Professor, Department of History, Punjabi University, Patiala, who willingly accepted me as his pupil for Doctorate Degree. He has been a source of constant inspiration and motivation in the completion of this work. He watched my progress over the years and very graciously spared time for discussing my problems for months together and meticulously went through all my drafts with his habitual thoroughness. I had the audacity of disturbing him even at odd hours. Without his constant support, I could not have thought of completing this work. I am and would always remain beholden to him for his very kindly and scholarly comments and suggestions during the course of the writing of my Ph.D. thesis.

I am equally indebted to Dr. Mohammad Idris, Associate Professor & Head, Department of History, Punjabi University, Patiala, for his usual courtesy and ungrudging help that he extended to me from time to time.

I am also grateful to Retd. Dr. Jaspal Kaur Dhanju, Professor & former Head, Department of History and Retd. Dr. Kulbir Singh Dhillon, Professor & former Head, Department of History and Dean Students' Welfare and Dean Colleges Development Council, Punjabi University, Patiala, they guided me with patience and kindness giving me liberty to pursue my own ideas.

I am very thankful to my teachers: Dr. Parneet Kaur Dhillon, Dr. Jasandeep Singh Sandhu, Dr. Sandeep Kaur and all the members of Department of History for their valuable suggestions and their time to time help.

I also would like to thank my mentor Dr. Balraj Singh Brar, Associate Professor, Department of Mechanical Engr., YCOE., Talwandi Sabo and Dr. Ashwani Kumar, Department of History, Central University of Punjab, Bathinda.

I also express my thanks to Mrs. Kiran Kaur, office incharge in Department of History for her cooperation in fulfilling all the formalities connected with thesis till the last day of submission.

I extend my thanks to the Staff of the Libraries that I visited during my research work, for helping me in locating the rare and valuable materials from libraries. I am grateful to the library staff of Bhai Kahn Singh Nabha & Dr. Ganda Singh Punjabi Reference Library, Punjabi University Patiala; Library of Punjab Historical Studies, Punjabi University, Patiala; State Archives, Patiala; Central Library, Patiala; A.C Joshi Library of Panjab University Chandigarh; Panjab Digital Library, Chandigarh; Bhai Gurdas Library, Guru Nanak Dev University, Amritsar, Library of Kurukshetra University; Haryana; National Archives of India, New Delhi & Nehru Memorial Museum and Library, New Delhi.

I am greatly indebted to my father Retd. D.S.P. Sardar Ranjit Singh and my mother Sardarni Sukhjeet Kaur, I also acknowledge the encouragement and support provided to me by my brothers Gurjinder Singh & Surinder Singh and my sisters Amandeep Kaur & Gurvinder Kaur.

I highly appreciate the co-operation, generous help and good wishes provided by my wife Gagandeep Kaur, my father-in-law S. Gursewak Singh Gill, mother-in-law S. Parampal Kaur Gill and brother-in-law Kaminder Singh Gill.

I am also very thankful to my friends Lakhwinder Singh, Kulbir Singh, Gagan Kumar, Dr. Rajiv Sharma, Jagsir Singh, Khleel Khan, Baljeet Singh, Dr. Harvinder Singh, Gurunanakditta Singh and Sukhwant Singh for their support and suggestions.

Above all, it is God the 'Almighty' with grace, I have moved through this venture.

Pushpinder Singh
Pushpinder Singh

GLOSSARY

• Bhadur	----- A brave man, A title
• Chadar Dalna	----- A simple ceremony of marrying widow
• Cis-Sutlej	----- Southern portion of Punjab or side of Sutlej
• Darbar	----- Royal Court, State Government, Assembly
• Dewan or Diwan	----- Chief Minister or Finance Minister of State
• Firman or Farmaan	----- Royal Order
• Gaddi	----- Throne or Royal seat
• Ilaqa or Ilaka	----- Territory or Jurisdiction
• Iqrarnama	----- A deed of Agreement
• Istumari	----- Holder of permanent tenure of land
• Jagir	----- An estate granted by a ruler to a noble in lieu of military service; assignment of land revenue for service rendered
• Jagirdar	----- Holder of a <i>jagir</i>
• Kharita, Khureeta	----- A special letter (generally sent in silken bag)
• Khillat	----- Robe of honor
• Mafi, Mufti	----- Rent free land
• Maharaja	----- A great king or the king of kings
• Misal	----- A small Sikh principality
• Misaldar	----- A head of Misal
• Munshi	----- Clerk, writer , a small official
• Nazar	----- A present to superior authority
• Nazzarana	----- Monetary present offered by a vassal or a noble to sovereign, succession fee
• Pargana	----- A small District
• Raja	----- A King
• Raja-i-Rajgan	----- A King of Kings, Title

• Sanad	-----	Grant, Document
• Sardar or Sirdar	-----	A chieftain or a noble, form to address the Sikhs
• Sikh	-----	Literally a disciple, a follower of religious order, founded by Guru Nanak and his nine successor
• Taluqa	-----	An estate
• Taluqadar	-----	Holder of an estate
• Tehsil	-----	A small administrative division
• Toshkhana	-----	A store room a ward robe, a chamber in which objects and valuable rare articles are kept
• Trans-Sutlej	-----	Opposite to Cis-Sutlej
• Vakil	-----	Agent of Native Chief
• Wasseatnama	-----	A Will
• Zamindar	-----	A landlord

INDEX

- Ajit Singh, 25, 37, 123, 124, 214
Akali Phoola Singh., 61
Akalis, 35
Ala Singh, 23, 28, 123, 229
Amar Singh, 7, 10, 15, 16, 18, 23, 24, 80, 85, 86, 95, 209
Ambala, 20, 49, 89, 101, 103, 109, 111, 113, 128, 135, 150, 162, 163, 172, 184, 192, 210, 212
Anglo-Sikh War, 26, 193
Attar Singh, 23, 62, 107, 147
Awadh, 4, 6, 7, 182, 183
Balanwali, 113
Bhagwan Singh, 108, 109, 110, 132, 168
Bhawalpur, 60, 81, 171, 204
Bhirog, 45, 46, 47, 200
Bikram Singh, 116, 117, 119, 121, 139, 141, 143, 144, 145, 181, 182, 183
Broadfoot, 20, 75, 76, 165, 166, 167, 174, 179, 207
Captain Birch, 40, 41, 126, 127, 199
Coolbrooke, 76, 101, 102, 104, 211
Council of Regency, 105, 107, 188, 190, 213
Dadri, 114, 115, 156, 178, 188, 214
Delhi, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 18, 20, 21, 23, 26, 27, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49, 50, 51, 52, 53, 54, 55, 57, 58, 59, 60, 61, 62, 64, 65, 66, 67, 68, 69, 70, 71, 72, 73, 74, 75, 76, 77, 78, 79, 80, 81, 82, 83, 84, 85, 86, 87, 88, 89, 90, 91, 92, 93, 94, 95, 96, 97, 98, 99, 100, 101, 102, 103, 104, 105, 106, 107, 108, 109, 110, 111, 112, 113, 114, 115, 116, 117, 118, 119, 120, 121, 122, 123, 124, 125, 126, 128, 129, 130, 131, 132, 133, 134, 135, 136, 137, 138, 139, 140, 142, 143, 145, 146, 147, 148, 149, 150, 151, 152, 153, 154, 155, 156, 157, 158, 159, 160, 161, 162, 163, 164, 165, 166, 167, 168, 169, 170, 171, 172, 173, 174, 175, 176, 177, 178, 179, 180, 181, 182, 183, 184, 185, 186, 187, 188, 189, 190, 191, 192, 193, 194, 206, 226, 228, 229, 230
Dholepur, 164, 219
Diwan Mokam Chand, 78
Diwan Mokham Chand, 88, 89, 91, 210
Doladhi, 25, 64, 72, 101, 207
England, 9, 15, 186, 191, 219
Fateh Singh, 9, 19, 23, 46, 47, 48, 49, 53, 59, 60, 61, 62, 64, 76, 77, 78, 79, 80, 81, 82, 83, 84, 130, 168, 195, 200, 208, 226
Firozepur, 170
Gajpat Singh, 10, 23, 133, 135, 215
George Clerk, 151
Gurdit Singh Ladwa., 64
Harding, 20, 104
Hissar, 62, 95, 96, 99, 163
Home Government, 3, 98, 101, 156, 207, 211, 217
Hoshiarpur., 181
Jalandhar Doab, 45, 78, 181, 182, 195
James Brown, 5, 7, 197
Jassa Singh Ahluwalia, 8, 9, 10, 16, 23, 46, 48, 50, 87, 151
Jaswant Rao Holkar, 11
Jaswant Singh Nabha, 64, 133
Jhajjhar, 171
John Lawrence, 117, 118, 119, 120, 121, 140, 141, 142, 143, 144, 145, 146, 179, 214, 216
John Malcom, 5, 9, 11
Joseph Davey Cunnigham, 5
Kaithal, 12, 51, 64, 88, 131, 195, 215
Kanwar Ranjit Singh, 125, 126, 215
Karam Singh, 13, 23, 25, 36, 38, 39, 41, 43, 66, 88, 122, 131, 133, 158, 214
Karnal, 41, 54, 55, 57, 59, 65, 163, 175, 176, 202, 226
Kaur Partab Singh, 52, 59
Khumanun, 148, 217
Kotkapura, 91, 93, 113, 193
Kotlia, 48
Kythal, 43, 67, 72, 73, 89, 138, 159, 219
Lal Singh, 30, 31, 40, 45, 51, 64, 73, 74, 88, 89, 91, 130, 155, 167, 168, 178, 195, 210
Lidhran, 25, 126, 128, 150, 151, 152
Local Government, 21, 47, 101, 118, 200, 211, 212, 217

Lord Auckland, 15, 17, 50, 113
 Lord Canning, 106, 118, 120, 122, 152, 172, 184, 185
 Lord Dalhousie, 141
 Lord Lake, 11, 27, 31, 44, 53, 59, 79, 97, 208
 Maharaja Mahinder Singh, 107
 Maharaja Ranjit Singh, 5, 14, 15, 16, 19, 25, 26, 44, 47, 52, 53, 55, 64, 65, 66, 68, 69, 70, 71, 73, 76, 77, 78, 79, 82, 85, 86, 88, 89, 91, 92, 95, 111, 134, 136, 158, 180, 201, 203, 205, 206, 208, 209, 210, 216, 221, 226, 227, 229
 Mahrajian, 100, 101, 102, 103, 113, 212, 213
 Malerkotla, 53, 61, 89, 92, 172, 195, 210
 Maratha, 30, 76
 Methab Kaur, 108, 109
 Misar Naudha, 37, 38, 40, 199
 Mokham Chand., 91
 Morwan, 74, 76, 207
 Mr. Clerk, 17
 Mr. Edgeworth, 112, 145
 Mughals, 3, 9, 20, 28, 30, 64, 92, 100, 162, 195, 196, 204
 Narinder Singh, 23, 105, 106, 124, 158, 160, 161, 162, 164, 213, 219
 Nihal Singh, 23, 50, 84, 85, 86, 87, 119, 139, 140, 141, 142, 178, 179, 180, 185, 199, 209, 216
 Ochterlony, 31, 32, 34, 35, 36, 38, 41, 44, 46, 51, 55, 56, 57, 58, 59, 70, 71, 74, 93, 97, 98, 111, 123, 126, 127, 198, 200, 202, 203, 225
 Oudh, 5, 6, 14, 27, 40, 182, 185, 186, 222
 Phagwara, 83, 116, 120, 142, 144, 145
 Philour, 169

Princep, 5, 13, 14, 15, 16, 57, 67, 68, 77, 88, 89, 197, 227
 R.G Taylor, 107, 213, 214
 Raja Bhag Singh, 25, 30, 50, 51, 52, 53, 54, 55, 56, 57, 58, 59, 60, 61, 62, 64, 67, 68, 69, 88, 111, 133, 195, 201, 202, 204
 Raja Bharpur Singh, 107, 109, 110, 149, 168, 170, 172, 213
 Raja Davinder Singh, 74, 129, 165, 167, 168, 170, 222
 Raja Fateh Singh
 Fateh Singh, 79
 Raja Jaswant Singh, 44, 45, 64, 71, 75, 91, 101, 126, 129, 130, 149, 151, 154, 195, 214
 Raja Randhir Singh, 116, 183
 Raja Sahib Singh, 24, 31, 36, 37, 38, 64, 66, 68, 69, 70, 71, 206
 Raja Sarup Singh, 113, 114, 115, 131, 134, 136, 138, 174, 176, 177
 Rani Aus Kaur, 24
 Rani Daya Kaur, 55, 56, 202
 Rani Khem Kaur, 31
 Resident of Delhi, 69
 Rhotak, 163
 Rohillas, 35
 Ross Bell, 96, 97, 98, 99, 211
 Sangat Singh, 23, 25, 90, 111, 112, 130, 132, 133, 150, 215
 Sirsa, 19, 95, 96, 97, 99, 163
 Sonthi Sikh, 128
 Suchet Singh, 115, 116, 117, 119, 121, 139, 141, 143, 144, 145, 146
 Suujarah, 155, 217
 Trans Sutlej., 19

CONTENTS

Certificate

Declaration

Acknowledgement

Sr. No.	Chapter Name	Page No. 1
1.	Historical Milieu	1- 28
2.	Relationship between British Government and Cis-Sutlej States	29 - 61
3.	Relationship between Lahore Darbar and Cis-Sutlej States	62 - 91
4.	British Paramountcy in Cis-Sutlej States	92 - 119
5.	Succession and Dispute Matters of Cis-Sutlej States	120 - 154
6.	Cis- Sutlej States Services in Anglo –Sikh Wars and in Revolt of 1857 A.D	155 - 191
7.	Conclusion	192 – 220
8.	Bibliography	221 – 228
9.	Appendix	229 – 241
10.	Glossary	242 - 243

Chapter - 1

HISTORICAL MILIEU

Modern history has its roots in Europe; in the same way the genesis of European historiography can be traced to the Greeco-Roman tradition of writing history. “While European Historiography is a vast body of work which has enriched the existing information on various subjects; yet theoretical viewpoints and opinions have traced elements of narrative, principles and thoughts (clearly going beyond limitations of realist principles) in products of European historiography which coincide with the geo-political interests of Europe. In other words, products of European historiography are evidently Euro-centric in their overall orientation. However, R.G Collingwood defines that “There was no such thing as an Historian before 18th Century.”¹ However, Dr. Fauja Singh doesn’t concur with the statement of R.G Collingwood and states that “Collingwood seriously underestimated the contributions made to the modern disciples by its Greek predecessors.”² History is an evolving discipline; the achievements of one age are generally taken over by the next. But gaining everything is not possible. As the age of scholarship turned into an age of a criticism, much was retained, but not everything because the norms of history keep on changing with the passage of time. When Historicism as it emerged in Europe in the 18th century widened the perspective of history. The seminal thought propounded by the historicists was history is not something monolithic. History is an account written through interplay of socio-political perspective and the compulsions of geo-political realities.³

In the context of Indian Historiography everyone is well aware the way history of India has changed from time to time. There was time when Indians were being accused for lack of their historical sense. Major Rennel said that “founded on Hindu materials, there is no known history of Hindustan, nor any records of historical events of that country prior to the Muhammadan conquest.”⁴ The dominant

¹ W.J Van Der Dussen, *History Is a Science; The Philosophy of R.G Collingwood*, Martinus Publishers, London, 1981, p. 17.

² Fauja Singh (ed.), *Historian and Historiography of the Sikhs*, Oriental Publishers, New Delhi, 1978, preface, p. ii.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 3.

⁴ Quoted in James Mill, *The History of British India*, Vol. I, James Madden London, 1817, p. 374.

philosophy of life at that time was based on orthodox Bhramnical thoughts that the world is very old and in decline, that things are temporary that superhuman forces have the largest influence in shaping man and that man's proper course is to accept and to encourage the sentiment of resignation.⁵

Turks, Pathans and later Mughals who ruled India for nearly seven centuries, possessed an intense sense of history. In this context Dr. Phillips writes that "Muslim historians of Sultanate period in India like their brethren elsewhere wrote in the conviction that true religion is to be found in the authoritative guidance of divinely revealed Quran."⁶ But British historian H.M Elliot who wrote a voluminous *History of India* says that "Muhammadan History was not better than annals."⁷

In the eighteen century Muslims gradually gave the way to British who extended and strengthened their power in the nineteen century. With arrival of the Europeans in India, Historical writing began to transform drastically in respect of approach, method and treatment. Indian scholars have got rich harvest of historical material on different aspects of Indian History which was prepared in form of minutes, dispatches, consultation, proceedings, secret correspondence, individual collections, dairies etc. In the commencement of the rule of company all transaction were done verbally which enormously corrupted English officers.⁸ As this news reached London, the Home Government applied the inflexible rules which required every detail of every village level to central administration to be furnished to the writings to the Court of Directors. It was also made obligatory for company's officials to seek permission of the Directors on all vital aspects in writing. This practice was mainly instrumental in the collection of material on large scale in various ways.⁹

As a result many European came forward and write on India and formed a large amount of historical literature. First among them was Alexendar Dow who wrote *History of Hindustan*, its first copy was published in 1768 A.D. He joined

⁵ Fauja Singh (ed.) *Historian and Historiography of the Sikhs*, preface, p. iv.

⁶ Quoted in Ashish Nandy, *History and Theory Journal*, Vol. 34, no.2, Theme issue 34, Welesen University, U.S.A, p. 57.

⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 58.

⁸ Ali, B.Seikh, *History its Theory and Methods*, Laxmi Publication, Madras 1988, p. 331.

⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 332.

company's military service in 1760 A.D and got promotion to colonel rank in 1769 A.D. He also wrote about some other issues and his work was of general aspects. He criticized some brutal practices which prevail in Indian society since immemorial.¹⁰ Many historians came forward to write on India and produced a vast amount of historical literature; one among them was James Mill and Mountstuart Elphinstone. Their work was regarded as the first on complete historical work on India.¹¹

In this context Dr. Fauja Singh says that most of the other writers were however, were hardened administrators who were predominantly motivated by the desire to write with the purpose of influencing official policies. It is to be noted that though in Europe historiography was making great advances, partially all of it these writers show bit awareness of the main contemporary, currents of western thought and of changing character of western historical scholarship. Nevertheless imperceptibly they introduced into the country the historical methodology of Europe, which was completely different from what had up till now prevailed here. Their writings, howsoever prejudiced and politically motivated were marked by the elements of analysis, discussion and interpretation features which had been conspicuous by their nonexistence in the writings of Indian scholars. In modern scenario, as the contact increased between India and west, these new trends have struck deeper roots so that Indian writers also by now have come fully under their influence.

Intellectual curiosity and western interest in the general history of mankind can be taken to be the most extensively cited reason that led to the generation of western interest in Indian people. Many additional factors, on the other hand, were accountable for attracting British attention towards Punjab and its community, political reasons were the main cause to igniting their interest. British paid attention with keen interest towards Punjab when Sikhs at that time were growing as political power in the North western part of India in the last decade of 18th century.¹²

After the British territories expand, East India Company's power began to come closer to the land of five rivers of Punjab. Due to this reason the significance of

¹⁰ Alexandar Dow, *The History of Hindostan*, J.Walker, London, 1812, p. 21.

¹¹ Ali, B. Seikh, *History its Theory and Methods*, p. 331.

¹² Fauja Singh (ed.), *Historian and Historiography of the Sikhs*, p. 4.

Sikh studies emerged for the British conquerors both in military and diplomatic arena. Now their interest gave way to necessity. What needs to be specifically understood was that sometimes European administrator were in the employment of some courts like Delhi or Awadh which had to fight against the growing power of Sikh in Punjab. So this encouraged many officer of East India Company to know about the people of Punjab.

Therefore, The English Historian's writings based on Punjab can be classified into three category viz. (i) eye witness to more or less cotemporary accounts of the late eighteen century like the *Calendar of Persian Correspondence*, English Foreign Department/Secret Proceedings, writer James Brown, Polier, George Foster (ii) those who wrote during the life and Maharaja Ranjit Singh e.g. John Malcom, Henry T. Princep; and (iii) who wrote after Maharaja Ranjit Singh death and even after the annexation of the Punjab e.g. W.L M. Greogor , Joseph Davey Cunningham and Sir Lepel Henry Griffin etc. With this division it becomes not only easy to understand but also easy to understand the changed opinion and motive of English writers and British Government during three different phases of Punjab.

Antoine Lois Henri was born at Lausanne Switzerland in 1741 A.D.¹³ and his father's name was H. E Polier, who was of French origin and a citizen of Switzerland. His uncle was the commandant of the fort St. Geroge in Madras. Polier arrived in India in 1757 A.D and joined the East India Company as an assistant engineer at Calcutta. He also worked in Madras and Bihar. After some instant he was promoted as Chief Engineer with the rank of Captain in 1762 A.D.¹⁴ Polier was a Swiss citizen due to which he faced a lot of problems in getting promotions in east India Company.

Eventually he got an opportunity of attaining a deputation with the Nawab of Oudh.¹⁵ Due to certain problems he resigned from his job in 1775 A.D and then

¹³ Darshan Singh, *Western Image of Sikh Religion*, National Book Organization, New Delhi, 1999, Introduction, p. vii.

¹⁴ Gyaneshwar Khurana, *British Historiography on the Sikh Power in Punjab*, Allied Publishers, New Delhi, 1985, p. 3.

¹⁵ Fauja Singh (ed.), *Historian and Historiography of the Sikhs*, p. 8.

worked under the Mughal Emperor for some time.¹⁶ Hasting readmitted him in the East India Company's service in 1782 A.D as Lieutenant Colonel and stationed him at Lukhnow.¹⁷

It was during his posting in Lukhnow that he started taking interest in Indian history and religion.¹⁸ He presented various papers at various meetings and forums.

His paper 'The Siques' or the 'History of the Seekers' was presented on 20 December 1787 A.D in front of the members of Asiatic Society of Bengal.¹⁹ This paper touches upon almost all the important aspects of the contemporary Sikh society, their origin and progress of the belief, their struggle for independence, their religious and civil institution, their dress and diet, occupation etc.²⁰

Polier's writings seems very critical of Sikhs. The internal evidences suggest that he collected information about Sikhs at his own and wrote it down to recommend to the Nawab of Oudh and the British to extirpate the Sikhs.²¹ He gave credit of apprising Sikh power not to the Sikhs but to the anarchy and weak Mughal Government from past so many decades. He was worried and was concerned about the breakdown of Mughal power because of the shift or passing away of political

¹⁶ Ganda Singh (ed.), *Early European Accounts of the Sikhs and the History of the Origin and the Progress of the Sikhs*, Indian Studies, New Delhi, 1974, p. 89. Also See; C.E Buckland, (ed.), *Dictionary of Indian Biography*, Oxford Uni. Press, London, 1906, p. 339.

¹⁷ Krishan Dyal Bhargava (ed.), *Brown's Correspondence*, Orient Longman, Delhi, 1960, pp. 293-294.

¹⁸ "While he was at Lukhnow he developed an interest in collecting manuscripts and paintings. It was here in 1783 A.D under his patronage that miniatures and paintings having distinct European artistic imprint were prepared. He also arranged a part of *Mahabhart* to be translated into Persian. Finally it was in this period of his life that Polier showed an interest in the Hindu religion. He was the first European to have succeeded in securing a full set of *Vedas*. Apart from collecting oriental manuscripts and miniature during his stint in Awadh, Poiler built up a great Library in Lukhnow where his collection was maintained. The contents of this Library, along with his other collection were distributed between the Bibliotheque National in Paris, the British Museum in London, the Library of King's College at Cambridge, Eton College in London, the Islamic Museum at Berlin and the Bibliotheque Cantonale of Lausanne".

¹⁹ Himdari Banerjee (ed.), *The Khalsa and the Punjab*, New Delhi, 2002, pp. 55-69.

²⁰ Darshan Singh (ed.), *Western Image of the Sikh Religion*, Introduction, p. xi.

²¹ *Ibid.*, pp. 8-9.

power from the Muslims of Delhi to rising power of Sikh in Punjab and areas connecting Punjab and Delhi, Which is clear from following extract of his letter:

“Such is their way of making war, which can
only appear hazardous to the wretched
Hidustani Troops of these quarters,
Who shiver as much at the name of a Seik...
But now that they have put on their bracelet,
Fifty of them are sufficient to keep at bay a
Whole battalion of the King’s forces such as they are.”²²

In fact, Polier was concerned about three things. In the first, he was appeasing Awadh. Secondly, he was criticizing and displeasing Sikhs by noticing that “if Sikhs were not attacked soon in their own proper provinces it is much to be feared their tenets and manners will be adopted by all *zamindar* of the *sobuah* of Delhi.”²³

Despite of it, Polier put very little attention like others British historian on the chiefs of Cis-Sutlej states. Polier talks about overall Sikh community but during this time these petty chiefs had also started attaining power in Punjab and were trying to build their own identity. Only scanty reference is given by him in his work *Shah Alam II and His Court*. He discusses the dispute of Najaf Khan, Minister of Delhi Empire and Chief Amar Singh of Patiala. Amar Singh was backed by Zabata Khan, son of Rohilla chief Njibullah. But he neglect Amar Singh and focus only on Zabata Khan.²⁴

James Brown joined the English East India Company’s army in 1765 A.D as a cadet.²⁵ He got promotions in his early career. In 1767 A.D, he got promoted to the rank of Lieutenant and four years later he was promoted to the Captain’s rank on June

²² Ganda Singh (ed.), *Early European Accounts of the Sikhs and the History of the Origin and the Progress of the Sikhs*, p. 65.

²³ *Ibid.*, p. 64.

²⁴ Partul Gupta (ed.) Antoine Louis Henri Polier, *Shah Alam II and His Court*, S.C Sarkar and Sons, Calcutta, 1947, p. 58.

²⁵ Gyaneshwar Khurana, *British Historiography on the Sikh Power in Punjab*, p. 5.

30, 1771 A.D. Warren Hasting, Governor General of India selected him his aid-de-camp in 1772.²⁶ As a reward for his exceptional abilities he was appointed as collector of the Jungle Terai districts in 1774 A.D and served there for six years. On 19 January 1781 A.D he was sent to the imperial court at Delhi as an agent of Governor General.²⁷

Browne returned to England in 1786 A.D. He was promoted to the rank of Lieutenant Colonel on 2 Feb., 1788 A.D. After that he returned to India. He took last breath at Dinapur on 22 June, 1792 A.D at the age of 48.²⁸

Browne submitted many papers among which first entitled 'Description of the Jungle Terry Districts' on June 20, 1787 A.D. Second paper was 'History of the Origin and Progress of the Sikhs' on September 17, 1787 to John Motteux, Chairman of the court of Directors. Later these were published by the order of the court under the title 'Indian Tracts' in 1788. Warren Hasting was very interested to obtain knowledge about the Punjab specially Sikhs. In his letter he wrote to Browne that:

“Your first concern must be to collect the
Materials of a more complete and genuine
understanding you must study the Characters,
Connections, Influence and the Power of the
Several competitor for the possession of the
King’s favour or the Exerciser of his authority
And the state, view, and relations of the autonomous
Chiefs and states whose territory border on this.”²⁹

His appointment as Agent and Envoy of the Governor General in the court of Mughal Emperor Shah Alam provided him chance in day to day political affairs the

²⁶ Fauja Singh (ed.), *Historian and Historiography of the Sikhs*, p. 2.

²⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 2.

²⁸ Darshan Singh (ed.), *Western Image of the Sikh Religion*, Introduction, pp. 8-9.

²⁹ Krishan Dyal Bhargava (ed.), *Brown’s Correspondence*, p. 3.

military strength of the different chiefs and fractions, including the different Sikh Sardars, who were fighting for supremacy in these areas. His book has put substantial light on the political activities of Sikh Sardars including Jassa Singh Ahluwalia during that period.³⁰ Jassa Singh Ahluwalia was fearless Sikh leader and he was also among the ancestors of Ahluwalia House. Latter this house emerge into power in Kapurthala under Fateh Singh. But James Browns book doesn't deals with later period of Punjab History.

James Browne wrote comprehensively about the political achievements of Jassa Singh against Mughals and Afghans. James Browne writes about Jassa Singh Ahluwalia that "A chief of considerable weight and abilities, having been chosen commander of their (Sikhs) grand army (Dal Khalsa)."³¹

Browne was first administrator researcher who understood the inborn relations of Sikh religion and politics and the power derived therein.³² Historiographically, Browne's work effort marked the beginning of modern historical writings on the Sikh and Punjab.³³ Later Historians like John Malcom, J.D Cunningham also used it for writing about the Punjab and Sikhs. In the end of his writings Browne also shows his concern to protect the British possession in India.

There was another intellectual who was of great reput and was asked to furnish information about Sikh and Punjab and that was George Forster. George Forster was an explorer and a scholar. He was civil officer of Madras establishment of the East India Company in 1782.³⁴ Due to his scholarly aptitude he was selected by Governor General Warren Hastings to advance to Punjab for collecting reliable information and writings.³⁵

³⁰ J.S Dua, *British Historiography Eighteen Century Punjab*, Radha Publication, Delhi, 2002, pp. 24-25.

³¹ *Ibid.*, p.26.

³² Ganda Singh (ed.), *Early European Accounts of the Sikhs and the History of the Origin and the Progress of the Sikhs*, p. 18.

³³ J.S Grewal, *Historical Writings on The Sikhs (1784-2011)*, Manohar Publisher, New Delhi, 2012, p. 24.

³⁴ C.E Buckland (ed.), *Dictionary of Indian Biography*, Oxford Uni Press, London, 1906, p. 151.

³⁵ Darshan Singh (ed.), *Western Image of the Sikh Religion*, Introduction, p. 13.

His love of exploration made him undertake a dangerous and arduous overland journey from Bengal to England. He left Calcutta on 23rd May, 1782 A.D and besides stray references to the Sikhs wrote a connected account of them in at Jammu in March 1783 A.D.³⁶ Forster was in regular communication with A.L.H Polier and acquired from him besides other information, “Large Historical tracts”.³⁷

George Forster attributes the rise of Sikh to their invincible determination and their resourcefulness in daringly seizing on every hold which offered support. He believes that it was their religious spirit and its force which led to their rise on political scene of the country.³⁸

There is no uncertainty that his account regarding the origin and early history of Sikhs, probably due to the dearth of material, is extremely sketchy and replete with the factual errors. In view of the immense political achievements of the Sikhs his purpose was to acquaint the English East India Company with them and their activities during 18th century. George Forster is one of those English writers who has hardly ever mentioned about the names of different Sikh Sardars and about their respective activities. He has generally written about the Sikhs in General and various important aspects of their arm forces, their guerilla mode of fighting, their struggle under Muhgal and Afghan armies. Nor he has like any other preceding English writers have discussed the organization of *Misls*. He has undoubtedly referred to the Mughal Governors, Nadir Shah and Ahmad Shah. He has mentioned different Sardars at various occasions without adding the names of their *misl*. He has described Amar Singh and Gajpat Singh as Chiefs of Patiala. Sardar Jassa Singh is mentioned instead of Jassa Singh Ahluwalia³⁹

Foster is at the best when his pursue for the application of the laws of history makes him assume the rise of a strong man in Punjab. He predicted that:

“Should any future cause call forth the joint efforts of the

³⁶ George Forster, *A Journey from Bengal to England*, Vol. I, R.Faulder, London 1788, Letter XI, pp. 291-340. This letter was written by George Forster to Mr. Gregory from Lukhnow.

³⁷ *Ibid.*, preface p. xvii.

³⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 293.

³⁹ J.S Dua, *British Historiography Eighteen Century Punjab*, pp. 28-30.

Sicques to maintain the existence of the kingdom and religion,
 we may see some determined chief led on by his genius and
 achievement and, absorbing the power of his associates, display from
 the ruins of their commonwealth, the standard of monarchy.
 The page of history filled with the like efforts springing from
 the like causes. Under such a form of Government I have little
 hesitation in saying, that the Sicques would be soon advanced
 to the rank amongst the native princes of Hindostan, and
 would become a terror to the surrounding states.”⁴⁰

From this citation it can be understood that writer was no mere observer and collector of information but also was a thinker, who was well familiar with the operative forces of History and his appreciation of Sikhs was based on realization that they possessed some of those qualities which go to make a powerful nation.⁴¹

The British came into direct contact with chiefs of Punjab in 1805 A.D, as a result of Jaswant Rao’ Holkar’s advance into Punjab. Lord Lake followed Holkar, whose wish to gain the Sikh chiefs to his cause soon gave way to despair. During this campaign Lord Lake was accompanied by a political officer named John Malcom, who was required to convince the Sikh chiefs not to provide any help to Holkar. John Malcom was in contact with the chiefs of the both sides of Sutlej through their *Vakeels*.⁴² This was first visit of Malcom in Punjab and he fully utilized this opportunity by collecting every bit of useful information about religion of Punjab, its people and chiefs. He visited Calcutta in 1806 A.D and remained there for six months; this was the period when he completed his book *Skech of Sikhs*.⁴³ He also wrote

⁴⁰ George Forster, *A Journey From Bengal to England*, pp. 292,300,320.

⁴¹ Fauja Singh (ed.), *Historian and Historiography of the Sikhs*, p.15.

⁴² John William Kaye, *The Life and Correspondence Of John Malcom*, Smith, Elder and Co., London, 1922, p. 351.

⁴³ Gyaneshwar Khurana, *British Historiography on the Sikh Power in Punjab*, pp. 17-18.

'*History of India his Memoris*', his reports on the Central provinces and the English translation of Bhakt Mal's Khalsa Nama.⁴⁴

Both as an author and administrator he belonged to the Romantic School to which Elphinstone and Munro also had the honor to belong. As such he had an intense sympathy and regard for history, customs and religion of natives of India. This outlook was in sharp contrast to that of utilitarian's like James Mill who saw nothing well in Indian society. It is this mode of thinking which seems to have changed the general approach of Malcolm in the writing of the *Sketch of the Sikhs*.⁴⁵

The account of John Malcolm *Sketch of the Sikhs* has to be seen in the light of number of political changes that had occurred especially in the regard of Punjab. Notwithstanding, the rise of Maharaja Ranjit Singh's power, the political design of English had also started becoming more transparent. Due to English apprehension of a combined attack of the French monarch Napoleon Bonaparte and Afghan Chief Zaman Shah on India, the former tolerated for some time Maharaja Ranjit Singh's intervention in the affairs of Cis-Sutlej states, though they could successfully influence him not to help Holkar. Meanwhile, the English had begun to create a strong political front in the Cis-Sutlej territories by bringing chiefs of Nabha, Jind, Patitola

⁴⁴ C.E Buckland (ed.), *Dictionary of Indian Biography*, p. 271.

"John Malcolm was born at Burnfoot in Dumfriesshire in 1769 A.D. He could not get proper formal education because of his father's financial problems. But his rich maternal uncle, who was a trader, brought him to London where he was given primary education. At very young age, he was commissioned in the army of East Indian Company where he joined because of his uncle's rapport with the Director of the Company. In 1783 A.D John Malcolm came to Madras when he was just fourteen. Later this regiment joined the main army of the Nizam of the Deccan. He was influenced by the power, grandeur and monetary consideration. He studied the history of India and meditated on the principle responsible for the creation of the British Empire in India and those on which depend its stability. He came back in Madras in 1796 A.D, where he acted as a Secretary to the Commander in Chief. In April 1798 A.D Lord Wellesley became Governor General of India. Malcolm placed his papers written on the native of India before Wellesley in order to gain political employment. On Sept. 10, 1798, he was appointed Assistant to the Resident of Hyderabad. Here he took active part in Mysore war and settlement of Mysore."

⁴⁵ Fauja Singh (ed.), *Historian and Historiography of the Sikhs*, p. 17.

etc. under their protection after defeating the Martha Sardar Mahajdi Sidhia in 1803A.D.⁴⁶

In his account he says that desire of these petty chiefs was to extend their territory and to become powerful than their nearby chief and relatives. He further added that under the intoxication to attain power these quarrels have been transmitted from father to son. Therefore, every village had become matter of dispute. That's why these discontented chiefs joined Marathas and English because their powers could help them to get the possession of a village or fort, from which they had been unjustly excluded by their own father or brother. Holkar encouraged their application and used them as his advantage.⁴⁷

These chiefs were mainly belonged to Malwa region which lies between Jamuna and Sutlej rivers and were called 'Malwa Singh', and almost all were converted from Hindu tribes of Jatt and Gujjar. The title of Malwa Singh was conferred upon them for their extraordinary gallantry, under the Banda Bhadur. The principle chiefs among Malwa Singh were Sahib Singh of Patiala, Bhanga Singh of Thanesar, Bhag Singh of Jind, Bhailal Singh of Kaithal. Besides these there were several other minor chiefs, such as Gurudah Singh, Judh Singh and Karam Singh; all of whom have some villages and horses. They consider themselves as independent but in general to secure their possession they needed powerful leaders.⁴⁸

Among these chief Patiala was largest and most flourished town and territory of these Malwa Singh were situated to the North West frontier by the Satluj.⁴⁹

John Malcolm was one of those English writers, who instead of writing about the activities and role played by the different Sikh Sardars in their skirmishing against the Mughal and Durrani forces, also wrote about the Sikhs as a whole and has left it to the mere conjecture of the reader to make out the names of the Sikh leader leading the Sikh forces at particular moment. But in spite of this and due to certain inaccuracies, his work seems to be more objective, richer in information and provide better quality

⁴⁶ J.S Dua, *British Historiography Eighteen Century Punjab*, p. 39.

⁴⁷ Sir John Malcolm, *Sketch of the Sikhs*, J.Murray, London, 1812, p.108.

⁴⁸ *Ibid.*, pp. 109-110.

⁴⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 111.

than the prior works and many things written by him during first decade of nineteenth century in the brief treatise on the Sikhs remained unopposed for some time.⁵⁰

Sketch of the Sikhs can be divided into three parts ;

- (i) Sketch of the History and the present state of the Sikhs with the observation on their religious institute , usage , manners and characters;
- (ii) Countries and Government of the Sikhs;
- (iii) Religion of the Sikhs.

The motivation behind this work was not different from the one which underlay the accounts of Browne, Polier and Forster; the desire to delight the curiosity of the European thinkers about the rising of the Sikh Community.⁵¹

Princep's account *Origin of Sikh Power in Punjab and Political Life of Maharaja Rannjit Singh* appeared in 1834 A.D nearly twenty five years after Malcolm had written his work *Sketch of the Sikhs*. A primary change had taken place in Punjab during this period. Instead of a congeries of collective fighting and almost independent chief ship, Punjab now represented as large unified kingdom. The energies of the Sikhs which had been sapped by internal conflicts, wild ambitions and petty maneuverings got a new direction under Maharaja Ranjit Singh. However Maharaja Ranjit Singh's aim was to unifying the entire Punjab under his leadership proved abortive. The fright of Maharaja Ranjit Singh made the Cis-Sutlej Sikh chiefs to seek British protection. These developments placed the British completely in a new situation. They had not only to keep friendly relations with a fairly powerfully neighbors but were also had to settle matters when approached by the protected chiefs.⁵²

On the other hand Russian pressure had increased so much in Persia and Central Asia that English had started feeling *Russ-Phobia* and considered precarious for the security of British Empire in India. Maharaja Ranjit Singh was being considered unsafe and stumbling block for the security of latter's empire in India. As such, through Princep has given his object of writing his work as to give narrative of

⁵⁰ J.S Dua, *British Historiography Eighteen Century Punjab*, p. 40.

⁵¹ Fauja Singh (ed.), *Historian and Historiography of the Sikhs*, p. 17.

⁵² Gyaneshwar Khurana, *British Historiography on the Sikh Power in Punjab*, p. 35.

the incidence leading to the rise of Maharaja Ranjit Singh, the brief but helpful information about the activities and political, social and economic fabric of the Sikhs shows that the English were preparing for the take off at an opportune time.⁵³

Henry Thoby Princep was born in Thoby (England) on 15th July 1793. His father John Thoby came to India as military trainee. Later he took trafficking in indigo and went back to England in 1788 A.D. He published *A Review of the Trade of East India Company* and even other pamphlets. He remained Member of Parliament from 1802 to 1806 A.D.⁵⁴ H.T Princep arrived in Bengal in 1809 A.D and also became assistant secretary to the Governor General of Bengal, Marquis Hasting in 1814 A.D, whom he had accompanied on his tour through Oudh, N.W.P, Nepal Pindari and in Marthas wars.⁵⁵ Princep was appointed Persian secretary to the Government on December 16, 1820 A.D. Later, Princep got permission from Governor General Marquis of Hasting's administration to write *A History of Political and Military Transaction of India*.⁵⁶ This book is generally considered to be the finest and most reliable narrative of the events of that time. The original version was revised and published in 1824 A.D when author was on a leave in England.⁵⁷

Despite the high position held by writer in Government of India he does not restrain himself from expressing his thought which opposed British official stand.⁵⁸

However there are certain limitations in H.T Princep's writing also. His work roughly covered the period from 1742 to 1833 A.D. H.T Princep has mainly depended upon Captain Murray.⁵⁹ At the end of his book Princep gives notes based on the work of Khuswant Rai's *Tarikh-i-Sikhan* when a part of Princep's book was already in press.⁶⁰

⁵³ J.S Dua, *British Historiography Eighteen Century Punjab*, p. 43.

⁵⁴ George Smith, *The Dictionary of National Biography*, p. 1071.

⁵⁵ C.E Buckland (ed.), *Dictionary of Indian Biography*, p. 344.

⁵⁶ Fauja Singh (ed.), *Historian and Historiography of the Sikhs*, p. 40.

⁵⁷ Sir Leslie Stephen and Sir Sidney Lee (ed.), *Dictionary of National Biography*, Vol. v, Smith, Elder an, Co, London, 1921-22, p. 392.

⁵⁸ Gyaneshwar Khurana, *British Historiography on the Sikh Power in Punjab*, p. 47.

⁵⁹ J.S Dua, *British Historiography Eighteen Century Punjab*, p. 43.

⁶⁰ "During his long service H.T Princep was brought into close contact with a long succession of Governor Generals including Lord Hastings, Lord Amherst, Lord William Bentinck, Lord Auckland and Lord Ellenbrough. In 1865 A.D he wrote autobiographical sketch of his official life. Princep was conservative to the backbone. On the question of education, H.T Princep was strongly opposed to the

Since, as admitted by Princep himself that his purpose of writing book was to give a narrative of occurrences leading to the rise of Maharaja Ranjit Singh⁶¹, he has given a little but valuable information about the activities and some aspects of the administrative structure of the Sikhs and different Sikh Sardars during the Eighteenth century from the invasion of Nadir Shah onward. However when compared to the other Sikh sardars like Alha Singh, Amar Singh, Jahnda Singh, Jassa Singh Ramgarhia, Charat Singh and Maha Singh, Sardar Jassa Singh Ahluwalia has not figured so significantly in this account.⁶²

Princep has also mentioned the conferring of the title of Raja on Alha Singh of Patiala in 1762 A.D.⁶³ He also tells that later title of *Maharaja Rajgan Mahendar Bahdur* conferred upon his grandson Amar Singh in 1764 A.D by Ahmed Shah Abdali. However, Princep is absolutely mum regarding the attitude of Sikh chiefs towards Allah Singh when he accepted the honor from Durrani.

Princep though disinterested in the quarrel and petty feuds of Sikh *Misls*, attempted a cautious analysis of the nature of these organizations. Considering the fact that no work written previous to Princep shows any association with the structure of the *misls*, the contribution of Princep in this regard is fundamental and his explanations is illuminating. As per him the *misls* were “confederacies of equals under the chiefs of their own selection.”⁶⁴

policy initiated by Macaulay of substituting English for the classical oriental languages as the medium of Instruction. In 1835 A.D, H.T Princep was appointed as Member of Governor General’s Council during a temporary vacancy which was made permanent in 1840 A.D He retired from service in 1843 A.D and settled in London. He retired in 1874 A.D because of deafness and failing sight and died on Feb. 11, 1878 A.D.” Sir Leslie Stephen and Sir Sidney Lee (ed.), *Dictionary of National Biography*, Vol. V, p. 393.

⁶¹ H.T Princep writes that “It is objective of the following pages to collect and exhibit in continuous narrative, the occurrence of this description in the Punjab, and to trace the rise of the chief Maharaja Ranjit Singh, who now sways the destinies of that province and of a large bordering territory, with a vigor of authority, unknown to any other part of India, not subject to the dominions of Europeans.” Henry Princep, *Origin of the Sikh Power in Punjab and Political life of Maharaja Ranjit Singh with an account of Religious Laws and customs of the Sikhs*, 1834, reprint, Patiala, 1970, p. 2

⁶² J.S Dua, *British Historiography Eighteen Century Punjab*, p. 44.

⁶³ Henry Princep, *Origin of the Sikh Power in Punjab and Political life of Maharaja Ranjit Singh with an account of Religious Laws and customs of the Sikhs*, p. 20.

⁶⁴ Gyaneshwar Khurana, *British Historiography on the Sikh Power in Punjab*, p. 41.

Nevertheless, Princep has chiefly focalized on the political events leading on the postulation of the power by Maharaja Ranjit Singh. So he didn't gave much information about Cis Sutlej chiefs of Punjab instead only a brief references was shared of them when Maharaja Ranjit Singh crossed the Sutlej for his expeditions. Than a brief entry of Cis Sutlej chief's has been shared. After 1809 A.D not a single reference occurred.

The decade of 1839 A.D to 1849 A.D became a landmark in the History of Punjab. Within ten years political circumstances got changed after the death of Maharaja Ranjit Singh. British took advantage of weak situation of Punjab during this time writing of Jospeh Davey J.D Cunningham's appeared for first time. A *History of the Sikhs from The Origin of the Battle of Satluj* in 1849 A.D has been regarded as the culmination of almost a century of western script on Sikhs and Punjab.⁶⁵

J.D Cunnigham was born on July 1812 A.D in Lambeth in a Scottish family⁶⁶his Father Allen Cunnigham was an author. He had received his education from various private schools of London. He had a fascinating career at Addiscombe, a military seminary for training of military officers for the East India Company. He arrived in India in 1832A.D.⁶⁷

In 1837 A.D , Lord Auckland got impressed by Joseph's vividness and efficiency, appointed him Assistant to Colonel Claude Wade, the political agent at Ludhiana, partly in his capability as an engineer, with a view to improvise the defenses of the town of Ferozepur.⁶⁸In 1838 A.D he was present at interview between Lord Colonel Wade when he forced through the Kyber Pass and was promoted as first Lieutenant on 20 May 1839 A.D.⁶⁹ In 1840 A.D he was appointed in administrative charge of the Residency of Ludhiana⁷⁰ under G. Rusell Clerk who had succeeded Colonel Wade. J.D Cunningham accompanied Colonel Shelton and his reliving brigade to Peshwar when he returned with his troops escorting Dost

⁶⁵ Darshan Singh (ed.) *Western Image of the Sikh Religion*, Introduction, p. 38.

⁶⁶ Sir Leslie Stephen and Sir Sidney Lee (ed.), *Dictionary of National Biography*, p. 314.

⁶⁷ C.E Buckland (ed.), *Dictionary of Indian Biography*, London, p.103.

⁶⁸ Gyaneshwar Khurana, *British Historiography on the Sikh Power in Punjab*, p. 121.

⁶⁹ Sir Leslie Stephen and Sir Sidney Lee (ed.), *Dictionary of National Biography*, Vol. V, p. 315.

⁷⁰ Fauja Singh (ed.), *Historian and Historiography of the Sikhs*, p. 40.

Mohammad Khan under Colonel Wheeler. During the part of 1841 A.D at Ferozepur, he was in the magisterial charge⁷¹ and in 1841-42 he was appointed in Tibet to solve the problems between Jammu troops and Chinese.

In winter of 1842 A.D, J.D Cunningham was also present at the interview between Lord Ellenborough, Dost Mohammad and the Sikhs. In 1843 A.D he became Assistant of Col. Richmond who had succeeded Mr. Clerk as the agent of the Governor –General on North-West frontier. In 1844 A.D and 1845 A.D he was British agent in the native state of Bhadarargarh.⁷²

J.D Cunningham was very passionate of reading books and he had read several books on such subjects as History, Literature, Philosophy, Science, Gerography and Geology. It was expected that while on the way to developing a philosophy of history, he should have made a significant study of Indian History. He made a critical study of some Persian works in all prospects both in that language and in translation. As a one who was both interested in history and working in North Western Agency, Joseph started doing a vital study of the history of the Sikhs. He also made himself well-known with Adi Granth, Gur Ratnwali and some other Rehtanamas believed to be conferred on the Sikhs by Guru Gobind Singh such as Rehtatnama of Parhlad and Tankhanama.⁷³

It must be noticed that J.D Cunningham had lived among the Sikh people for a period of nine years and during an extremely essential portion of their History. He had gone through a variety of circumstances with all classes of men and he had at the same instant free access to all the public records bearing on the affairs of the frontier. It was after being required in 1844 A.D to draw up reports on the British contacts generally with the state on the Sutlej, and especially on the military resources of the Punjab, that he considered the idea and felt that he had the source of writings of the history of the Sikhs.⁷⁴

In fact, from 1844 AD to 1848 A.D he inscribed four articles in the *Journal of Asiatic Society of Bengal*. These were the *Notes on Moorcrafts travels in Ladakh* in 1844 A.D. *Notes on the Antiquities of the Districts within the Bhopal Agency* in 1847

⁷¹ Joseph Davey Cunningham, *The History of the Sikhs*, Alhemarle Street, London, 1853, preface, p. xxiii.

⁷² Sir Leslie Stephen and Sir Sidney Lee (ed.), *Dictionary of National Biography*, p. 315.

⁷³ Joseph Davey Cunningham, *The History of the Sikhs*, Appendix XX, p. 344.

⁷⁴ *Ibid.*, preface, p. xxiv.

A.D, *On the Ruins of Puthree* in 1848 A.D and *Notes in the Limits on Perpetual Show in the Himalayas* in 1848 A.D. Further he took nearly four years since 1844 A.D to finish his work; *The History of Sikhs* in 1848 A.D was published in 1849 A.D.⁷⁵

J.D Cunningham aimed at accomplishing two objectives in writing the *History of the Sikhs*. His main zeal was to give Sikhism its place in the general history of humanity by showing its connection with the several creeds of India and secondly by impressing upon the people of England the great requirement of attending to mental changes in the progress amongst their million of subjects in East. He attempted to attain the above objective in his first four chapters. In his last five chapters he covered the contemporary history which prevails during his own time. His another aim was to give some account of the connection of the English with Sikhs and in part with the Afghans from the time they began to take a direct concern in the affairs of these races and to involve them in the web of their policy for opening the navigation of the Indus and for bringing Turkestan and Khorasan within their commercial influence⁷⁶

The reference of Cis-Sutlej chiefs comes in brief. Cunningham writes that Amar Singh Phulkian have got control over the Haryana between 1768-78 A.D and settled himself in the country near Hisaar,⁷⁷ had even acquired Sirsa and Fatehabad.⁷⁸ Cunningham's book's main focus was Maharaja Ranjit Singh and contained a fore warning and suggestion to the administration related the future course of action to be taken towards the Punjab after the second Anglo- Sikh war. Therefore not much importance was given to Cis Sutlej states than Trans Sutlej. Few references occurred when Maharaja Ranjit Singh crossed Sutlej before 1809 A.D treaty for his expedition but they all were Maharaja Ranjit Singh centered. After 1809 A.D treaty Maharaja was not allowed to cross the Sutlej for expedition. After 1809 A.D J.D Cunningham discusses only one matter which was of Fateh Singh of Kapurthala. Fateh Singh had left Kapurthala in 1825 A.D that Maharaja might attack upon him.

Apart from it J.D Cunningham was basically a historian of ideas. His understanding of the Sikh chiefly stemmed from his thoughts on their religion and

⁷⁵ S.S Bal, *British Policy Towards Punjab*, New Age Publisher, Calcutta, 1971, Appendix I, p. 253.

⁷⁶ J.S Dua, *British Historiography Eighteen Century Punjab*, p. 61. See also; Joseph Davey Cunningham, *The History of the Sikhs*, preface, p. xx.

⁷⁷ Joseph Davey Cunningham, *The History of the Sikhs*, p. 105.

⁷⁸ *Ibid.*, p.104.

beliefs. Religion appeared to him to be springboard of all action of the Sikhs.⁷⁹ In no other description of the history of the Sikh they have been described with so much stress and cogency in relation to their faith. The role and the motivation of the religion in the development of Sikh community as a political power had been noticed by Browne, Polier, Forster, Malcolm but it was reserved for J.D Cunningham to wholly work out his relationships.⁸⁰

J.D Cunningham far from joining his immediate predecessors in glorifying British arms and justifying British Policy towards the Sikhs offered a most serious condemnation of the English in their handling of the situation which had emerged in Punjab after the Maharaja Ranjit Singh's death. In his opinion, the English had themselves brought about the First Anglo- Sikh war, because the action of the British Indian Government had convinced the Sikhs of the English designs on the Punjab. Though the sincerity of the English was not to be questioned, their "honesty can only be admitted at the expenses of their judgment and knowledge of mankind." Cunningham spoke authoritatively and in indisputably terms. He invoked his eight years residence among all classes of the Sikhs as the means of attaining "accurate information" and coming to just conclusions.

Cunningham's evaluation of British Indian Policy towards the Sikhs was based on his assumptions that armed clash with the Sikhs could have been avoided. He praised the old school who had maintained affectionately solid relations with Maharaja Ranjit Singh. Cunningham decisively holds the view that the war with the Sikhs resulted from the aggravation given by the British officials and was won in collaboration with the self seeking Sikh chiefs. With his official understanding and usual insight, Cunningham enumerates the steps taken by the British official which pronounced a assurance among the Sikh soldiers that their kingdoms was in threat. His criticism of Harding and George Broadfoot is a particularly rigorous. Cunningham opined that in British relations with the neighboring states, the nature of British Agent was as much as an vital factor as the policy itself.⁸¹ Cunningham addressed himself to be of British nation. Since the East India Company draw its authority from the whole nation so all its affairs were in last resort national affairs.

⁷⁹ Gyaneshwar Khurana, *British Historiography on the Sikh Power in Punjab*, p. 132.

⁸⁰ Darshan Singh (ed.), *Western Image of the Sikh Religion*, Introduction, p. 43.

⁸¹ Gyaneshwar Khurana, *British Historiography on the Sikh Power in Punjab*, p. 141.

Yet, we find in the contemporary sources that the Cunningham's writings were not appreciated by the British. "The writer has written in an anti-English spirit more as a Sikh than a Christian, more as a Punjabee than an Englishman." Sir Henry Lawrence wrote in an unfinished article on the Cunningham's *History of the Sikhs*. Needless to say that, the book appeared at the time of annexation of the kingdom of Lahore by British in 1849 A.D. *The Times* noted that his heart was with the Sikhs throughout his work. *The Calcutta Review* remarked that he had written his history "for the most part as a Sikh historian would write it."⁸²

As a punishment, he was set aside from his political appointment and sent back to the regimental duty. The dishonor undoubtedly hastened his death, and soon after his appointment at the Merrut Division of Public works, he died suddenly at Ambala in 1851 A.D.⁸³

At present when a grave attempt is being made to rewrite Indian History, it is essential to study attitudes, assumptions and limitations etc. of our past historical writers therefore to study the rise of new political powers in Punjab after Mughals and Durrani, British historians must be study because the history of Punjab drew attention of the British authors much before the annexation of Punjab. This field of historical enquiry continued to be enhanced by the contribution of experienced British officials of which some are discussed. One among them was Lepel Griffin. Unlike other administrator historians of the last century, who wrote in the retirement or while they were on vacation Lepel Griffin, having a flare for writing, began to contribute to the huge historical information while he was still very young. A glance of his writings reveals the versatile nature of his genius.⁸⁴

⁸² J.S Grewal, *Historical Writings on the Sikhs (1784-2011)*, p. 123.

⁸³ Joseph Davey Cunningham, *The History of the Sikhs*, 'Biographical Notes on the Cunningham Family' p. xii.

⁸⁴ Besides his journalistic writings following are Lepel Griffin's works published in the form of books and pamphlets:

- (i) *The Punjab Chiefs*, The historical and biographical notices of the principle families in the territories under the Punjab Government, Lahore 1865.
- (ii) *The Punjab Chiefs*, The historical and biographical notices of the principal families in the Lahore and Rawalpindi Divisions of the Punjab, New Edition Bringing the histories down to date by Charles Francis Massey, two volumes (Lahore, 1890).
- (iii) *The Rajas of Punjab*, Being the history of Princely states in the Punjab and their political relations with the British Government, Lahore, 1870.

Lepel Henry Griffin was born on July 1838 A.D at Watford, Lepel Griffin successfully qualified Indian Civil Service (ICS) examination in 1859 A.D after that he was appointed as Assistant Commissioner of the Punjab on 17th November 1860 A.D and subsequently rose to the prominent positions of the Chief Secretary. He continued to serve in the province till July 1879 A.D, during the mental incapacity of Raja Kharak Singh of Kapurthala State, the name of Lepel Griffin , the then under secretary to the Punjab Government was suggested for acting as Superintendent of the State as he was reckoned ‘eminently qualified’ for the office. His appointment as a result was sanctioned by the Government of India on the recommendation of the Local Government. He was instructed to carry on the administration as far as possible in conformity with the local laws and usages.⁸⁵

After assuming the charge of the States in April 1875 A.D he used his energy and efforts in improving every single branch of its administration and the Lieutenant – Governor was highly impressed with the benefits of his superintendence. In his passion for reforming the administration of the Kapurthala State, he foisted two Europeans officers into the State service- one as Assistant Engineer and the other as Headmaster of the Randhir College. In August 1875 he submitted a suggestion to the effect that one of the Kapurthala regiments be allowed to be encamped for a month with the nearest English Brigade and joins in the field work and Brigade parades. Pointing towards his proposal he remarked:

I cannot but believe the result would be good; other states would be anxious to follow the example and the training afforded would make serviceable troops of the now half disciplined forces of feudatory States, which should be an important part of the

-
- (iv) *The Law inheritance to Chiefships as observed by the Sikhs previous to the Annexation of Punjab, Lahore, 1869.*
 - (v) *Ranjit Singh*, Reprint, Delhi, 1957.
 - (vi) *Sikhism and the Sikhs*, an article contributed to the book, *The Great Religions of the World*, London, 1905.
 - (vii) *Famous Monuments of Central India*, London, 1886.
 - (viii) *The Great Republic*, London, 1884.
 - (ix) *Women’s Influence in the East*, with an Introduction, 1892.
 - (x) *Our North West Frontier*, Allahabad, 1881, printed 27 pages for circulation.

⁸⁵ Government of India to Punjab Government, Dated 1 March 1875, Foreign Department, Secret, March, 1875, no. 68. (National Archive of India.) (Hereafter N.A.I).

imperial military strength and accustomed to work with British troops, unless accepted by the Government, as an auxiliary force.⁸⁶

When the issue was referred to Government of India for its consideration, C.U Aitchison and F. Henry, the Secretary and the Under Secretary respectively favored the proposal efficiently.⁸⁷ The Commandant-in-Chief, Lord Napier; however, opposed it on the ground that it would invite similar requests from the other states and cause inconvenience and refusal of their requests would be creates jealousy and possible ill feelings towards Kapurthala.⁸⁸ On the whole, Griffin's administration in the state as Superintendent was much-admired as a marked success till 1876 A.D and in November 1878 A.D he was appointed as permanent Chief Secretary of Punjab. Acknowledging his exceptional and incredible services, the Supreme Government conferred upon him title of C.S.I in July 1879 A.D and that of K.C.S.I in may 1881 A.D. Though Lytton had all praise for him, his successor Ripon did opposite and punished him by sending him to Central India. Unwilling he left Punjab to take the charge of new office and engaged himself there in reforming the Princely States of Gawalior, Indore and Bhopal etc. He aspired to become Lieutenant Governor of Punjab but he was deeply frustrated when his desire could not be fulfilled. In January 1889 A.D he sought to retire on medical ground. After his retirement he got settled in England and evinced keen interest in literature and contemporary politics. He died on 9 March 1908A.D, leaving behind his wife and two sons.⁸⁹

Griffin's principal work relevant to the Princely States was *The Rajas of Punjab* which was published from Lahore in 1870 A.D. This work gives a detailed and wide-ranging account of Princely states of Punjab including Patiala, Jind, Nabha, Kapurthala and Mandi. However, Hill State of Punjab does not fall within the purview of his work as the author considered these states comparatively petty and unimportant. After giving genealogies and early history of these states, he discusses at length the major events of reign of all the Rajas.⁹⁰

⁸⁶ Foreign Department, Political A, May, 1876, no. 224. (N.A.I)

⁸⁷ *Ibid.*, Nos. 223-227.

⁸⁸ *Ibid.*, no. 226, para 2 .

⁸⁹ For Further Detail See : Biographical Details of Griffin , *Dictionary of National Biography*, vol, i. 1901 -1911, 1976, pp. 167-169.

⁹⁰ Ala Singh, Amar Singh, Sahib Singh, Karam Singh, Narinder Singh, Mahinder Singh of Patiala State, Gajpat Singh, Bhag Singh, Fateh Singh, Sangat Singh, Sarup Singh and Ragubir Singh of Jind

He dilates upon the conquests and military exploits of the Chiefs not ignoring their flaws and mistakes. He gives lively remarks about the character and conduct of the chiefs. Some occurrence may be given here in this regards about Raja Narinder Singh of Patiala he writes that:

“Narinder Singh had inherited from his father and grandfather a jealousy of British Government and a disposition to assert his own dignity, privileges and pretensions in a factious and litigious spirit which turned every inquiry into conflict, which Government were compelled to make.”⁹¹

About chief of Kapurthala named Fateh Singh he detect that “ He has very fair reputation and is looked upon by the disaffected as the fit person to be put at the head of confederacy to throw off the yoke; but he is evidently not a revolutionist; he is mild and good natured, seemingly simple, and undoubtedly wanting energy.”⁹² His comments on Pahar Singh of Faridkot were thus:

“The new chief was a liberal- minded and capable man, and immensely improved his territory more than doubling the revenue in twenty years, he founded many new villages and the lightness of the assement, and his reputation for justice and liberty, induced large number of peasants to emigrate from Lahore and Patiala to his territory.”⁹³

Griffin has drawn attention to the fact that some women who were close relatives of Raja Sahib Singh of Patiala played a extremely significant role in the affairs of the state like Rani Rajinder Kaur of Paghware (a first cousin of Late Raja Amar Singh). Rani Sahib kaur, the sister of ruling Raja and Rani Aus Kaur the wife of Raja, regarding the role of these women he observes:

“Rani Rajinder was one of the most notable women of her age.

she possessed all the virtues which men pretend are their own.

State, Hamir Singh, Jaswant Singh, Devinder Singh, Bharpur Singh and Hira Singh of Nabha State, Jassa Singh Ahluwalia, Bhag Singh, Nihal Singh, Randhir Singh , and Kharak Singh of Kapurthala State, Mohar Singh , Gulab Singh, Attar Singh, Pahar Singh and Wazir Singh of were of Faridkot State.

⁹¹ Lepel Henry Griffin, *The Rajas of Punjab*, Low Price Publication, Delhi, Reprint 2014, p. 236.

⁹² *Ibid.*, pp. 478-479.

⁹³ *Ibid.*, p. 562.

bravery perseverance and sagacity, without any mixture of the history and that of Rani Sahib Kaur and Aus Kaur, who some years later conducted with so much ability the affairs of the Patiala state it would almost appear that the Phulkian Chiefs excluded by direct enactment all women from any share of power, from the suspicion that they were able to use it far more sensibly than themselves.”⁹⁴

Griffin has also put light on the administration of the several chiefs. With some exceptions, he has normally presented a gloomy and dismal picture of their administration, particularly during the minority of a Chief; referring to the minority of Raja Sahib Singh of Patiala he shares that:

“For a child, surrounded by greedy and unscrupulous officials, who found their own profit in his weakness and inexperience, there could be little hope of a thriving or happy reign .. during his long minority, the general rule of practice is corruption of the grossest and most unblushing kind.”⁹⁵

Likewise Lepel Griffin states that during the minority of Raja Sangat Singh of Jind the affairs of the state “fell into the utmost confusion; the territory was ill managed, the people discontented... the mismanagement states on the border.”⁹⁶

Griffin traces relation with Princely states of Punjab in petty details on the basis of the reliable material. He shares the content of the Proclamation of 3 May 1809 A.D by which the Cis-Sutlej Chiefs were taken under the protection of East India Company against the authority and the control of the Maharaja Ranjit Singh. He cites various instances which show necessity of British Government to interfere in the

⁹⁴ Lepel Henry Griffin, *The Rajas of Punjab*, p. 67.

⁹⁵ *Ibid.*, pp. 52, 61.

⁹⁶ *Ibid.*, pp. 322, 326.

internal affairs of the Chiefships. The cases of British intervention were many in order to settle the disputes related to the succession matters in states as for example to set aside will of Raja Bhag Singh of Jind who had considered Partap Singh as his successor⁹⁷ and to uphold the legitimate claim of Karam Singh against Ajit Singh.⁹⁸

The British authority also intervened authoritatively to settle the disputes among the chiefs and between the chiefs and their feudatories, as they did in the matters of prolonged dispute between Patiala and Nabha over Doladhi⁹⁹ and between Nabha and the Sikh feudatories of Lidhran and Sonthi.¹⁰⁰ In 1829 A.D the protected chiefs were not allowed to accept any Jagir from Maharaja Ranjit Singh.¹⁰¹

The Sikh chiefs rendered services to their British power from the time when the latter was involved in the wars and Griffin has alluded to such services, as the Raja of Kapurthala and the Nabha offered their services to the British during the First Afghan War.¹⁰² In the course of two Anglo Sikh wars, the chiefs of Patiala, Jind, Faridkot provided all possible assistance to the British.¹⁰³ The loyalty of Kapurthala and Nabha during the First Anglo Sikh war had been doubtful¹⁰⁴ but during the second Anglo-Sikh War, Kapurthala proved its loyalty towards British.¹⁰⁵ During the revolt of 1857-58 A.D the Maharaja of Patiala, Raja of Jind, Kapurthala, Nabha and Faridkot rendered prominent services to the British for which they were rewarded. Lepel Griffin has given a detailed account of such services.

While sharing the account of the Sikh Chiefship of Punjab Griffin has made noticeable references to Maharaja Ranjit Singh, the Sikh ruler of Lahore and his relation with these Cis-Sutlej Chiefs.

The foremost merit of Griffin's work *The Rajas Of Punjab* is that he gives a comprehensive and thorough account of all aspects of the rule of the Native Chiefs.

⁹⁷ Lepel Henry Griffin, *The Rajas of Punjab*, pp. 309-322.

⁹⁸ *Ibid.*, pp. 155-157.

⁹⁹ *Ibid.*, pp. 157-160.

¹⁰⁰ *Ibid.*, pp. 392-396.

¹⁰¹ *Ibid.*, pp. 324-325.

¹⁰² *Ibid.*, pp. 394-396.

¹⁰³ *Ibid.*, pp. 184-187, 351-54, 564-565.

¹⁰⁴ *Ibid.*, pp. 496-502, 410-417.

¹⁰⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 502.

He had not even ignored the minutest detail of any event. Evidently, he worked hard to collect all the information from the various sources which could be available to him. He not only depended on the British official records but also himself gathered and compiled information on the basis of the personal interviews with the chiefs and also from their private records. The author claims that “No chapter of Indian History has ever been written so unreservedly or with so much detail as the present volume.”¹⁰⁶ His account constitutes a thorough history of the Sikh Chiefships of the region from their remote origin up to 1870 A.D.

Griffin’s work all said and done, is highly motivated. He seeks to defend the British policy and sings the glories of British imperialism. He writes in his prefatory note to *The Rajas of Punjab* as given below:

“The policy of English Government so far as the Sikh States are concerned has been uniformity benevolence, enlightened and just; that in no single instance has it abused its strength to oppress its weaker neighbors, but that , on the contrary, It has taken less than its undoubted right, and has decided disputed questions with a kindness and disinterestedness which will be looked for in vain in the administration of any other country.”¹⁰⁷

He also states that the “Government of India has had one policy and one alone, whether Punjab or Oudhe or Bengal was concerned.” In other words Griffin believes that the British career of the conquest in India was entirely clean and unblemished. He ignores the crooked means which the British authorities had adopted, like in the annexation of Sind, Punjab, Sitara, Jhansi, Nagrpur, Oudh etc.

Not only this, Griffin also criticize all those British writers and historians who have condemned the British policy in bold and open manner, According to him, who “believed that the county was won by most unjustifiable means that each new province added to British India signified new crimes and that the conquerors were only successful because they were unscrupulous.”¹⁰⁸ Such Englishmen, as per him , “have neither the means nor

¹⁰⁷ Lepel Henry Griffin, *The Rajas of Punjab*, preface, ii.

¹⁰⁸ *Ibid.*, preface, iii.

the inclination to inform themselves the truth... when either find it profitable to abuse their country or who are so unfortunate as to be able to find nothing but national shame and incapacity where others would find monuments of national energy and glory.”¹⁰⁹

Of the various Phulkian families Griffin treated the history of Patiala state with huge details owing to its size and importance in the Cis-Sutlej politics. Its ruler, he, points out, was “ the acknowledged head of the Sikhs” while his service “ during the darkest and doubtful days of mutiny’ was “ worth a brigade of English troops” “to tranquilize the people than hundred official disclaimer would have done.”¹¹⁰

Though, Lepel Griffin also mentions the early History of Cis-Sutlej chiefs but he himself shares that “He his chief desire to record the British relations of the Cis-Sutlej from the time of conquest of Delhi by Lord Lake in 1803 A.D; Its history and policy which British Government had adopted towards its feudatories.” His efficiency can be traced from his work because he shares only general history of chiefs and no reference of any foot note is being shared until British advent in Cis-sutlej chief history. It can be understand from this chapter that every historian prior to Lepel Griffin which had wrote history of Punjab one thing was common among them when they shared the History of 19th century; they focused only on Maharaja Ranjit Singh and neglect the other chiefs of Cis-Sutlej. Until now large and extensive work has been done on the Maharaja Ranjit Singh by numerous scholars and historians while Cis-Sutlej chiefs had also played an important role in history of Punjab.

During 1757 A.D Cis- Sutlej States were formally ceded by Ahmed Shah Durrani. In 1761 A.D Durrani recognized Ala Singh as one of the administrator of *Chakla* Sirhind specified the nature of *Chaudrie Zamindari*, *Faujdari* and *Jagir* assignment to him in the name of villages and *parganas*.¹¹¹ In 1762 A.D title of Raja was given to Ala Singh. Much detailed work has been done on Ala Singh. But period of 1803A.D to 1870 A.D which is much

¹⁰⁹ Lepel Henry Griffin, *The Rajas of Punjab*, pp. 213-14.

¹¹⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 284.

¹¹¹ B.N Grover, An Analysis of Cotemporary Durrani Revenue Documents and Correspondence Pertaining to the Patiala Chieftainship, *Punjab Past and Present*, Vol. XXIV-I, April, 1990, p. 231.

important period in Punjab because Mughals and Marathas had lost their power and during this period Sikh and British powers became center of politics in Punjab. As it has been told earlier that not much work has been done as Cis Sutlej states centered except Lepel Griffin so most of the writers who have written some accounts on the subject of these Princely States subsequently had inevitably to borrow most of the information from Griffin's work. It should be noted that Lepel Griffin was Pro-British. His twofold objective of writing about Sikh Chief to justifying the British imperialistic policy and ensuring the Sikh chiefs towards British is the reason that he chooses to discuss about only few of the many Chiefs which bears the title of Rajas. Lepel Griffin claims that British policy in respect of Cis-Sutlej was consistently liberal and generous. However, his view got contradicted when he put a number of examples about the absorption of Sikh chief ship by British in unjust manner. It has been discussed in next chapters.

So propose study is focused on Lepel Griffin's work *The Rajas of Punjab*. An attempt has been made to analyze the political relation of the British with Cis-Sutlej states of Patiala, Nabha, Jind, Kapurthala and Faridkot from 1803 A.D up to 1870 A.D from historical perspective." So basically purpose of the purposed study is to derive the authentic and unbiased information from this valuable source. Not only the relation of Cis-Sutlej with British has been examined but also other matters related to Cis-Sutlej States have also been discussed in case study.¹¹²

Chapter – 2

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN BRITISH GOVERNMENT AND CIS-SUTLEJ STATES

Beginning of 19th century was of historically important in the concern of political history of Princely states of the Punjab. During this time period leading powers like Marathas and Mughals were fading away from Indian political scenario. Year by year red line was advancing further to the north. This red line was marked by British possession which played great role in politics of Punjab. Lepel Griffin's book *The Rajas of Punjab* covers this essential time period. 1803 A.D was the year when Princely states of Punjab had started building up their relations with British.

Patiala:

Lepel Griffin commencing from the rise of British power in India tells that on 11 September 1803 A.D General Lake defeated the Maratha army which was under the command of Bourquin in Delhi and succeeded to access the capital of India and also took over Gurgaon and Agra from Maratha. Many minor chiefs like Gurdit Singh Ladwa, Bhag Singh of Thanesar had taken side of Marathas in the battle fought against the British. However, Phulkian¹ chiefs didn't fight against British.² According to S.N Banerjee, Phulkian chiefs were long before in the correspondence of British and were seeking to attain benefit from the British therefore they kept themselves assiduously aloof from the battle³. Raja Bhag Singh and Lal Singh joined English forces; it has been mentioned in Jind state.⁴

Lepel Griffin tells that after losing battle from British Jaswant Rao Holkar came to Punjab in hope to get aid from the Sikh Chiefs. He remained at Patiala for few days but failed to

¹ For detail of Phulkian States see; Appendix I.

² Lepel Henry Griffin, *The Rajas of Punjab*, Low Price Publication, Delhi, Reprint, 2014, p. 89. See also; Bikram Jit Hasrat, *Anglo Sikh Relations 1799-1849*, Research Institute Book Agency, Hoshiarpur, 1968, pp. 40-41. See also; Joseph Davey Cunningham, *A History of the Sikhs*, Ahlemarle Street, London, 1863, p. 127.

³ S.N Banerjee, *History of Patiala*, Vol. I, N.D., p. 9.

⁴ *Infra*, 49.

get assistance from Raja Sahib Singh of Patiala⁵ on the other hand General Lake had entered Punjab in pursuit. Therefore, he left for Amritsar.⁶ Bhakt Mal and Abdul Khan Majid verify Griffin's account.⁷ As per W.H Allen, Rani Aas Kaur's relations were not good with Raja of Patiala,⁸ she endeavored to make Holkar instrumental to her views and Holkar was willing to take benefits for their dispute but being pressed by the time and in consequence approach of Lord Lake he had to leave.⁹ According to Joseph Davey Cunningham and *Phulkian State Gazetteers*, Amir Khan Ruhela had also come with Holkar in Patiala.¹⁰ Holkar's meeting with Maharaja Ranjit Singh has been discussed in Third chapter.¹¹

Lepel Griffin inscribes that after proclamation of 1809 A.D matter of mismanagement in Patiala reached at peak. On 9th January 1811 A.D Ochterlony (Political agent to Governor General of India at Ludhiana Agency) was invited by Raja Sahib Singh and other Phulikan chiefs. Raja want to place administration under his step mother Rani Khem Kaur but Ochterlony was in favor of Rani Aas Kaur.¹² According to *Ludhiana Agency Records* and K.M Pannikar, Rani Khem Kaur's pernicious influence on Raja was the major reason for malaise of the state therefore Ochterlony preferred Rani Aas Kaur.¹³ As per the records of *Ludhiana State Agency* Raja was forced to give the administration to Rani Aas Kaur instead of Rani Khem Kaur. Raja of

⁵ Raja Sahib Singh was born on 18 August 1773 A.D. His father Raja Amar Singh was ruler of Patiala. At the age of seven he got succession to the throne of Patiala 1781 A.D. Under the influence of his grandmother Rani Hukum Kaur, Nanu Mal Aggarwal was appointed Prime Minister. He died on 26 March of 1813 A.D.

⁶ Lepel Henry Griffin, *The Rajas of Punjab*, p. 92.

⁷ Bhakt Mal (trans.), *Khalsanama*, Punjab Historical Studies, Punjabi University, Patiala, p. 104. See also Colonel Mohd. Abdul Majid Khan, *A Short History of Patiala State*, Rajinder Press, Patiala, 1910, p. 3.

⁸ For early geographical details of Patiala State see; Appendix I.

⁹ W.H Allen, *History of Punjab; Rise Progress and Present Condition of Sect and Nation of Sikh People*, Vol. I, Leaden Hall Street, London, 1846, p. 279.

¹⁰ Joseph Davey Cunningham, *A History of The Sikhs*, p. 128. See also; Punjab State Gazetteers, *Phulkian States*, Vol. XVII., Punjab Government Press, Lahore 1904, p.78.

¹¹ *Infra*, p. 73.

¹² Lepel Henry Griffin, *The Rajas of Punjab*, pp. 134-135. See also; *Records of Ludhiana Agency 1809-1815*, Punjab Government Press, Lahore, 1911, p. 247.

¹³ K.N Pannikar, *British Diplomacy in North India*, Associated Publishing, New Delhi, p. 107. See in detail; Ochterlony to Edmonstone, 9 March 1811, *Records of Ludhiana Agency 1809-1815*, pp. 246-248.

Jind and Nabha's influence was also used to put pressure on Raja of Patiala, so he could agree upon to change his decision in favor of Rani Aas Kaur.¹⁴

Lepel Griffin further mentions that certain actions for reforms were taken with the consent of Raja and Bhai Lal Singh; Rani Aas Kaur was made the *diwani* or administrator, on the condition that all of the business was to be conducted under the name of Raja Sahib Singh. Extravagant grant of lands were resumed and Jagirdar were compelled to keep their contingents ready for service.¹⁵

However, the Government was not in favor of interference of the Ochterlony in personal matter of Patiala. According to Government the situation in every protected state was the same and if they would interfere in one matter even on the demand of chiefs than they would have to look after other states too. As per the policy of 3 May of 1809 A.D.¹⁶ they didn't want to break their own rule by directly interfering in the state matter so Government ordered Ochterlony to limit his interference.¹⁷ Through the official letter of Edmonstone, the decision of Government to stop interference can be traced.¹⁸ However, decision of Government could not stop Ochterlony instead Ochterlony exclaimed that it was us who saved the Cis-Sutlej chiefs from wrath of Maharaja Ranjit Singh therefore in return of substantial benefit a demand of the body of horse when required could be derived. Ochterlony further remarks that "I hereby presume to think that, we are entitled to assume such a control as will ensure to us a slight return not merely for security and protection but for actual existence as a Government."¹⁹ It can be assumed that mismanagement was just an excuse because when Raja Sahib Singh failed to furnish supply of horsemen than Ochterlony decided to give the administration of the Patiala to his trusted ones and Rani Aas's relation were not good with Raja Sahib Singh and Rani had also expressed her

¹⁴ Ochterlony to Edmonstone, 4 May 1811, *Records of Ludhiana Agency 1809-1815*, pp. 262-263.

¹⁵ Lepel Henry Griffin, *The Rajas of Punjab*, p. 135.

¹⁶ For detail of 'Treaty of 3rd May 1809' see; Appendix II.

¹⁷ Lepel Henry Griffin, *The Rajas of Punjab*, p. 136.

¹⁸ For detail of Government Order See; N.B Edmonstone to Ochterlony, 5 April 1811, *Records of Ludhiana Agency 1809-1815*, pp. 256-259.

¹⁹ Mia Bashir Ahmed Farooqi, *British Relations with Cis-Sutlej States 1809-1823*, Punjab Government Records Lahore, 1971, p. 20

desire to obey the orders according to British Government therefore she was perfect for Ochterlony.²⁰

Lepel Griffin point out that now these chiefs had no fear of Maharaja Ranjit Singh so these powerful chiefs started to absorb smaller ones. To stop them Government issued second proclamation to thwart the violence and disturbance.²¹ As per the opinion of J.D Cunningham encroachment didn't cease at once by issuing the *sanads*.²² From the account of Colonel G.B Malleeson, *Ludhiana State Agency* and C.V Aitchison reason of issuing second *Sanad* find similar.²³

Lepel Griffin again talks about the administration which had come under Aas Kaur. She did well in her state. Revenue increased and Jagirdgar compelled to supply contingents so by December 1811 A.D Raja had 2000 cavalry and 2000 foot soldiers.²⁴ As it has been discuss earlier Ochterlony's main motive was to attain service of body of horses from Patiala.

Lepel Griffin further points out that during this peaceful management of Rani Aas Kaur, evil advisers of Raja; Albel Singh and Gujar Singh started intriguing against Rani because they had been deprived of from their lands because they had been cheating in paying the revenue to state.²⁵ As per *Ludhiana Agency Records*, Albel and Gurdial Singh and Missar Naudha were the member of council which was made to assist Rani Aas Kaur. Nonetheless, Lepel Griffin gives the name of Gurdial Singh as Gujar Singh neither he mention about council nor he mentions about their work.²⁶

²⁰ Lepel Henry Griffin, *The Rajas of Punjab*, p. 134. Also See; *Records of Ludhiana Agency 1809-1815*, p.280.

²¹ Lepel Henry Griffin, *The Rajas of Punjab*, p. 137.

²² Joseph Davey Cunningham, *A History of The Sikhs*, p. 142.

²³ Colonel G. B Malleeson, C.S.I, *An Historical Sketch of Native States of India*, Longman Green, London, 1875, p. 334. See also; C.V, Aitchison, *A Collection of Treaties and Sandas*, Vol. I, Government Printing, Calcutta, 1892, p. 197. Also; Edmonstone to Ochterlony, 5 July 1811, *Records of Ludhiana Agency 1809-1815*, pp. 259-261. For *Sanad* see, Appendix III.

²⁴ Lepel Henry Griffin, *The Rajas of Punjab*, p. 139.

²⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 139-140.

²⁶ Ochterlony to Edmonstone, 8 June 1811, *Records of Ludhiana Agency 1809-1815*, pp. 268-269.

On the persuasion of his adviser Raja Sahib Singh captured Rani Aas Kaur along with her son as well as Misar Diwan Naudha and imprisoned them. But soon Raja realized that administration also fell into disorder therefore he had to released them and he requested the Rani to retake the administration.²⁷ According to S.N Banerjee urge of ambition, attraction towards power and anxiety for her son's future compel Rani Aas to agree with the wish of Raja Sahib Singh.²⁸

Lepel Griffin go on to inscribe that Rani Aas started believing that Raja's next caprice might endanger her life therefore she called Ochterlony to settle the matter. So, Ochterlony arrived at Patiala on 6th April 1812 A.D with sufficient force.²⁹ From the work of Colonel Abdul Majid reason of Ochterlony's arrival found same but no date of arrival is mentioned.³⁰ According to the Mia Bashir Farooqi, Ochterlony came to Patiala on the request of other Phulkian chiefs on the same date.³¹

In the opinion of Lepel Griffin the Raja was coward and imbecile man and no hope to reconcile with him. Raja declined to give assurance of continuity of Rani in written. Therefore Ochterlony had to use the force to support the Rani Aas Kaur.³² Mia Farooqi supports above statement.³³

Lepel Griffin writes further that matter got stretched because Gurdial Singh and his party were again plotting conspiracy against Rani Aas Kaur. Policy of opposition was to induce Raja to leave capital and to send back Ochterlony. Ochterlony attempted to make alliance with

²⁷ Lepel Henry Griffin, *The Rajas of Punjab*, pp. 140-141.

²⁸ S.N Banerjee, *History of Patiala*, Vol. I, N.D., p. 276.

²⁹ Lepel Henry Griffin, *The Rajas of Punjab*, p. 142-143,

³⁰ Col. Mohd. Abdul Majid, *A Short History of Patiala State*, Rajindra Press, May 1910, p. 4.

³¹ Mia Bashir Ahmed Farooqi, *British Relations with Cis-Sutlej States 1809-1823*, Punjab Government Records, Lahore, 1971, p. 23.

³² Lepel Henry Griffin, *The Rajas of Punjab*, p. 144.

³³ Mia Bashir Ahmed Farooqi, *British Relations with Cis-Sutlej States 1809-1823*, p. 21.

opposition but these arrangements found ineffective.³⁴ A report which was sent by Ochterlony on the affairs of Patiala justifies the above statement.³⁵

Ochterlony now recommended that Rani Aas Kaur should be made virtual Regent to save the state from bankruptcy and ruin.³⁶ Raja under the influence of evil counsels formed a plot to murdered Ochterlony. Fortunately it got detected in time.³⁷ Official Letter of Ochterlony register in *Ludhiana Agency*, in which he state that he was attacked by a man with gun and a sword who was sent by Raja but luckily he managed to save himself in fatal attack.³⁸ As per the remarks of S.N Banerjee “It seems to have been an isolated act of a madman rather than the result of a plot engineered by the operation.”³⁹ On the contrary Mia Farooqi tells that though it was suspected that some persons around the Raja had hand in the attack but Ochterlony himself didn’t entertain any such suspicion.⁴⁰

Lepel Griffin writes that Raja at some length pretended to agree to the reduction in expenditure but when he was about to sign on the agreement he changed his decision and said that this agreement was made to deprive him off from his authority completely. Even in addition he doubled his security in a pretext that his life was under threat.⁴¹ *Ludhiana Agency Records* validates Lepel Henry Griffin’s report.⁴²

Lepel Griffin in his account shares that Rani also got scared because Raja had filled fort with Rohillas and Akalis but she could managed to escape on the arrival of British forces in disguise of servant. Than British Government issued a circular that British had interfered on the account of deceit of Raja Sahib Singh and henceforth Rani Aas Kaur would solely act as regent. At the end Raja had to give up. He visited David Ochterlony and gave him the key of the fort

³⁴ Lepel Henry Griffin, *The Rajas of Punjab*, p. 144-145.

³⁵ Ochterlony to Edmonstone, 8 May 1812, *Records of Ludhiana Agency 1809-1815*, pp. 288-292.

³⁶ Lepel Henry Griffin, *The Rajas of Punjab*, p. 145. See also; Ochterlony to Edmonstone, 8 May 1812, *Records of Ludhiana Agency 1809-1815*, pp. 288-292.

³⁷ Lepel Henry Griffin, *The Rajas of Punjab*, p. 146.

³⁸ Ochterlony to Edmonstone, 19 May 1812, *Records of Ludhiana Agency 1809-1815*, pp. 293-295.

³⁹ S.N Banerjee, *History of Patiala*, Vol. I, p. 279.

⁴⁰ Mia Bashir Ahmed Farooqi, *British Relations with Cis-Sutlej States 1809-1823*, p. 24.

⁴¹ Lepel Henry Griffin, *The Rajas of Punjab*, pp. 146-147.

⁴² Ochterlony to Edmonstone, 31 May 1812, *Records of Ludhiana Agency 1809-1815*, pp. 295-300.

even ordered Rohilla's troops to evacuate the fort.⁴³ Mia Farooqi and *Ludhiana State Agency* advocates the above statement.⁴⁴

Lepel Griffin expatiates that direction were issued to all commandants of forts to obey the orders of Rani Aas Kaur. But under the secret orders of Raja of Patiala, commander of Dodan fort refused to obey the Rani. Although Raja Sahib Singh also told to British that commander was disobeying his orders too. Therefore, a detachment was sent and after severe cannonade and by damaging the wall of the fort, British got able to force the rebel commander to surrender. Commander told the British that he had to oppose Rani Aas Kaur only in the accordance with the positive orders. Although confession of commander is given but no such name is given under whose command he was disobeying the Rani's orders. Despite of it Lepel Griffin himself declares that Raja was behind this.⁴⁵ According to Mia Bahsir Farooqi commandant disobeyed the Rani on the secret and positive instruction.⁴⁶ In *Ludhiana Agency Records* it has been given that main instigator were Rani Partap Kaur, her brother Dal Singh and Gujar Singh who have always been possessed an unbound influenced over Raja Sahib Singh.⁴⁷ According to S.N Banerjee commandant disobeyed Rani Aas Kaur on the persuasion of Partap Kaur's Brother Dal Singh.⁴⁸

Lepel Griffin tells that after solving the matter of dispute between Raja Sahib Singh and Rani Aas Kaur when Ochterlony was about to leave on 15th June. He told the Raja that state of Chamokian had been bestowed to his son.⁴⁹ *Ludhiana Agency Records* certifies the transfer of Chamokian to his son Karam Singh⁵⁰ but here it should be noted that village was granted to his son without informing or having any discussion with Raja Sahib Singh. The decision was taken solemnly by David Ochterlony. Although British Government had asked his agents to stop

⁴³ Lepel Henry Griffin, *The Rajas of Punjab*, p. 148.

⁴⁴ Mia Bashir Ahmed Farooqi, *British Relations with Cis-Sutlej States 1809-1823*, p. 25. See also; Ochterlony to Edmonstone, 31 May 1812, *Records of Ludhiana Agency 1809-1815*, pp. 295-300.

⁴⁵ Lepel Henry Griffin, *The Rajas of Punjab*, p. 149.

⁴⁶ Mia Bashir Ahmed Farooqi, *British Relations with Cis-Sutlej States 1809-1823*, p. 25.

⁴⁷ Ochterlony to Edmonstone, 19 June 1812, *Records of Ludhiana Agency 1809-1815*, pp. 301-303.

⁴⁸ S.N Banerjee, *History of Patiala*, Vol. I, p. 280.

⁴⁹ Lepel Henry Griffin, *The Rajas of Punjab*, p. 150.

⁵⁰ Ochterlony to Edmonstone, 19 June 1812, *Records of Ludhiana Agency 1809-1815*, p. 304.

interfering in the matters of states but interference was being never stopped. According to Giani Gian Singh, village Chamokian had been given back to Nand Singh⁵¹ but when he started looting the British territory than they gave it back to Patiala.

Lepel Griffin mentions that due to extravagant expenses of Raja of Patiala from the treasury made British Government to put limitations on the powers of Raja. So, Rani Aas Kaur was made sole authority of Private Royal Treasury and monthly allowance of Raja was reduced to 12,000 per month.⁵² From Mia Bashir's account similar statement can be trace.⁵³

Lepel Griffin in his work explains the character of Misar Naudha, who was chief adviser of Rani. He tells that though chief was of unpopular character but he set to bring reforms. Thus, he became the target of his enemy first they tried to insinuate that he was indulge in carrying out intrigues with Rani against Raja but this absolute false charge got disapproved. Then they planned to murder the Missar Nauda but plot to murder him came into light due to Dal Singh, brother of Partap Kaur.⁵⁴ Lepel Griffin again blames Raja for this but according to Giani Gian Singh, Rani Kehm Kaur under the influence of Raja of Nabha planned to kill the Misar Naudha. She had given covetousness that after death of Sahib Singh, throne will be given to her son Ajit Singh.⁵⁵ As per *Ludhiana State Agency Records* heir and successor of Raja Sahib Singh were behind the murder conspiracy.⁵⁶

Lepel Griffin further elaborates that Raja Sahib Singh suddenly fell ill and died on 26th March 1813 A.D reason of his death was excessive drinking. Suspicion arose that Raja Sahib Singh died because he had given poison but Government denied it. Lepel Griffin by taking Rani's side exclaims that Rani Aas Kaur couldn't desire to give poison to Raja because she could

⁵¹ Nand Singh was chief of Chamokian village. He attacked upon friends of Patiala state. Therefore Patiala state seized his fort. But Ochterlony ordered Patiala to restore plundered property to Nand Singh. Patiala said that Nand Singh was their own feudatory but Ochterlony replied that he was under the Nishanwalia chiefs. Therefore in 1810 A.D Nand Singh regained the fort.

⁵² Lepel Henry Griffin, *The Rajas of Punjab*, p. 151.

⁵³ Mia Bashir Ahmed Farooqi, *British Relations with Cis-Sutlej States 1809-1823*, p. 25.

⁵⁴ Lepel Henry Griffin, *The Rajas of Punjab*, p. 153.

⁵⁵ Giani Gian Singh, *Raj Khalsa*, Part II, Lassen Street Northridge, U.S.A, N.D, p. 51.

⁵⁶ Ochterlony to J.Adam, 2 April 1813, *Records of Ludhiana Agency 1809-1815*, p. 335.

lose her seat.⁵⁷ Mia Bashir justify the death date.⁵⁸ According to Giani Gian Singh he died due to a fester wound.⁵⁹ Most important point to be noted here is that David Ochterlony himself agrees that reason of Raja's death was his hate towards Rani Aas Kaur and British Government. He had started to spent secluded life and kept his odium preserved with the obstinacy till end of his life. Therefore, it can be said and can also simply assume that Raja Sahib Singh was being neglected by his Rani and British Government and many restriction were imposed upon him gradually so consequently he started drinking alcohol in excess and died. Even a physician had given a hint that Raja might have given poison but David Ochterlony rejected it without investigating it.⁶⁰ It can also be seen that even Government felt happy that suspicion of death which had been excited that death of Raja was occasioned by poison have been satisfactorily removed. Despite ordering the investigation Government made a lame excuse and put blame over a particular party of Darbar that this party wanted to regain administration by removing Rani Aas Kaur and Miser Naudha.⁶¹

Lepel Griffin accepts that interference of British Government in Patiala state was of complete failure. Because Rani's most judicious measures had been thwarted. So, troops which were being paid more regularly than ever became dissatisfied and mutinous. But after the death of Raja Sahib Singh British changed their policy and stopped interfering in the Patiala state.⁶² From David Ochterlony and Government's correspondence without any doubt it can be judged that British policy of interference in Patiala state was a major failure.⁶³ S.N Banerjee claims on the behalf of judging the Ochterlony's letters that administration of Rani Aas Kaur was not so good which David Ochterlony had claimed. Ochterlony himself criticized the action of the Regent and her administration not only in single letter but in many even he pointed out some of her measures too. He shares that she instigated the opposition by establishing a Thana in property

⁵⁷ Lepel Henry Griffin, *The Rajas of Punjab*, p. 153.

⁵⁸ Mia Bashir Ahmed Farooqi, *British Relations with Cis-Sutlej States 1809-1823*, p. 26.

⁵⁹ Giani Gian Singh, *Raj Khalsa*, Part II, p. 52.

⁶⁰ Ochterlony to J. Adam, 2 April 1813, *Records of Ludhiana Agency 1809-1815*, p. 336.

⁶¹ J. Adam to Ochterlony, 30 April 1813, *Records of Ludhiana Agency 1809-1815*, p. 336.

⁶² Lepel Henry Griffin, *The Rajas of Punjab*, p. 154.

⁶³ Ochterlony to J. Adam, 2 April 1813, *Records of Ludhiana Agency 1809-1815*, p. 335. See also; J. Adam to Ochterlony, 30 April 1813, p. 337.

of Mai Kehm Kaur and attempted to confiscate the Jagir of Partap Kaur. He further add that Rani Aas Kaur's administration of 1811 A.D was attended with fair measures of success because it had support of ruler lacking this in the 1812-13 A.D as Ochterlony's admission proved to be different in result and character.⁶⁴

Lepel Griffin narrates that new Raja Karam Singh was under the influence of his mother and agreed to leave administration in her hands and in Misar Naudha.⁶⁵ According to Giani Gian Singh at first Raja Karam Singh was not willing to give the charge to Missar Naudha.⁶⁶

Lepel Griffin writes that David Ochterlony was present at installation ceremony of new Raja on 30th June.⁶⁷ Colonel Abdul Majid supports the claim of Lepel Griffin.⁶⁸

Lepel Griffin describes that on 1st November 1814 A.D British declared war with Gurkhas. Raja of Patiala took part in war and he had been engaged in repelling the encroachments under the order of Governor General's agent at Ludhiana. He regained the villages Mundlaian and Berowali.⁶⁹ Gurkha war and role of Patiala can be trace in *Ludhiana Records* and in the work of Colonel Abdul Majid.⁷⁰

Lepel Griffin further elaborates that infantry of Raja of Patiala had been employed with Colonel David Ochterlony and a portion of his cavalry had been deployed in guarding the foot hills of Ropar. For his services British Government conferred upon him 16 *pargannas* in exchange of *nazarana* worth Rs.1,50,000 and issued a *sanad*.⁷¹ As given in *Punjab State Gazetteers* total *nazarana* paid worth Rs.1,28,000.⁷² However, *sanad* given in C.V Aitchison

⁶⁴ S.N Banerjee, *History of Patiala*, Vol. I, pp. 283-284.

⁶⁵ Lepel Henry Griffin, *The Rajas of Punjab*, p. 155.

⁶⁶ Giani Gian Singh, *Raj Khalsa*, Part II, p. 53.

⁶⁷ Lepel Henry Griffin, *The Rajas of Punjab*, p. 156.

⁶⁸ Col. Mohd. Abdul Majid, *A Short History of Patiala State*, p. 4.

⁶⁹ Lepel Henry Griffin, *The Rajas of Punjab*, p. 157.

⁷⁰ Ochterlony to J. Adam, 28 October 1813, *Records of Ludhiana Agency 1809-1815*, p. 344. See also; Col. Mohd. Abdul Majid, *A Short History*, p. 5.

⁷¹ Lepel Henry Griffin, *The Rajas of Punjab*, p. 158.

⁷² *Punjab District Gazetteer*, Vol. XVII - A, Punjab Government Press, Lahore, 1904, p. 48.

gives exact information which is being given in *The Rajas of Punjab*.⁷³ In *Memoranda of Information*, Colonel Abdul Majid and in account of Colonel G.B Malleson fees paid for *nazarana* is given Rs. 2,80,000.⁷⁴

As given in *The Rajas of Punjab* administration of Patiala was working well under the command of Rai and Missar Naudha. But Raja Karam Singh again fell into the hands of ill advisers and determined to remove both from the power. Missar Nudha blamed that his life was in danger and accused Raja and Bhai Lal Singh for this however nothing wrong found against accused, than hereafter Raja Karam Singh took possession of whole power in his own hands.⁷⁵ According to S.N Banerjee, Missar Naudha blamed only Bhai Lal Singh for conspiracy not the Raja.⁷⁶ It has been given in *Captain Birch's Notebook* that Raja wanted to take charge in his own hands and wanted to replace Rani Aas Kaur and Missar Naudha but Government on hearing this, sent him a letter giving strict warning and told that both had been appointed by Government and Raja Karam Singh could not replace them.⁷⁷

As stated in *The Rajas of Punjab*, Raja Karam Singh not only took power in his hands but also made Missar Naudha his Chief Minister and appointed several of his own friends into important office.⁷⁸ According to Muhammad Hasan Khan, by the order of Metclaf of Delhi Resident, Missar Naudha was appointed on seat of Chief Minister.⁷⁹ It has been given in *Captain Birch's Dairy* that Misser Naudha was appointed by British Government by giving strict warning to Raja related it.⁸⁰

⁷³ C.V, Aitchison, *A Collection of Treaties and Sandas*, Vol. I, Government Printing, Calcutta, 1892, p. 199.

⁷⁴ N.D., *Memoranda of Information Regarding Certain Native Chiefs*, N.D, p. 2. See also; Col. Mohd. Abdul Majid, p. 5. Also; Colonel G. B Malleson C.S.I, *An Historical Sketch of Native States of India*, Longman Green, London, 1875, p. 334.

⁷⁵ Lepel Henry Griffin, *The Rajas of Punjab*, p. 158.

⁷⁶ S.N Banerjee, *History of Patiala*, Vol. II, N.D, p. 2.

⁷⁷ Captain G. Birch, *Selection From Notebook Kept By Captain G. Birch 1818-1821*, Superintendent, Government Printing Punjab, Lahore, p. 35.

⁷⁸ Lepel Henry Griffin, *The Rajas of Punjab*, p. 159.

⁷⁹ Muhhamad Sayed Hasan Khan, *Tarikh-i-Patiala*, Safir-Hind Press, Amritsar 1878, p. 265.

⁸⁰ Captain G. Birch, *Selection from Notebook Kept By Captain G. Birch 1818-1821*, p. 35.

Lepel Griffin further elaborates that Raja Karam Singh himself took the charge of Treasury, Household and Revenue Department. On the other side British Government ordered that no inference would be made from now on. Because it was inevitable that Raja would acquire the power sooner or later.⁸¹ According to Hasan Khan, Government had no reason to stop Raja Karam Singh and had to dissolve the Regency.⁸²

Lepel Griffin elucidate that, Misar Naudha died soon in 1818 A.D while he was returning from Jowala Mukhi pilgrimage than Raja Karam Singh appointed Barkat Ali Khan as a Chief Minister, who was the native of Oudh and remained under the service of David Ochterlony earlier.⁸³ As told by Hasan Khan, Barkat Khan was also appointed on the order of British Government.⁸⁴

Lepel Griffin further inscribes that Rani Aas Kaur had been the sole head of Toshkhana, Treasury and Jewel House and she had increased her Jagir from 50,000 to approximately 2 Lakh which had been granted in 1807 A.D for maintenance of her and her son. Hasan khan supports Lepel Griffin claim.⁸⁵ According to Mia Farooqi, Rani increased her jagir from 50,000 to 7 Lakh.⁸⁶

Lepel Griffin further mentions that due to sole possession of Rani Aas Kaur over treasury irritated Raja Karam Singh, suddenly a quarrel between Barkat Ali Khan and Pathan leader Wazir Khan took place whereas Wazir Khan was in favor of Rani Aas Kaur. Raja started believing that his mother wanted to start a revolt against him. Therefore he requested British officer of Karnal to interfere in the matter. Political agent declared Raja Karam Singh a sole and absolute power and Rani Aas Kaur agreed to move to Sanour. She also agreed to abstain from all kinds of interference.⁸⁷

⁸¹ Lepel Henry Griffin, *The Rajas of Punjab*, p. 160.

⁸² Muhhamad Sayed Hasan Khan, *Tarikh-i-Patiala*, p. 265.

⁸³ Lepel Henry Griffin, *The Rajas of Punjab*, p. 160.

⁸⁴ Muhhamad Sayed Hasan Khan, *Tarikh-i-Patiala*, p. 265.

⁸⁵ Muhhamad Sayed Hasan Khan, *Tarikh-i-Patiala*, p. 265.

⁸⁶ Mia Bashir Ahmed Farooqi, *British Relations with Cis-Sutlej States 1809-1823*, p. 26.

⁸⁷ Lepel Henry Griffin, *The Rajas of Punjab*, p. 161. See also; Giani Gian Singh, *Raj Khalsa*, Part II, p. 55.

Lepel Griffin refers to the fact that two important points were not settled. First, huge amount of territory claimed by Rani Aas Kaur as her Jagir and second, the custody of *Toshkhana*. Rani Aas Kaur carried away the *Toshkhana* with her to Sunour. From Hasan Khan's account it can be trace that Rani took *Toshkhana* with her.⁸⁸ According to S.N Banerjee, Captain Birch had taken the responsibility for the arrangement of *Toshkhana* for which prior consent of ruler was not obtained.⁸⁹

As per the statement of David Ochterlony which is given in *The Rajas of Punjab*, Rani Aas Kaur had left with no right over the territory. Captain Birch had allowed Rani Aas Kaur to take treasure, believing that it would remain safe with her and Rani had promised to send correct list of its content to her son. However, she had not done so and sent an improper memorandum.⁹⁰ However, Hasan Khan tells that Raja Karam Singh complained against Rani Aas Kaur that she had taken some costly items from *Toshkhana* with her, so he complained about it to British officer.⁹¹

Raja Karam Singh proposed a proposal that Rani Aas Kaur should return to Patiala and in favor which she would be given Rs. 50,000 every year for her maintenance. She was also told to bring back *Toshkhana* to Patiala. Government considered this proposal of his just and fine. Therefore, in October 1823 A.D Captain Murray, Political Agent was sent to assist the Raja to implement his legitimate wishes.⁹² Every statement found to be same in work of Hasan Khan.⁹³

Lepel Griffin tells that when agent arrived and made demand, than Rani Aas Kaur tried to present bribe for the continuity of existing arrangement but officer rejected her offer and she was brought back to fort. At first she refused to accept the settlement and also refused to stay in Amargarh. Raja Karam Singh didn't want to hurt her mother so he gave her the fort of Sanour

⁸⁸ Muhhamad Sayed Hasan Khan, *Tarikh-i-Patiala*, p. 265.

⁸⁹ S.N Banerjee, *History of Patiala*, Vol. II, p. 6.

⁹⁰ Lepel Henry Griffin, *The Rajas of Punjab*, p. 162.

⁹¹ Muhhamad Sayed Hasan Khan, *Tarikh-i-Patiala*, p. 265.

⁹² Lepel Henry Griffin, *The Rajas of Punjab*, p. 163.

⁹³ Muhhamad Sayed Hasan Khan, *Tarikh-i-Patiala*, p. 266. See also; From Elliot to Murray, 29 September 1823, *Press List of Old Records In the Punjab Secretariat 1809-1840*, Punjab Government Lahore, 1911, no. 24 and 22 October 1823, no. 23.

and also gave her the possession of estate worth Rs.50,000.⁹⁴ Same judgment is traceable in *Tarikh-i-Patiala*.⁹⁵

It is worth to mention that it was a legitimate right of Raja Karam Singh to get his throne because he had become capable to run the state. Lepel Griffin tries to hide the inference of British Government when Raja demanded his right from Government and Government instead of giving him the full fledged charge of his state deliberately harass him by daunting letters and by compelling him to keep Missar Naudha in his office against his will and on the other hand due to British Government, tussle between son and mother got stretched. Even Government repeatedly interfered in the matter of Patiala state of which government had promised number of times not to do so in matter of state.

British Government was in ambiguity. British Government could not deny the right of Maharaja who was of competent age and understating to assume the direct and uncontrolled management of affairs as his legitimate right. The cession of Regency of Rani Aas Kaur would have the effect, on the one hand, of pacifying the jealousies and discontents which were attributable to the nature of prevailing conditions of things and on the other of throwing Missar Naudha out of power. The British liked the one and disliked the other of these effects. The advantages which had been deprived from the connection which Patiala under the administration of Rani Aas Kaur and Naudha Missar were so appreciated by Governor General in Council that make them so reluctant to change of system which might destroy their influence hitherto exercised so beneficiary to the interest of state. Hence British Government asked Raja Karam Singh not to disturb the existing settlement.

British Government had no objection to termination of the Regency of the Rani Aas Kaur which could not be defended on any ground but it strongly wanted to continuance of the pro-British Missar as the chief Minister through whom state could be controlled and information derived. Overthrow of Missar Naudha was impending sooner. Eventually apart from his unpopularity he was a symbol of British interference.

Nabha:

⁹⁴ Lepel Henry Griffin, *The Rajas of Punjab*, pp. 163-164.

⁹⁵ Muhammad Sayed Hasan Khan, *Tarikh-i-Patiala*, p. 266.

According to Lepel Griffin when Nabha⁹⁶ came in contact with British Government at that time Jaswant Singh⁹⁷ was the ruler of Nabha. Chiefs of Jind and Kythal were eager to make British their friend but at first Raja of Nabha was not willing, nevertheless he sent his agent to meet General Lake along with other chiefs.⁹⁸ But according to K.M Pannikar, in beginning British Government was not interested in Cis-Sutlej states matters but in 1803 A.D they thought that it would be a better idea to establish close relations with these states strategically, in order to evade any attempt of an army from the western side of the Indus River. At first attention of British was not to extend their territories rather to create a buffer zone.⁹⁹

Lepel Griffin tells that when Marattha prince Holkar advancing to the northwards of Lahore he stopped at Nabha to get assistance from Raja of Nabha but Raja of Nabha Jaswant Singh refused to help him against British. Due to his act Lord Lake got pleased and assured him that as long as he remained in their side his possession would never be curtailed nor any tribute would be demanded from him.¹⁰⁰ This is to be noted here that if Raja of Nabha was not willing to become friend of British as per given by Lepel Griffin than how it could be possible that without any alliance with British he refused to help Holkar against the British Government and favored them? Bute Shah clears this confusion by telling that Cis-Sutej chiefs got scared by repulsive attacks of Maharaja Ranjit Singh thus they secretly got together and looked upon British for their protection as a only solution and as per given in *Sidhu Brara Da Itihaas* and in *A History of Punjab* when Holkar came for help Jaswant Singh told him that they already have made alliance

⁹⁶ For detail of Nabha State history see Appendix I.

⁹⁷ Jaswant Singh was son of Raja Hamir Singh of Nabha at the death of his father he was only eight years old. He was born in 1775 A.D. Rani Desu, one of the widows of Hamir Singh was appointed as a new ruler's regent. Jaswant Singh died on 22nd of May in 1840.

⁹⁸ Lepel Henry Griffin, *The Rajas of Punjab*, p. 421. See also; Bhai Gurmukh Singh, *Tawarikh Nabha*, Gurmat National Agency, Amritsar, N.D, p. 10.

⁹⁹ K.M Panikkar, *British Diplomacy In North India*, Associated Publishing House, New Delhi, 1970, p. 99.

¹⁰⁰ Lepel Henry Griffin, *The Rajas of Punjab*, p. 422.

with British so he cannot help him.¹⁰¹ But Lepel Griffin's above statement found same in *District and State Gazetteer of Undivided Punjab* and in some other sources too.¹⁰²

Lepel Griffin discusses the observation of David Ochterlony about Nabha which is given in *The Rajas of Punjab* states that Jaswant Singh Nabha in his thinking was far superior in management and in understanding than other chiefs¹⁰³ but Lepel Griffin in his observation didn't discussed the part in which David Ochterlony wrote to Government that Raja Jaswant Singh as an ally of Maharaja Ranjit Singh had received very considerable grants but intervention of British in Cis –Sutlej matters, he had to suffer a lot and then Ochterlony forward Raja's verbal interrogation to the Government in a letter for decision and for further planning. The above statement is traceable in Ochterlony's letter registered in *Records of Lahore Agency*.¹⁰⁴

As per given in *The Rajas of Punjab*, Jaswant Singh of Nabha was given a separate letter of proclamation on 3 May 1809 A.D from Governor General for his personal assurance. This letter is listed in *A Collection of Treaties engagements and Sandas*.¹⁰⁵ It is to be noted that these treaties were not much important for British Government but was very beneficial for chiefs because of this they were getting exemption from tribute and had secured all of their previous authorities and rights. That's the reason they were eager to sign a treaty of assurance which was of much importance for them from everything.

As per Lepel Griffin in 1810 A.D Raja Jaswant Singh received title from Delhi emperor 'Brar Bans Sarmour Malwinder Bhadur'.¹⁰⁶ Lepel Griffin tells that Patiala family's growing power was dissatisfying the Nabha Chief because Nabha Chief's claimed themselves as a head

¹⁰¹ Bute Shah (trans.) *Tarikh-i-Punjab*, Vol. I, Punjab Historical Studies, Punjabi University, Patiala, N.D, p. 36. See also; Balwant Singh Historian, *Sidhu Brara Da Itihaas*, New Lal Bhag, Patiala, 1986, p. 129. Also; Syad Muhhamad Latif, *History of Punjab*, Eurasia Publishing House, New Delhi, 1964, p. 332.

¹⁰² District and State Gazetteers of Undivided Punjab, Vol. IV, B.R Publishing Corp., Delhi, 1985, p. 299. See also; Ravinder Singh Sodhi, *The Shahi Country of Nabha*, S.C.P Publication, Nabha, 2012, p. 16. Also; Bhai Gurmukh Singh, *Tawarikh Nabha*, Gurmat National Agency, Amritsar, N.D, p. 11.

¹⁰³ Lepel Henry Griffin, *The Rajas of Punjab*, p. 423.

¹⁰⁴ *Records of Ludhiana Agency*, p. 70.

¹⁰⁵ Lepel Henry Griffin, *The Rajas of Punjab*, p. 423. See Also; C.V Aitchison, *A Collection Treaties Engagements and Sandas*, Vol. VIII, Superintendent Government Printing, Calcutta, 1909, p. 286.

¹⁰⁶ Lepel Henry Griffin, *The Rajas of Punjab*, Low Price Publication, Delhi, Reprint 2014, p. 423.

of the family by birth and right. That's why Patiala and Nabha relations were never remained in a good state.¹⁰⁷ One of the British official letters clarifies that Raja Jaswant of Nabha had written to British Government that he belongs to older branch of Phulkian family he feels insulted when he considered lower than other Phulkian families therefore on this behalf he claimed that he must be given the higher rank.¹⁰⁸ Through analyzing some other sources it is found correct that Nabha was senior branch of Phulkian family and Raja of Nabha wanted to become more powerful than Patiala. So, he deliberately keeps on fighting with Patiala indirectly.¹⁰⁹

Jind:

According to Lepel Henry Griffin Raja Bhag Singh¹¹⁰ of Jind¹¹¹ was first among the other Cis-Sutlej chiefs, who made an alliance with British Government. Raja of Jind made advances to British General immediately after battle of Delhi on 11th September of 1803 A.D. Which were got accepted by British Government. General Lake declared him trustworthy friend and accepted his authority over the Ghoanah and Kharkhodah estate which were adjacent to Delhi. It is also given in *The Rajas of Punjab* that Raja Bhag Singh induced his friend Bhai Lal Singh of Kaithal to join the British.¹¹² It is worth to mention that at this stage both parties were seeking benefits from each other because from the British Government's side they wanted to secure help from Sikh chiefs against Marathas or to at least get assurance of neutrality from them. While on the

¹⁰⁷ Giani Lal Singh (trans.), Rai Kali and Tulsi Ram, *Punjab Di Sair*, Punjabi University, Patiala, 1971, p. 248. See also; Bhagat Singh, *History of Sikh Misals*, Punjabi Publication Bureau, Punjabi University, Patiala, 2009, p. 332.

¹⁰⁸ From Vkeel Nuzzer Ali of Nabha to Governor General, Foreign Department, Political Consulation, no. 198-200. (N.A.I).

¹⁰⁹ Punjab State Gazetteers, Vol. XVII A, Phulkian States, p. 341. See also; Ravinder Singh Sodhi, *The Shahi Country of Nabha*, p. 17. See also; Giani Gian Singh, *Tawarikh Raj Khalsa*, Vol. III, S.G.P.C, Amritsar, p. 193.

¹¹⁰ Bhag Singh was born on 23 September, 1760 A.D. His father Gajpat Singh was chief of Jind. He got accession of Jind Chiefship in 1789. In 1786 A.D emperor Shah Alam had conferred upon him jagirs of Districts of Gohana and Kharkohda. He began to fall seriously ill and died on 16 June, 1819 A.D.

¹¹¹ For detail of Jind State history see Appendix I.

¹¹² Lepel Henry Griffin, *The Rajas of Punjab*, p. 321.

other hand Raja of Jind like other Phulkian Chiefs wanted to overthrow the Perron, their former benefactor and wanted to attain some additional benefits in the form of escheats from British.¹¹³

As per J.D Cunningham, Bhai Lal Singh had seen the power of Lake was first to join the British and he suggested the Raja of Jind to join the British.¹¹⁴ It is to be noted that General Lake called Raja of Jind and Raja of Kaithal a friend and an ally because they had attacked and killed the Ekta Rao, the commander of Marathas, who had taken up a position between Delhi and Panipat in 1805 A.D for British Government.¹¹⁵ Therefore Lake confirmed the title of Jind Raja over Kharkhoda and Gohana estate.¹¹⁶

Lepel Griffin praises the Raja of Jind by saying that he was very wise man he changed the side at very first by assuming that which would become the winning side and also induced his friend to be equally wise. After having their submission Raja of Jind and Raja of Kaithal returned to their territories. When in 1805 A.D Colonel Burn defeated the hostile Sikhs than Raja Jind and Bhai Lal Singh thought that if they would join the General it would be more advantageous for them. However their services were not important but they held the Sharanpur while David Ochterlony was in pursuit of the Marathas.¹¹⁷ Despite of it, J.D Cunningham tells that in Shamlee near Shranpur it had became hard for Colonel Burn to fight but active help of Bhai Lal Singh and Raja of Jind brought ultimate relief.¹¹⁸

In the work of Lepel Griffin it has given that Raja Bhag Singh joined the General Lake in his pursuit of Jaswant Rao Holkar in 1805 A.D. British Government deployed him as an envoy to his nephew Maharaja Ranjit Singh to stop him to help the Holkar against British. Lepel Griffin assuredly says that this mission was conducted by Bhag Singh to please the General Lake so he

¹¹³ For the detail of the British Government and Raja Bhag Singh of Jind's two face policy in the shape of friendly alliance see also; Bikram Jit Hasrat, *Anglo Sikh Relations 1799-1849*, pp. 45-47. See Also; W.H Allen, *History of Punjab; Rise, Progress and Present Condition of Sect and Nation of Sikh People*, Vol. I, Leaden Hall Street, London, 1846, p. 267.

¹¹⁴ Joseph Davey Cunningham, *A History of The Sikhs*, p. 127.

¹¹⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 127.

¹¹⁶ C.V Aitchison, *A Collection of Treaties and Sandas*, Vol. I, p. 127. See Also; Imperial Gazetteer of India, Vol. II, Usha Publication, Punjab, 1984, p. 275.

¹¹⁷ Lepel Henry Griffin, *The Rajas of Punjab*, p. 321.

¹¹⁸ Joseph Davey Cunningham, *A History of The Sikhs*, p. 127.

could able to exert considerable influence with his nephew over British.¹¹⁹ It is worth to mention that not only Bhag Singh wanted to attain benefits but the British Government was also seeking to create a connection with Maharaja Ranjit Singh which they had tried in 1800 A.D to create a front against Shah Zaman. But Maharaja Ranjit Singh had not showed interest in British at that time. So most probably Raja Bhag Singh was person of their interest to persuade the Maharaja. Most likely Lake granted the lands to Bhag Singh for to clear the way for their long waited policy in which they wanted to create a buffer zone. In beginning the policy of British was to create a close connection with these states in order to frustrate any attempt of invading army from the western side of Indus.¹²⁰ Due to the Bhag Singh of Jind the negotiation didn't reach at completion between Mahraja Ranjit Singh and Jaswant Rao Holkar so Rao was compelled to leave Punjab. Thus Bhag Singh received grant of Bawanah and it was life time grant in the name of his son Kaur Partab Singh. Hansi had been granted to him first but on his own request Bawanah district was given in exchange. Bhag Singh was also given the villages of Mamrezipur and Nihana Kalan.¹²¹ Bute Shah, Khuswant Rai and Sohan Lal Suri confirm that British had sent Raja Bhag Singh as an envoy for negotiation with Maharaja Ranjit Singh.¹²² According to Colonel G.B Malleson in pursuit of Holkar, Raja Bhag helped British Government very enthusiastically.¹²³ In Gazetteers same statement can be seen except grant of Mamrezipur and Nihana Kalan.¹²⁴ However, as per J.D Cunningham intermediate between the Maharaja Ranjit Singh and British was Fateh Singh Ahluwalia and as far as the grant is concerned it was granted by Lord Lake for their services towards British Government.¹²⁵

As per the work of Lepel Griffin Raja Bhag Singh readily accepted the survey of his country by Lieutenant White and tried everything to make it successful. Lepel Griffin himself

¹¹⁹ Lepel Henry Griffin, *The Rajas of Punjab*, p. 321.

¹²⁰ Bikram Jit Hasrat, *Anglo Sikh Relations 1799-1849*, p. 35. See also; K.M Pannikar, *British Diplomacy In North India*, Associated Publishing House, New Delhi, p. 99.

¹²¹ Lepel Henry Griffin, *The Rajas of Punjab*, p. 322.

¹²² Bute Shah (trans.) *Tarikh-i-Punjab*, Vol.III, Punjab Historical Studies, Punjabi University, Patiala, p. 34. See also; Khuswant Rai, (trans.) *Tarikh –i- Sikhan*, Vol. I, Punjab Historical Department, Punjabi University, Patiala, p. 209. Also; Sohan Lal Suri, *Udmat-Ut-Twarikh*, Daftar II, Guru Nanak Dev University, Amritsar, 1985, p. 67.

¹²³ Colonel G. B Malleson C.S.I, *An Historical Sketch of Native States of India*, p. 338.

¹²⁴ Punjab State Gazetteers, *Phulkian States*, Vol. XVII, p. 215.

¹²⁵ Joseph Davey Cunningham, *A History of The Sikhs*, p. 130.

agrees that a survey of Sikh territory was seen with suspicion and believed only for annexation. However Raja Bhag Singh was above all of these prejudices. Lepel Griffin tells that although he was a faithful ally of British but he had not properly trusted his new alliance and therefore when Maharaja wanted to visit on sacred fair in Haridwar which was part of British territory Bhag Singh dissuaded him from his idea. He told that Bishan Singh and Mohar Singh which had been sent by Maharaja Ranjit Singh to get permission from Delhi Government were not trustworthy. He suggested the Maharaja not to go without his army.¹²⁶ In *Tarikh-i-Sikhan* it has been given that Raja Bhag had said to Maharaja Ranjit Singh that British people are not trustworthy.¹²⁷ *Umdat –ut-Tawarikh* tells that *Vakils* of Shajanabad and Bhag Singh were behind the cancelation of Maharaja's trip.¹²⁸

Lepel Griffin tells that in 1808 A.D Raja Bhag Singh after unprovoked attacked made by Maharaja Ranjit Singh over Malerkotla perceived that his possession would not be safe for long. So he decided to be a friend of British Government. As per the correspondence between Raja of Jind and British which are given in *The Rajas of Punjab* it can be seen that Bhag Singh was seeking British protection but British Government was not ready to fulfill the desire of Sikh chief yet. Despite it British Government had wrote the Maharaja not to molest Cis –Sutlej chiefs because they were as their friend and ally. However Raja Bhag Singh keep on pushing British to take the step to render the protection by continuous solicit through letters. He told the British Government that Maharaja of Patiala for his own safety had exchanged turbans with Maharaja Ranjit Singh and Raja Bhag Singh exclaims that in reality the four Cis-sutlej chiefs including him are inwardly wishes for the protection of the British Government. So they believed that British government will secure them in crucial time because Raja Bhag had got news from Lahore that Maharaja is preparing for the next expedition.¹²⁹ In the opinion of Lieutenant John Clunes relation between Raja Bhag and Maharaja Ranjit Singh got disturb due to that the Raja

¹²⁶ Lepel Henry Griffin, *The Rajas of Punjab*, p. 324.

¹²⁷ Khuswant Rai (trans.) *Tarikh –i- Sikhan*, Vol. I, p. 256.

¹²⁸ V.S Suri (trans.) Sohan Lal Suri, *Umdat-Ut-Twarikh*, Daftar II, Guru Nanak Dev University, Amritsar, 1985, p. 84.

¹²⁹ Lepel Henry Griffin, *The Rajas of Punjab*, p. 328. See also; Letter From Bhag Singh to Resident at Delhi, 3rd December 1808, Foreign Department, Secret and Separate Branch, vol. 24, no. 14. See also; Seton to Bhag Singh, Secret and Separate Branch vol.24 no. 44.

Bhag Singh had violated the hospitality of the Maharaja Ranjit Singh and eloped with his favorite female.¹³⁰ From the *Guldaste-i-Punjab*, *Tarikh-i-Punjab*, *Ibaratnama*, it confirms that the Cis-Sutlej got annoyed from Maharaja's behavior and were seeking British Protection.¹³¹ As per *Ludhiana Agency* records British at first were not willing to protect these. For the English all the Cis-Sutlej chiefs could not be trusted, they believed that they could change sides at anytime.¹³² Even because of Napoleonic fear they didn't want to break the connection with the Ranjit Singh.¹³³

Lepel Griffin narrates that after one month Maharaja went back to Lahore and Raja Bhag Singh was called for an interview with Mr Seton, the resident. When Raja reached Karnal than Ochterlony was advancing toward Sutlej and by thinking that the presence of Raja with Ochterlony would be good so resident advice him to join it. Therefore Raja joined the English force at once.¹³⁴ Official record justifies the above statement given in *The Rajas of Punjab*.¹³⁵

It has been told in *The Rajas of Punjab* that Bhag Singh didn't want to meet the Maharaja Ranjit Singh. So when an agent from Lahore came to Patiala to summon him and Chain Singh on hearing this he left the Patiala and went to Karnal. Chain Singh was the confidential agent of Patiala chief to Lahore Darbar. Even his sudden departure furnished Raja Patiala with a good pretext for not to send his agent to Lahore.¹³⁶ In a secret intelligence of British above statement

¹³⁰ Lieutenant John Clunes, *An Historical Sketches of Princes of India*, Smith and Elder Co., London, N.D, p. 183.

¹³¹ Amarvant (trans.) Raja Ram Tota, *Guldaste-i-Punjab*, Vol. I, Department of Punjab Historical Studies, Punjab University, Patiala, p. 68. Also; Jeet Singh Seetal (ed.) Kanhyia Lal, *Tarikh-i-Punjab*, Vol. III, Publication Bureau, Punjab University, Patiala, 1987, p. 59. Also; Mufti-Ali-Ud-Din(trans.), *Ibartnama*, Vol.III, p. 473.

¹³² *Records of Ludhiana Agency 1809-1815*, p. 5.

¹³³ K.M Pannikar, *British Diplomacy in North India*, p. 110.

¹³⁴ Lepel Henry Griffin, *The Rajas of Punjab*, p. 329.

¹³⁵ *Press List of Old Records In the Punjab Secretariat 1809-1840*, Punjab Government, Lahore, 1911, no.4. See also; Seton Esquire to Edmonstone Sect. to General, 15 Jan. 1809, no.9, *Records of Ludhiana Agency 1809- 1815*, p. 24.

¹³⁶ Lepel Henry Griffin, *The Rajas of Punjab*, p. 329.

found to be true and in addition it also found that Raja Bhag Singh persuaded the Sahib Singh to not to go to the Lahore.¹³⁷

According to Lepel Griffin Colonel David Ochterlony welcomed Raja Bhag Singh with kindness. Raja told him that all of the Sikh chiefs are eagerly waiting for to welcome the British Government. Though few chiefs like Sardar Jodh Singh Kalsia are under the heavy obligation and they cannot come forward at once and declare friendship with British yet. David Ochterlony told to Raja Bhag Singh that Raja have to return the land which they had occupied from the friend of the British it had been taken from Rani Daya Kaur and he would lose not more 4,000 a year.¹³⁸ It can be clearly understood from *Ludhiana Agency* record that Cis- Sutlej chiefs were waiting to join the British.¹³⁹ It is true that Sardar Jodh Singh wanted to join British but circumstances were not favorable for him due to his close connection with Maharaja Ranjit Singh therefore Ochterlony told Bhag Singh that Jodh Singh should not need to break the connection with Maharaja Ranjit Singh at present but he needed written assurance from him that in event of the hostilities he would join the British.¹⁴⁰ A point should be noted here that as per British Government's policy David Ochterlony was trying to lure every small and important chief to his side so they could use them if a war occurs between Maharaja Ranjit Singh and British.¹⁴¹

As per *Ludhiana Agency* record Raja agreed to return the land to Rani Daya Kaur which he had got from late expedition of Maharaja Ranjit Singh. Here Lepel Griffin didn't mentioned a point that which can be presume from the *The Ludhiana Agency Records* that Raja Bhag was agreed to give up land because he was seeking for British Protection but when David Ochterlony asked him to return the all grants which he had gained from last expedition he questioned him about that what British Government has decided about his other Grants when he agreed to return the land to Rani Daya Kaur. On this David Ochterlony replied that he had not received orders

¹³⁷ Seton to Edmonstone, Foreign Department, Secret Branch, 1809, No.24, p. 15. See Also; Letter of Bhag Singh to Resident, 5 December 1808, Foreign Department and Secret Branch, Vol no. 24, no. 15. Exact copy of letter can also be seen in the *Records of Ludhiana Agency 1809-1815*, p. 32.

¹³⁸ Lepel Henry Griffin, *The Rajas of Punjab*, p. 330.

¹³⁹ Resident to Patiala, 15 Jan. 1809, *Records of Ludhiana Agency 1809-1815*, pp. 26-27.

¹⁴⁰ Colonel Ochterlony to Edmenstone, 20 Jan. 1809, no.3, para.5 *Records of Ludhiana Agency 1809-1815*, p. 34.

¹⁴¹ For detail of the Policy see; *Records of Ludhiana Agency 1809-1815*, pp. 1-40.

about it yet though he agrees in the official letter that he didn't wish to give any answer for fear of deceiving one party or encouraging other. From the above statement of David Ochterlony it has been clear that David Ochterlony knew the answer but at that time they needed the Raja Bhag Singh the most because he was the main key between chiefs and British connection and question which David Ochterlony was trying to hide was most probably related with Ludhiana because Ochterlony had kept an eye on Ludhiana fort for British cantonment which Bhag Singh had received from Maharaja. For which David Ochterlony had already wrote to British Government without the consent of Bhag Singh and even it did happen. Whereas Bhag Singh did get nothing for his lose. He had to paid heavy price for the British Protection.¹⁴²

As per noted in *The Rajas of Punjab* on the arrival of the David Ochterlony at Ludhiana, Raja Bhag Singh acted as mutual friend between British and Lahore and to prevent the hostility he urged the General David Ochterlony to halt, but General at first refused him proposal because he had got orders from Government to march. General believed that on his arrival at Ludhiana Gaimda Singh would evacuate the fort in accordance with the promise of Maharaja. While Lahore agents who were at Ludhiana denied that they Maharaja had not issued such orders. However, Bhag Singh succeeded in the changing the route of British army to Sirnewal instead of Ludhiana. In actual Bhag Singh desired to maintain friendship between both sides.¹⁴³ From the opinion of Bikram Jit Hasrat that Raja Bhag Singh really as compare to *The Rajas Punjab* had stopped the Anglo Sikh war at this crucial time which would have changed the history of Punjab.¹⁴⁴ Even he informed David Ochterlony that Maharaja Ranjit Singh is not in favor of war but his advisers were instigating him against British.¹⁴⁵

Lepel Griffin put in the picture that on 19th February David Ochterlony arrived at Ludhiana with his detachment. Raj Bhag Singh had gained this territory from Mahraja Ranjit Singh two years before. Raja Bhag Singh was not willing to give Ludhiana to British at first. He pleaded that without fort he would not .able to collect the revenue to 24 villages along the Ludhiana. But Government was determined to Get Ludhiana. So Bhag Singh urged to

¹⁴² Colonel Ochterlony to Edmenstone, 20 Jan. 1809, no.3, *Records of Ludhiana Agency 1809-1815*, pp. 33-35.

¹⁴³ Lepel Henry Griffin, *The Rajas of Punjab*, p. 331.

¹⁴⁴ Bikram Jit Hasrat, *Anglo Sikh Relations 1799-1849*, p. 87.

¹⁴⁵ Colonel Ochterlony to Edmenstone, 20 Jan. 1809, *Records of Ludhiana Agency 1809- 1815*, No. 3, para. 9, p. 35.

government to obtain Karnal in exchange of Ludhiana, which had been once under the possession of his family. David Ochterlony was in support for Raja Bhag Singh. So he wrote an application to Government in his support.¹⁴⁶ From official letter of David Ochterlony above statement match fairly well.¹⁴⁷ According to H.T Princep and W.H Allen David Ochterlony reached Ludhiana on 18 February.¹⁴⁸ As per *Guldaste-i-Punjab and Tarikh –i-Punjab* David Ochterlony on the request of Bhag Singh came into Ludhiana and by paying rent he establish there his military camp.¹⁴⁹

Lepel Griffin gives the low down that Government could not gave Karnal to Bhag Singh because it had already been conferred on Muhhamad Khan and the condition of Karnal State were not normal it required strong measures. Government also rejected the proposal to restore the Ludhiana to Rai Alyas. Government at first agreed to compensate Raja Bhag Singh Singh for his loss but later they decided that British Cantonment at Ludhiana is only intended to be for short term and it would be revert to chief so no compensation required. Lepel Griffin further tells that British military station at Ludhiana has not lifted yet.¹⁵⁰ From *Press list of Old Records* it confirms that Government had rejected his request for Karnal in exchange of Ludhiana.¹⁵¹ By examining the *Ludhiana Agency* it found that Government didn't want to left Ludhiana ever even they didn't gave Karnal in exchange of the Ludhiana for purpose. Government told to Ochterlony that they need Bhag Singh in Ludhiana because he will at all times provide them supplies and secure the good will of District and if they will transfer the chief of Karnal to Ludhiana and Ludhiana chief to Karnal than they have to suffer a lot. It can be comprehend that British Government was thinking of his own benefits. In fact Ochterlony was well aware of his

¹⁴⁶ Lepel Henry Griffin, *The Rajas of Punjab*, p. 332.

*Detailed application in Favor of Raja Bhag Singh by Ochterlony is being given in *The Rajas of Punjab*.

¹⁴⁷ Colonel Ochterlony to Edmenstone, 18 Feb. 1809, no.7, *Records of Ludhiana Agency 1809-1815*, p. 62.

¹⁴⁸ Henry T. Princep, *Origin of Sikh Power in Punjab*, Military Orphan Press, Calcutta, 1834, p. 67. See also; W.H Allen, *History of Punjab; Rise, Progress and Present Condition of Sect and Nation of Sikh People*, Vol. I, Leaden Hall Street, London, 1846, p. 287.

¹⁴⁹ Amarvant (trans.) Raja Ram Tota, *Guldaste-i-Punjab*, Vol. I, Department of Punjab Historical Studies, Punjabi University, Patiala, p. 67. See also; Bute Shah (trans.), *Tarikh-i-Punjab*, p. 170.

¹⁵⁰ Lepel Henry Griffin, *The Rajas of Punjab*, pp. 333-334.

¹⁵¹ From Seton to Ochterlony, 4 March 1809, *Press List of Old Records In the Punjab Secretariat 1809-1840*, no.4, .p.63

Government's attitude so he had himself sent an application in the favor of Bhag Singh in which he mentioned that Bhag Singh was most trusted person of Maharaja Ranjit Singh even though he helped British Government much and now British Government must do justice with him. But Government did the opposite.¹⁵² Lepel Griffin boast that British Government's Protection saved them from in justice However in reality they were playing them as a fool and using them as puppet. They had nothing to do with chiefs their own benefits were above them all. They didn't care for chiefs' loses or the benefits. Raja of Jind in his stupidity not only lost the territory of Ludhiana but also lost the true friendship from Maharaja Ranjit Singh. He had chosen the side to save his territory from Maharaja Ranjit Singh but he lost it immediately without any gain in return by seeking the British Protection. Though he played and crucial role between British and Sikh Chiefs and British friendship. But intentions of British were clear they want to secure that border. It can be easily understood from the relationship of Maharaja Ranjit Singh and Raja Bhag Singh of Jind that Maharaja Ranjit Singh trusted him so much that even he was negotiating with the English , Maharaja Ranjit Singh never doubt upon him.

In the time period of 1810 A.D Lepel Griffin focuses on another issue of territory of the Dharmpur, situated in Karnal. Bhara Singh was Jagirdar of Dharmpur. When Bhara Singh died, Raja Bhag Singh appealed to British Government that this estate belongs to his father because Bhara Singh had worked under them therefore territory should be given to him. But Lord Lake rejected his appeal.¹⁵³ *Raj Khalsa* validates the above given testimony.¹⁵⁴

In next matter Lepel Griffin discuss the succession matter of primogeniture in Jind State. Bhag Singh due to his dissipated habit and excess drinking was putting his life under risk. Therefore, he decided to choose a successor before his death so he gave a draft of will to Agent of British Government. The content of will contained that his younger son Prince Partap Singh was to be appointed his successor to his chief ship. While his elder son Fateh Singh was going to get only the districts of Sangrur and Ludhiana. The Agent had tried to induce the Raja to change

¹⁵² Colonel Ochterlony to Edmenstone, 18 Feb. 1809, , *Records of Ludhiana Agency 1809-1815*, no.7, pp. 62-64. See also; Seton to Ochterlony, *Records of Ludhiana Agency 1809-1815*, pp. 64-66. For letter from Ochterlony to Government see; Lepel Henry Griffin, *The Rajas of Punjab*, p. 332.

¹⁵³ Lepel Henry Griffin, *The Rajas of Punjab*, p. 336.

¹⁵⁴ Giani Gian Singh, *Raj Khalsa*, Part II, p. 108.

his mind about the succession and argued that his government was in favor of the rule of Primogeniture and pointed out that dispute might arise due to his will but Raja was adamant. Due to his excess drinking Raja Bhag Singh suffered a paralytic stroke in March 1813 A.D, which deprived him of the power of speech and the power of motion. This necessitated the appointment of Regency. On April 1813 A.D, Government wrote his unwillingness to sanction the will of Raja of Jind on the ground that no proved custom has been found in the Jind family that an elder son being suppressed by a younger brother. Therefore, Government rejected the succession of Kuwar Partab Singh and authorized elder son for the Chief ship. Regarding the Jagirs which had been given by British to Bhag Singh were the only life grants. These were five in numbers; Gohana, Faridpur, Barwana, Kahrkoda, and Murzepur. It was decided by the Government to resume their grants after Bhag Singh's death.¹⁵⁵ According to Ahmed Farooqi, Raja Bhag Singh had given draft of will to Ochterlony not to the Agent and the month in which Raja Bhag Singh got Paralytic attack has been given April instead of March while it mentions that Government's letter had issued in May to Bhag Singh apart from it all other contents found similar.¹⁵⁶ This fact can't denied that British Government had intervened in the cases of Patiala, Nabha and Jind authoritatively for assertion of the primogeniture but it didn't apply it as a rule in the case of Bhawalpur when in 1850 A.D Nawab nominated his third son to the succession.¹⁵⁷ In the opinion of H.B Singh, British always keep seeking the chance to interfere in the succession matters of the Princely states because as per their secret policy they wanted only those rulers to rule over princely states who would work under their command.¹⁵⁸

In the context of succession Lepel Griffin shares the insight of British Government that their next step was to appoint a Regent after the death of Raja Bhag Singh. Raj Bhag Singh had a strong dislike for his elder son Fateh Singh, so neither he nor his mother could be entrusted with the Regency, while Partap Singh was out of question. The only choice they had left with was that of Rani Sobrahi, mother of Raja's third son Mehtab Singh. She was only person against which appointment as regent the fewest objections exists. So lady accordingly with the sanctioned of

¹⁵⁵ Lepel Henry Griffin, *The Rajas of Punjab*, pp. 339-341.

¹⁵⁶ Mia Bashir Ahmed Farooqi, *British Relations with Cis-Sutlej States 1809-1823*, p. 22.

¹⁵⁷ Foreign Department, Political Consultation, 31 May 1850, no. 280. See also; Foreign Department, Political Consultation, 1 November 1850, Nos.- 54-55.

¹⁵⁸ H.B Singh, *Ankhila Jarnail Akali Phoola Singh*, Sundar Printers, Delhi 1988, p. 43.

the Government was appointed as a Regent. The Rani Sobrahi agreed to obey the wishes of the British Government with the regard to the succession and to abstain from any interference with the eldest son and his mother.¹⁵⁹

Lepel Griffin mentions further that the Partab Singh was not satisfied with such an arrangement. He had hoped from long that on the death of his father he would become Raja and now British had appeared to oppose him. He therefore began intriguing against Regency and raised troops directly. Somehow Rani Sobrahi came to know about him so she complained about him to British. British Government gave him warning that if he would do such things he would lose his provinces. But Partap Singh paid no heed to this and on 23 August 1814 A.D he took the fort of Jind by surprise, putting to death many persons including Rani Sobrahi, Munshi Jaishi Ram and others. Than British took instant action and reassumed the fort by force. The resident desired the following arrangements to be made i.e. Kanwar Fateh Singh the eldest son of Raja Bhag Singh was to be entrusted with the entire arrangements of the affairs but the administration was to be run under the name of his father Bhag Singh. Suitable provision was to be made for the dignity and comfort of the Raja. Partap Singh was to be seized and sent to Delhi to wait till the further orders of the Governor General.¹⁶⁰

When Partap Singh felt that British were going to capture him, he left Jind, and fled to Balanwali. Not feeling him safe there he fled to Makhawal by crossing Sutlej and in 1815 A.D he joined with Akali Phoola Singh. Partap Singh remained with Phoola Singh for two months than he succeeded in persuading Phoola Singh to cross Sutlej and actively assist him to Balanwali which was remained in open rebellion against Raja of Jind. When British came to know about it they ordered Nabha and Malerkotla to attack over Balanwali. Phoola Singh was quite famous among Sikhs thus there were less chances of Nabha troops to attack against him with loyalty. Patiala troops tried to intercept Akali Phoola Singh. Akali Phoola Singh marched to Muktsar. Partap Singh got captured in Balanwali and was taken to Delhi where he died in June

¹⁵⁹ Lepel Henry Griffin, *The Rajas of Punjab*, pp. 342-343. See also; Mia Bashir Ahmed Farooqi, *British Relations with Cis-Sutlej States 1809-1823*, p. 23. Also; Giani Gian Singh, *Raj Khalsa*, Part II, p. 110. See also; Krishan Betab, *Itihaas Riyast Jind*, Mhaan Printers, Sangrur 2007, p. 64.

¹⁶⁰ Lepel Henry Griffin, *The Rajas of Punjab*, pp. 342-343. See Also; Mia Bashir Ahmed Farooqi, *British Relations with Cis-Sutlej States 1809-1823*, Punjab Government Records, Lahore, 1971, p. 29. Also; Giani Gian Singh, *Raj Khalsa*, Part II, pp. 111-112. See also; i Jindal, *The Princely States of Jind Revisted*, p. 19.

1816 A.D in confinement. The estate of Barwan which was granted to him for life lapsed to British.¹⁶¹ According to Nihal Ras, British sent a message to Akali Phoola Singh to sent prince back to them and if he not than he should be prepare for war.¹⁶² In H.B Singh's work the similar incident which is given in *The Rajas of Punjab* can be seen.¹⁶³

It has been given in *The Rajas of Punjab* that in 1817 A.D a case of village Dabri and Danouli occurred. Mr. Fraser was revenue officer of the British Government, he discovered from the ancient register that Dabri and Danouli were under the Hissar but Raja of Jind without any right took these villages under his possession however on the plea of the Raja of Jind British abandoned the scheme to attach the villages to their property.¹⁶⁴

Raja Bhag Singh died in 1819 A.D and was succeeded by his elder son Fateh Singh, unfortunately reign of Fateh Singh was very short he died in 1822 A.D after his death his son at minor age was being installed on the throne of Jind.¹⁶⁵ From the number of sources like; *Press List, Gazetteer etc.* Lepel Griffin's statement about Raja Jind's death and installation seems accurate.¹⁶⁶

Kapurthala:

Lepel Griffin discusses that number of possessions of chief Fateh Singh¹⁶⁷ of Kapurthala¹⁶⁸ were situated in the Jalandhar Doab to the north of Sutlej. His connections before 1825 A.D were not merely intimate with British. He came in direct communication with British for the first time in the matter of chiefship of Bhirog. This estate had belonged to Jassa Singh

¹⁶¹ Lepel Henry Griffin, *The Rajas of Punjab*, Low Price Publication, Delhi, 2014, p. 349.

¹⁶² Nihal Ras, *Nirbhair Jathedar Akali Phoola Singh*, Chattar and Jeevan Singh, Amritsar, 2010, p. 37.

¹⁶³ H.B Singh, *Ankhila Jarnail Akali Phoola Singh*, pp. 45-47.

¹⁶⁴ Lepel Henry Griffin, *The Rajas of Punjab*, p. 353. See also; Mia Bashir Ahmed Farooqi, *British Relations with Cis-Sutlej States 1809-1823*, p. 38.

¹⁶⁵ Lepel Henry Griffin, *The Rajas of Punjab*, pp. 353-354.

¹⁶⁶ H. Middleton to Captain Ross 11 April 1822, *Press List of Old Records In the Punjab Secretariat 1809-1840*, Book No.22, p.178. See also; *Punjab District Gazetteer*, Vol. XVII A, p. 215. Also; Kahzan Singh, *History and Philosophy of the Sikh Religion*, Part I, Newal Krishan Press, Lahore, 1914, p 296.

¹⁶⁷ Fateh Singh was ruler of Kapurthala he was twelve years old when he got *Sardari* of the Ahluwalia Misal in 1801. He was the only son of Bhag Singh. He was close companion of Maharaja Ranjit Singh. He died in 1837 A.D.

¹⁶⁸ For detail history of Kapurthalla State see Appendix I.

Ahluwalia, he conferred it upon Mirza Singh whose son Johwar died in a battle while fighting for Ahluwalia. Further Johwar Singh's son Maha Singh was not loyal vassal. In 1817 A.D, Ochterlony got frustrated because of Maha Singh. As Maha Singh declared that he's accountable only towards Fateh Singh. So Ochterlony asked Fateh Singh to confiscate the territory of Maha Singh. Fateh Singh sent command under Mir Nizammudin to take over the charge by using power.¹⁶⁹ Ram Rao also agrees with this particular incident.¹⁷⁰ In spite, by investigating Captain Birch's diary it is found that Fateh Singh was daunted by British General, that if he would not punish Maha Singh than British would deprive him off from his supremacy over Bhirog.¹⁷¹

In the next phase of Bhirog matter Lepel Griffin tells that after seizure of Bhirog by Fateh Singh, Ochterlony issued an order. In his order he pardoned Maha Singh by giving an argument that Maha Singh at that time was minor and he was under the influence of his mother, trustworthy of his mother Baswa Singh and Rai Singh were the reason behind committing everything. So, Ochterlony ordered Fateh Singh to withdraw his troops and to reinstate Bhirog to Maha Singh. But Fateh Singh on other the hand refused to restore the Bhirog.¹⁷² Though in counter reply Fateh Singh forward a letter through his *Vakil* in which he explained the matter of Bhirog with its earlier history. In which he acclaimed that Bhirog belonged to his Ahluwalia ancestors and number of times Bhirog holders had confirmed Fateh Singh's ownerships upon it and mother of Maha Singh was also appointed by him. On the request of Ochetrlnony he punished Maha Singh without any delay and conduct of punishment was made without reference. Maha Singh's mother urged him to excuse them from British but he retained it. From Fateh Singh's letter to Governor General it seems unobjectionably cleared that Government's action to reinstall Maha Singh made Fateh Singh tempestuous. Because he had have spend a lot of money on Bhirog encroachment. That's why he refused to set Bhirog free.¹⁷³

Lepel Griffin further explains that when Fateh Singh didn't changed his decision than Government directly warned him that if he would not restored the estate than British force

¹⁶⁹ Lepel Henry Griffin, *The Rajas of Punjab*, p. 528.

¹⁷⁰ Joginder Kaur (ed.), *Ram Sukh Rao's Fateh Singh Parbhakar*, Punjab State Archives, Patiala, 1980, p. 498.

¹⁷¹ Captain G. Birch, *Selection from Notebook Kept By Captain G. Birch, 1818-1821*, p. 129.

¹⁷² Lepel Henry Griffin, *The Rajas of Punjab*, Low Price Publication, Delhi, p. 529. See also; N.D, *Kapurthala State- Its Past and Present*, N.D, Kapurthala, 1928, p. 9.

¹⁷³ Captain G. Birch, *Selection from Notebook Kept By Captain G. Birch 1818- 1821*, pp. 130-132.

would be sent to dispose off his encroachment. When this matter turn out to be more serious than Local Government forward it to the Indian Government. Government of India allowed Fateh Singh to use his supremacy over Bhirog by any measures, which he might sees fit to employ.¹⁷⁴ It is to be noted that Government changed its decision only when it noticed that Fateh Singh got enraged by their conduct, so they immediately took action because they didn't want to break off their relationship with Fateh Singh which they were secretly building from many years.

However, case of Bhirog became more and more complex, apprised by Lepel Griffin that when Maharaja Ranjit Singh directed Sirdar not to proceed against Maha Singh, if any expedition might be necessary than Lahore troops would march along with Kapurthalla. Order from Lahore Darbar paralyzed the movement of Fateh Singh over Bhirog so he asked Government to interfere. But Government refused to interfere, but instead notified that Lahore troops would not be permitted to cross Sutlej.¹⁷⁵

The case of Kapurthala vs Bhirog indicated the pitiful and helpless position of Fateh Singh. He had obeyed orders of British Government on the one hand and of Maharaja Ranjit Singh on the other hand. Between ultimate powers his position became so ineffective that he couldn't have asserted his legitimate right over his vassal. For long, Maharaja had treated Fateh Singh as an ordinary Sardar but Maharaja's fresh intervention nursed grudge due to which bitterness occurred between Fateh Singh and Maharaja Ranjit Singh's friendly relation. Hereafter, Kapurthala chief Fateh Singh began to look more and more to the British authorities.

Lepel Griffin in his work shares, next the matter of Isru fort. In 1818 A.D English Government had to interfere with regard to the erection of fort situated at Isru in protected territory. But Raja of Patiala got alarmed by this sudden construction near his territory. However, Sardar wanted to erect the fort according to his own plan, so Government ordered to stop construction.¹⁷⁶ In Captain Birch's Diary it is to be noted that Government had ordered to stop the construction because it was prohibited to construct a new Building in protected state without

¹⁷⁴ Lepel Henry Griffin, *The Rajas of Punjab*, p. 530. See also; Captain G. Birch, *Selection from Notebook Kept by Captain G. Birch 1818-1821*, p. 133.

¹⁷⁵ Lepel Henry Griffin, *The Rajas of Punjab*, p. 531. See also; Giani Gian Singh, *Raj Khalsa*, Vol. II, p. 162.

¹⁷⁶ *Ibid.*,

permission of Government.¹⁷⁷ According to J.D Cunningham Fateh Singh was constrained to construct fort by his old brother.¹⁷⁸

An old case recorded in *The Raja of Punjab* state that in 1822 A.D reason of headache between British and Fateh Singh was the small fort of Kotlia which was situated in the center of the Ahluwalia territory and was owned by Nihang Singh, a Pathan and at certain degree he was dependent over Fateh Singh but simultaneously he was dependent upon Patiala, Ropar and Bilaspur too. Fateh Singh asserted his supremacy and in 1822 A.D he forcefully took over the fort and refused to leave it, in spite of repeated messages from British Officers. He had occupied the fort with the assistance of elder brother of Pathan family named Balwant Khan who agreed to accept Fateh Singh suzerainty over Kotlia fort on a certain condition i.e if feudal services should be awarded to him. But on various occasions Government warned him to intervene in the Kotlia Chiefship. Government ruled out Ahluwalia chief supremacy over Kotlia that it was prior to the introduction of the British. He had ceased to get tribute and had also failed to afford the protection of Kotlia against other chiefs. So Government forcefully reinstalled Nihang Singh and denied to accept the supremacy of Fateh Singh over Kotlia.¹⁷⁹ It is being confirmed from Ram Sukh Rao that Kotlia was won by Jassa Singh Ahluwalia and Fateh Singh was used to collect revenue.¹⁸⁰ According to *Raj Khalsa* it does not matter in what circumstances Government issued the order whether it was just or unjust but for the Fateh Singh it was clearly unfair to deprive him off from his legitimate right.¹⁸¹

In 27 December 1825 A.D Lahore troops marched towards Kapurthla. Fateh Singh got scared and fled away to other side of Sutlej. For detail version of Lahore vs Kapurthalla, see chapter Relations of Lahore Darbar and Cis-Sutlej State.¹⁸²

According to *The Rajas of Punjab* account, Fateh Singh went to British Government to obtain sort of security for his Trans-Sutlej territories. But what Fateh Singh was demanding was

¹⁷⁷ Captain G. Birch, *Selection from Notebook Kept by Captain G. Birch 1818-1821*, p. 1.

¹⁷⁸ Joseph Davey Cunningham, *A History of The Sikhs*, p. 186.

¹⁷⁹ Lepel Henry Griffin, *The Rajas of Punjab*, p. 532. See also; N.D, *Kapurthala State- Its Past and Present*, p. 8.

¹⁸⁰ Joginder Kaur (ed.), Ram Sukh Rao, *Fateh Singh Parbhakar*, p. 515.

¹⁸¹ Giani Gian Singh, *Raj Khalsa*, Vol. II, p. 179.

¹⁸² *Infra*, 72-78.

not possible for British Government at that time. As British Government was bound under the treaty of 1809 A.D, they could not proceed to the north of Sutlej because of this agreement. Fateh Singh's possession comprising of 454 villages at that time, out of which 254 villages were under his direct control and 163 villages under the Jagirdars whereas Naraingarh and Jagraon consisting of 46 and 66 villages respectively as granted by the Maharaja, British had admitted possession over these villages of Maharaja Ranjit Singh.¹⁸³ In similar way statement is given in *Ibratnama* that British expressed that without consent of Maharaja it would not be possible to gain access over the territories which lies under Maharaja's protection. From now onwards, it would be better for Fateh Singh to endure patiently and must forget territories of Trans-Sutlej.¹⁸⁴ It should be noted that Ironically, British Government didn't want to enter into dispute with Maharaja at that time. Though Fateh Singh didn't want to go back but Government persuaded him to return to Kapurthalla and assured him the goodwill of Maharaja.¹⁸⁵ But Ram Sukh Rao tells that Fateh Singh's eventual return was preceded by hectic diplomatic activity on the both side of the river Sutlej. While his agents were seeking intervention of the British at Ambala, Ludhiana and Delhi and he himself received Lahore agents and sent his own cashier in return to negotiate terms with Maharaja.¹⁸⁶

According to Lepel Griffin when in 1838 A.D Lord Auckland visited Punjab, Nihal Singh to show his god-will to the British Government, he sent supplies to Kabul in first Anglo Afghan war and some of his troops took part in Kabul expedition of 1842 A.D far as Jallabaad.¹⁸⁷ Here it is to be noted that his tendency increased towards British Government was a result of his separation with Lahore Darbar because Kahrak Singh had taken over some Kapurthalla village.¹⁸⁸

Lepel Griffin defines that after the assassination of Maharaja Sher Singh on 15th September 1843 A.D Lahore Darbar was in chaos because no superior

¹⁸³ Lepel Henry Griffin, *The Rajas of Punjab*, Low Price Publication, p. 537.

¹⁸⁴ Mufti-Ali-Ud-Din (trans.), *Ibratnama*, Department of Punjab Historical Studies, Punjabi University, Patiala, p. 353.

¹⁸⁵ Lepel Henry Griffin, *The Rajas of Punjab*, Low Price Publication, p. 537.

¹⁸⁶ Joginder Kaur (ed.), Ram Sukh Rao, *Fateh Singh Parbhakar*, pp. 471, 472, 474.

¹⁸⁷ N.D, *Kapurthala State- Its Past and Present*, p. 11. See also; Syad Muhammad Latif, *History of Punjab*, p. 319.

¹⁸⁸ Giani Gian Singh, *Raj Khalsa*, Vol. II, p. 167.

successor had left to proclaim the throne. In the opinion of Lepel Griffin, Nihal Singh as a descendant of prominent Sikh chief Jassa Singh Ahluwalia was a strong claimant if he would have tried it to acclaim it with energy. Despite of it, Nihal Singh stopped to interfere in Lahore politics and began to make excuses to remain absent, further he keep on making excuse from month to month. In Lepel Griffin's observation Nihal Singh was of timid disposition and unexcited person that of in the most favorable condition from which he could attain much didn't take interest.¹⁸⁹ But according to *Twareakh Khalsa* Nihal Singh was well aware of circumstances of Lahore Darbar and he had got secret news even he was sure that in rupture politics and untrustworthy climate of Lahore Darbar British Government would definitely interfere so he thought it would be wise to not to interfere and on the other side told every secret of Lahore Darbar to British Government.¹⁹⁰

Faridkot:

Lepel Griffin says that during the early years of the Chiefship of the Pahar Singh¹⁹¹ of Faridkot¹⁹² his younger brother gave him much trouble. Sahib Singh took arms against him and he urged to British Government for assistance but British Government denied and therefore he was compelled to get help from the Raja of Jind. However, Lepel Griffin also questioned here the policy of his own Government because as per the rule of British Government no state could interfere in other state's matters.¹⁹³ Probably reason could be that the Faridkot State was barren state at that time and yield was very less thus revenue obtained was also low so maybe British Government did not want to waste their energy on such a waste land. Fortunately situation got changed when his brother died and peace returned to the state. It should be noted here that Lepel Griffin doesn't gives any sort of reason for the death of Sahib Singh because he might have been killed. Because Lepel Griffin himself says when minor chief of Faridkot Attar Singh dies in 1827

¹⁸⁹ Lepel Henry Griffin, *The Rajas of Punjab*, p. 542.

¹⁹⁰ Giani Gyan Singh, *Tawarikh Raj Khalsa*, Vol.III, p. 335.

¹⁹¹ Chief Pahar Singh of Faridkot was son of Charat Singh and in he succeeded his nephew Attar Singh in 1827 A.D. He remained on the seat for more than twenty two years. He helped British in Anglo Sikhs wars. He died in 1849 A.D and passed on his seat to his son Wazir Singh.

¹⁹² For detail history of Faridkot State see; Appendix I.

¹⁹³ Lepel Henry Griffin, *The Rajas of Punjab*, p. 616.

A.D that “In this unhappy family (Faridkot), it was exception and not the rule of death to result from natural causes.” It raises a question on the death of Sahib Singh.

CHAPTER – 3

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN LAHORE DARBAR AND CIS-SUTLEJ STATES

India's glorious history is intimately attached to its geographical location. It has always been remained a paradise for avaricious marauders. Later Mughals failed to cope up with these mighty challenges. Mughal weakness provided golden opportunity for Sikhs to gear up their position in political scenario. In the beginning of the 19th century Sikhs has emerged as powerful rulers and warriors. Among all the Sikhs *mislas*, Maharaja Ranjit Singh of Sukarchakia *misal* became the most powerful. By winning over all his prior powerful contenders eventually his interest started growing in Cis-Sutlej territories. To study this fascinating tales of politically intricate relations, the most resourceful account is *The Rajas of Punjab*. In this chapter, Relations of Lahore Darbar or can say relation of Maharaja Ranjit Singh have been analyzed as given in *The Rajas of Punjab*.

Patiala:

One of the most important matters which have been discussed by Lepel Griffin was the dispute between the Raja Sahib Singh of Patiala and his Rani Aas Kaur. A violent quarrel occurred between both of them. Rani Aas Kaur took arms against Raja Sahib Singh of Patiala. In this tussle Jaswant Singh Nabha and Raja Bhag Singh of Jind were in the side of Raja Sahib Singh. Allies of Rani Aas Kaur were Bhai Lal Singh of Kaithal and Sardar Bhanga Singh of Thanesar. The clash continued for some time thereafter Raja Jaswant Singh to stop this fight requested Maharaja Ranjit Singh for aid. Maharaja Ranjit Singh was his nephew. Raja of Nabha joined in his request because he had been defeated by Raja of Patiala at Mirwana and was eager to take revenge. Therefore he joined Maharaja Ranjit Singh and Maharaja Ranjit Singh was also desperately waiting to interfere in this matter. So, on 26th July of 1806 A.D Maharaja Ranjit Singh crossed Sutlej with an estimated 30,000 horses along with Fateh Singh Ahluwalia and Gurdit Singh Ladwa. On 28th of July Maharaja Ranjit Singh took the possession of Doladhi town which was belonged to Raja of Patiala. Doladhi was matter of dispute between the Nabha and

Patiala.¹ This is to be noted that Lepel Griffin had contradicted by saying that Raja of Nabha was eager to take revenge from Raja of Patiala and on the other side he says that he was willing to stop the fight. In the opinion of Bhakat Mal, Bhai Lal Singh was middleman to stop the quarrel instead of that Raja of Jind desired that throne should be passed over to Rani Aas Kaur.² According to Sohan Lal Suri, Khanyia Lal and Bute Shah, Raja of Patiala had himself requested for aid of the Maharaja Ranjit Singh by sending his own *Vakil* Dhian Singh to Lahore Darbar.³

Lepel Griffin further tells that no request was made to British for peace. But British looked Maharaja Ranjit Singh's approach with distrust therefore they consider it advisable to strengthen the Karnal fort in case of Maharaja Ranjit Singh would enter the district with force. However Raja of Jind had wrote to British that objective of his nephew's visit was to settle the dispute. While Lepel Griffin shares that Maharaja Ranjit Singh did little to restore the friendship between couple instead he took large amount of money for his good will.⁴ S.N Banerjee confirms that Maharaja Ranjit Singh's visit aroused suspicion in British Government's intensions.⁵ Mufti Ali-ud-Din in his works gives a fact that Rani Aas Kaur was sister of Raja Bhag Singh of Jind that is why he was helping the queen.⁶ As per Bute Shah though Lal Singh was supporter of Rani Aas Kaur but she had to made truce with the help of Fateh Singh Ahluwalia, who was close companion of Maharaja Ranjit Singh.⁷ Khuswant Rai says that she got scared from the news that Raja Patiala had approached Maharaja thus she apologized to Raja Sahib Singh before

¹ Lepel Henry Griffin, *The Rajas of Punjab*, Low Price Publication, Delhi, Reprint 2014, pp. 92-93. See Also; Amarvant (trans.) Raja Ram Tota, *Guldaste-i-Punjab*, Vol. I, Department of Punjab Historical Studies, Punjabi University, Patiala, pp. 57-58. Also; Bute Shah (trans.), *Tarikh-i-Punjab*, Vol. III, Punjab Historical Studies, Punjabi University, Patiala, p. 34.

² Bhakt Mal (trans.), *Khalsanama*, Punjab Historical Studies, Punjabi University, Patiala, p. 108.

³ V.S Suri (trans.) Sohan Lal Suri, *Udmat- ut -Twarikh*, Daftar-ii, Guru Nanak Dev University, Amritsar, 1985, p.69. See also; Jeet Singh Seetal (ed.), *Kanhyia Lal*, *Tarikh-i-Punjab*, Vol.III, Publication Bureau, Punjab University, Patiala, 1987, p. 175. Also; Bute Shah (trans.), *Tarikh-i-Punjab*, Vol. III, p. 37.

⁴ Lepel Henry Griffin, *The Rajas of Punjab*, pp. 93-94.

⁵ S.N, Banerjee, *History of Patiala*, Vol. I, N.D., p. 248.

⁶ Mufti-Ali-Ud-Din (trans.), *Ibartnama*, Vol. III, Department of Punjab Historical Studies, Punjabi University, Patiala, p. 478.

⁷ Bute Shah (trans.) *Tarikh-i-Punjab*, Vol. III, p. 40.

Maharaja's arrival.⁸ However in the views of Colonel Malleeson when Rani Aas Kaur appealed for the help of Maharaja Ranjit Singh than all the chiefs of Cis-Sutlej states got alarmed by upcoming visit of Maharaja and therefore appealed to British Government in Calcutta. But royal couple had settled their differences before any reply could arrive from Government.⁹ The conquest of Maharaja Ranjit Singh in 1806 A.D has been discussed separately in Nabha, Jind, Kapurthala.¹⁰

According to Lepel Griffin after the departure of Maharaja Ranjit Singh the disturbance once again occurred between the Royal couple of Patiala. Official had started taking one side or the other side for their personal benefits therefore incidents of perpetual fights and bloodshed increased. Even Lieutenant White, who was on survey of the frontier, was also being attacked by the friends of Rani Aas Kaur and compelled him to retrace his steps although he had furnished by Raja Sahib Sing with full authority. This incident is also mentioned in *Ludhiana State Agency Records* and *Tarikh-i-Sikhan* which is identical to *The Rajas of Punjab*.¹¹

As a result, Maharaja Ranjit Singh was again called for peace by chiefs. In the opinion of Lepel Griffin it was mere question of money and Rani Aas Kaur bribed highest to the Maharaja Ranjit Singh. Along with money and diamonds she offered a Brass gun named *Khuri Khan*. Thus, she got an estate for herself and her son Kuwar Karam Singh worth Rs. 50,000 consisting district Banur, Manimajra, Sanour, Surali, Bissoli, and Minathral in the shape of compromise.¹² While according to J.D Cunningham, Rani had called Maharaja Ranjit Singh.¹³ On the contrary, Khaniya Lal tells that Raja had offered *Khara Khan* or *Khuri Khan* and a necklace

⁸ Khuswant Rai (trans.), *Tarikh – I - Sikhan*, Vol. I, Punjab Historical Department, Punjabi University, Patiala, p. 173.

⁹ Colonel G. B Malleeson, *An Historical Sketch of Native States of India*, Longman Green, London, 1875, p. 334.

¹⁰ *Infra*, p. 69, 73, 82.

¹¹ Lepel Henry Griffin, *The Rajas of Punjab*, p. 95. See also; Lieutenant White to Seton, 24 December 1809, *Records of Ludhiana Agency 1809-1815*, Punjab Government Press, Lahore, 1911, p. 148. Also; Bute Shah (trans.) *Tarikh-i-Punjab*, Vol. III, p. 37.

¹² Lepel Henry Griffin, *The Rajas of Punjab*, Low Price Publication, Delhi, Reprint 2014, pp. 95-96. See also; Punjab State Gazetteers, *Phulkian States*, Vol. XVII, Punjab Government Press, Lahore, 1904, p. 48.

¹³ Joseph Davey Cunningham, *A History of The Sikhs*, Ahleamarle Street, London, 1863, p. 136.

to Maharaja Ranjit Singh in exchange of help.¹⁴ However Sohan Lal Suri tells that chiefs of Punjab tried to stop quarrel by suggesting the division of state Patiala. Even Raja of Patiala agreed for the division on one condition that Rani Aas Kaur would not be allowed to either contact or interferes in his personal matters. Thus, matter got stretched therefore Maharaja was being called for truce and when Maharaja Ranjit Singh arrived there, Rani Aas Kaur got scared from the power and the force of Maharaja thus accepted to live with Raja Sahib Singh in harmony without any condition.¹⁵ In the opinion of Colonel Malleson, Rani appealed to Maharaja for help but before Maharaja could reach the royal couple, couple had successfully settled their differences and when Maharaja reached Patiala than Raja Sahib Singh and Rani Aas Kaur presented him the necklace and the brass gun as gesture of thanks.¹⁶ On the contrary, it has been given in *Guldaste-i-Punjab* and in *Tarikh-i-Punjab* that Rani Aas Kaur had requested the Maharaja Ranjit Singh to help her and for assistance she offered necklace and money but when Maharaja was about to reach, the Patiala couple had already made peace agreement. So, Maharaja got angry and asked Rani Aas Kaur to fulfill her promise thus Rani Aas Kaur got scared by his power so she had to submit her necklace and other luxury items in Maharaja's treasury.¹⁷ However in H.T Princep's work it has been given that Maharaja was called by Rani to espouse her cause. She promised him *Khuree Khan* and necklace for assistance. But Rani and Raja had come to reconciliation before Maharaja Ranjit Singh reached Patiala. Rani Aas Kaur got secured Jagir of Rs.50,000 for her son through the mediation of Jind and Thanesar chiefs.¹⁸ It has been given in book *History of Patiala* that village granted to Rani Aas Kaur were Banur, Ranimajra, Surala Neonola, Sanur and Chanarthal.¹⁹

Lepel Griffin tells that due to frequent attacks of Maharaja Cis-Sutlej chiefs began to perceive that they would be destroyed one by one if they would not get any foreign assistance or

¹⁴ Jeet Singh Seetal (ed.), *Tarikh-i-Punjab, Kanhyia Lal*, Vol. III, Publication Bureau, Punjab University Patiala, 1987, p. 175.

¹⁵ V.S Suri (trans.) Sohan Lal Suri, *Udmat-ut-Twarikh*, Daftar- II, p. 76.

¹⁶ Colonel G. B Malleson C.S.I, *An Historical Sketch of Native States of India*, p. 334.

¹⁷ Amarvat (trans.) Raja Ram Tota, *Guldaste-i-Punjab*, Vol. i, pp. 57-58. See also; Bute Shah (trans.) *Tarikh-i-Punjab*, Vol. III, p. 43.

¹⁸ Henry T. Princep, *Origin of Sikh Power in Punjab*, Military Orphan Press, Calcutta, 1834, pp. 61-62.

¹⁹ S.N Banerjee, *History of Patiala*, Vol. I, N.D., p. 251.

British assistance. So, Raja Bhag Singh of Jind, Sirdar Chen Singh, Bhai Lal of Kythal and Agent of Patiala visited Mr. Seton, the resident of Delhi in March 1808 A.D to attain protection.²⁰ While, according to S.N Banerjee, Mir Gulam Hussian was also with the deputation.²¹

Lepel Griffin shares that British Government was disposed to protect the chiefs but Government had not taken decision yet that how to act upon it. Therefore, Cis- Sutlej chiefs decided to proceed to Haridwar to arrange amicable relation with Maharaja Ranjit Singh but Maharaja Ranjit Singh changed his plan at once and went back to Lahore because he had heard that Patiala chief was intriguing against him along with the English. From Lahore Maharaja Ranjit Singh proposed a meeting with Raja Sahib at Lakhnour. Raja Sahib Singh was not willing to meet but he was compelled to meet under the sheer terror. When Patiala Raja was gone to meet him Maharaja received him with utmost kindness and as a sign of brotherhood, both exchanged their turbans.²² However, S.N Banerjee and Mia Bashir Farooqi says that Cis Sutlej chiefs decided to meet Maharaja Ranjit Singh because they had got disappointed with their refusal of request which they had made to British Government and on the other side Maharaja Ranjit Singh went back to Lahore due to certain political situation in his state. Therefore, meeting took place at Lahore itself.²³ According to Sohan Lal Suri reason behind the cancellation of Maharaja Ranjit Singh's pilgrimage to Haridwar was the result of Raja Bhag Singh's advice.²⁴ As per H.T Princep, Maharaja Ranjit Singh had got news that detachment had met with Seton to get protection, so to detach the chiefs from British and to put them in his favor he was calling the chiefs for meeting.²⁵ In the views of J.D Cunningham, chiefs were verbally assured by British Government that they have had become dependent princes of them.²⁶ Nonetheless, Bikram Jit Hasrat says that Seton gave an unclear answer to the deputation and said that complaints against

²⁰ Lepel Henry Griffin, *The Rajas of Punjab*, pp. 98-99. See also; Henry T. Princep, *Origin of Sikh Power in Punjab*, p. 64.

²¹ S.N Banerjee, *History of Patiala*, Vol. I, N.D., p. 253.

²² Lepel Henry Griffin, *The Rajas of Punjab*, p. 100.

²³ S.N Banerjee, *History of Patiala*, Vol. I, N.D., p. 254. See also; Mia Bashir Ahmed Farooqi, *British Relations with Cis-Sutlej States 1809-1823*, Punjab Government Records, Lahore, 1971, p. 5.

²⁴ V.S Suri (trans.) Sohan Lal Suri, *Udmat-ut-Twarikh*, Daftar II, p. 76.

²⁵ Henry T. Princep, *Origin of Sikh Power in Punjab*, p. 65.

²⁶ Joseph Davey Cunningham, *A History of The Sikhs*, p.138.

Maharaja Ranjit Singh were baseless. In actual reports of British Government the French intrigues had been reaching Calcutta from Tehran, so in this crucial situation British Government was seriously thinking to send embassies to Kabul and Lahore.²⁷ It is to be noted at that time British Government needed Maharaja Ranjit Singh's help to secure Hindustani border from French invasion so they were not in position to take chiefs under their protection by ignoring and annoying the much useful person like Maharaja Ranjit Singh.

Lepel Griffin discusses the intention of Raja Sahib Singh of Patiala about Maharaja Ranjit Singh through his letter which he had written to Resident of Delhi. Resident of Delhi had also wrote a letter to Raja of Patiala prior to his meeting with Maharaja Ranjit Singh in which Resident of Delhi had promise for protection without waiting for the answer from the Calcutta. But Sahib Singh received this letter after the meeting was over. Lepel Griffin shares full fledged information of a letter of Raja Sahib Singh which he had written to British officials, in this letter Raja Sahib Singh narrated everything which occurred during meeting. He said that Maharaja expressed his desire to meet him but he didn't want to meet him as he sent Raja Bhag Singh, Chen Singh and his own agent Must Singh to Patiala. After discussing the matter for few days all chiefs gave their opinion that since British official Mr. Metclalf had been sent on the behalf of Governor General to establish friendship with Maharaja Ranjit Singh therefore opposing Maharaja would be unwise. Raja Sahib Singh further exclaimed that although he was not willing to meet him and if he would have got British Government's letter earlier than he would have replied to Maharaja in aggressive way.²⁸ However, in the opinion of S.N Banerjee, Sahib Singh and Banga Singh first decided to oppose the aggression of Maharaja Ranjit Singh but later they dropped an idea because from who they were seeking protection was also trying to conclude an alliance with Maharaja Ranjit Singh so rejecting the proposal of meeting would be unwise from political perspective.²⁹ It should be noted that at this time French threat had been ended and British Government could now take the Cis-Sutlej chiefs under their protection and they did not need Maharaja anymore. So as soon as they got news that chiefs has decided to be with Maharaja they immediately took action. Even Lepel Griffin himself talks about the necessity of Anglo-

²⁷ Bikram Jit Hasrat, *Anglo Sikh Relations 1799-1849*, Research Book Agency, Hoshiarpur, 1968, p.61.

²⁸ Lepel Henry Griffin, *The Rajas of Punjab*, p. 100-101.

²⁹ S.N Banerjee, *History of Patiala*, Vol.I, p. 259.

Sikh alliance during French Invasion.³⁰ So when threat of French invasion faded away British Government sent a letter to Maharaja Ranjit Singh through the envoy. In the letter it was stated that Cis- Sutlej states have had been taken under the protection.³¹ Mis Farooqi Bahsir and Sohan Lal Suri's account gives same detail.³²

Lepel Griffin holds that Maharaja Ranjit Singh decided to start a war with British. So Colonel David Ochterlony was sent with detachment of British troops to station on Sutlej to check any further extension of Maharaja Ranjit Singh to south as a guarantee of protection to the Cis-Sutlej chiefs.³³ *Ludhiana Agency Records*, S.N Banerjee and Mia Farooqi approve purpose of Ochterlony's arrival as told by Lepel Griffin.³⁴

Lepel Griffin further says that Government had assured Ochterlony that Chiefs were eagerly waiting to get British protection and compulsory engagements which were made by Maharaja Ranjit Singh with Raja of Patiala Sahib Singh should not be considered binding.³⁵ However, according to derived information from the *Ludhiana Agency Records* shows that British Government was not sure about Patiala that whether Raja would change his side or not in the favor of British.³⁶

Lepel Griffin records that on 14 January 1809 A.D Bhai Gurbakash Singh an agent of Maharaja arrived at Patiala to summon Raja Patiala or his minister to Amritsar but Raja refused to go or to send anyone else over there.³⁷ S.N Banerjee and *Ludhiana Agency Records* confirms Raja's refusal to Gurbaskh Singh.³⁸

³⁰ See Details; Lepel Henry Griffin, *The Rajas of Punjab*, pp. 118- 119.

³¹ *Ibid.*, p. 117.

³² Mia Bashir Ahmed Farooqi, *British Relations with Cis-Sutlej States 1809-1823*, Punjab Government Records, Lahore, 1971, p. 8. See also; V.S Suri(trans.) Sohan Lal Suri, *Udmat-ut-Twarikh*, Daftar II, pp. 97- 98.

³³ Lepel Henry Griffin, *The Rajas of Punjab*, p. 122.

³⁴ *Records of Ludhiana Agency 1809-1815*, Punjab Government Press, Lahore, 1911, pp. 1-24. See also; S.N Banerjee, *History of Patiala*, Vol.I, p. 266. See also; Mia Bashir Ahmed Farooqi, *British Relations with Cis-Sutlej States 1809-1823*, 1971, p. 10.

³⁵ Lepel Henry Griffin, *The Rajas of Punjab*, p. 122.

³⁶ *Records of Ludhiana Agency 1809-1815*, p. 3.

³⁷ Lepel Henry Griffin, *The Rajas of Punjab*, p. 122.

³⁸ S.N Banerjee, *History of Patiala*, Vol.I, p. 266. See also; *Records of Ludhiana Agency 1809-1815*, p. 32.

Lepel Griffin further writes that Ochterlony arrived at Patiala on 1st February of 1809 and Raja Sahib Singh welcomed him so greatly.³⁹ According to S.N Banerjee and Mia Farooqi, Ochterlony arrived on 2nd February of 1809.⁴⁰

Lepel Griffin registers that negotiations with Lahore and British Government were not going well and Maharaja's tendency were to start a war with them but somehow luckily at this crucial moment the war between the British and Maharaja Ranjit Singh got deferred. Thus, Maharaja Ranjit Singh signed a peace treaty with British Government on 25 April 1809 A.D in which he resigned his right over all Cis-Sutlej states which came under the British Protection. Various sources agree with Lepel Griffin.⁴¹ However as per K.N Pannikar, relation of British Government with Cis-Sutlej states stood on particular footing. No treaty or any written agreement was passed between both the parties. It was a unilateral action which was taken up from only British Government's side. Ironically Government didn't want to build intimate relations with Cis-Sutlej states. Clear intention of British Government was to establish an autonomous and loyal confederacy of chiefs who would be helpful to the British power in difficult times.⁴²

Lepel Griffin describes in his work the matter of Doldahi village. Dispute started when Bhai Tara Singh took this village under his possession and started ploughing it due to this action Raja Jaswant Singh of Nabha got annoyed and killed Bhai Tara Singh, who was the official of Patiala state. Jaswant Singh gave reason that Tara Singh had attempted to encroach his land. Raja of Patiala got furious at the loss of his official so Raja Sahib Singh in anger marched to Nabha and defeated him than to save himself Raja Jaswant Singh sent message through Raja Bhag

³⁹ Lepel Henry Griffin, *The Rajas of Punjab*, p. 123.

⁴⁰ S.N Banerjee, *History of Patiala*, Vol.I, p. 266. See also; Mia Bashir Ahmed Farooqi, *British Relations with Cis-Sutlej States 1809-1823*, p. 13.

⁴¹ For detail of the treaty see; C.V, Aitchison, *A Collection of Treaties and Sandas*, Vol. i, Government Printing, Calcutta, 1892, p. 196. See also; Joseph Davey Cunningham, *A History of The Sikhs*, p. 123-125. Also; Mia Bashir Ahmed Farooqi, *British Relations with Cis-Sutlej States 1809-1823*, p. 8-10. Also; Jeet Singh Seetal (ed.), *Kanhyia Lal, Tarikh-i-Punjab*, Vol. iii, Publication Bureau, Punjab University Patiala, 1987, p. 175. See; V.S Suri (trans.) Sohan Lal Suri, *Udmat-ut-Twarikh*, Daftar II, p. 186.

⁴² K.N Pannikar, *British Diplomacy in North India*, Associated Publishing, New Delhi, p. 105.

Singh of Jind to get help from Maharaja Ranjit Singh.⁴³ W.H Allen reports that due to some feud between Nabha and Patiala, Raja of Jind was deputed to get assistance of Maharaja Ranjit Singh because combine forces of Nabha, Jind, Ladwa and Kythal were very weak to challenge the Patiala forces.⁴⁴ It has been given in *Tarikh-i-Punjab* that Raja Jaswant Singh of Nabha offered amount of 50,000 to Maharaja Ranjit Singh for help through Bhag Singh of Jind.⁴⁵

Lepel Griffin further inscribes that after getting invitation Maharaja Ranjit Singh attacked on the Raja Shaib Singh and besieged him in Munsurpur and destroyed the well of Doladhi but later he gave order to Raja of Patiala to repair it.⁴⁶ But according to W.H Allen, Raja of Patiala on the arrival of Maharaja in Mansurpur offered him some amount of money and presented a piece of artillery and thus managed to propitiate the Maharaja.⁴⁷

Lepel Griffin further tells that till 1827 A.D land of Doladhi remained untilled. But after twenty one year Raja Jaswant Singh of Nabha again blamed Patiala for encroachment. However chief of Patiala rejected to appoint arbitrators due to this Captain Murray was compelled to visit and draw a boundary line⁴⁸ but as per *Press List of Old Records* Raja Jaswant Singh of Nabha had approached to Government against the action of Patiala.⁴⁹

Boundary fixed by Captain Murray failed to please both the parties. Lepel Griffin gives excuse of failure of fixing a proper boundary line because of the method applied by Maharaja Ranjit Singh to divide the land was not valid and to decide the exact point was became much

⁴³ Lepel Henry Griffin, *The Rajas of Punjab*, p. 171.

⁴⁴ W.H Allen, *History of Punjab; Rise, Progress and Present Condition of Sect and Nation of Sikh People*, Vol.I, Leaden Hall Street, London, 1846, p. 273.

⁴⁵ Bute Shah (trans.) *Tarikh-i-Punjab*, Vol.III, p. 39.

⁴⁶ Lepel Henry Griffin, *The Rajas of Punjab*, p. 171.

⁴⁷ W.H Allen, *History of Punjab: Rise, Progress and Present Condition of Sect and Nation of Sikh People*, Vol.I, p. 274.

⁴⁸ Lepel Henry Griffin, *The Rajas of Punjab*, p. 171.

⁴⁹ From Colebrooke to Murray, 7 April 1826, *Press List of Old Records In the Punjab Secretariat 1809-1840*, Punjab Government, Lahore, 1911, no. 28.

more difficult.⁵⁰ As per W.H Allen's account, Maharaja had given whole Doladhi to Patiala without dividing any portion.⁵¹

Lepel Griffin mentions that to settle the boundary questions, agents of Kythal and Jind chief were called upon to re-fix boundary and to remove the pillars which were fixed by Captain Murray as well as to destroy the cultivation done on disputed land. Than Agents fixed new boundary line successfully.⁵² Official records support the Lepel Griffin's account.⁵³

Lepel Griffin further elaborates that new decision was in the favor of Patiala so Raja Jaswant Singh of Nabha appealed against this decision. Raja Jaswant Singh blamed Colebrooke for favoring Patiala. Even daily complaints and encroachments report were being reported thus Delhi Government had to directly interfere in the matter. Government concluded that decision of Colebrooke should set aside and boundary lines which had been set previously by Captain Murray should be confirmed.⁵⁴ Official letter supports Lepel Griffin's explanation.⁵⁵

Nabha:

It is given in *The Rajas of Punjab* that when Maharaja Ranjit Singh came on the Cis-Sutlej expedition in 1807 and in 1808, Nabha Chief Jaswant Singh as an ally received a grant of four villages of Gumgrana estate which was taken from Gujjar Singh and next year the district of Kannah consisting of eighteen villages given to Jaswant Singh. But According to Bikramjit Hasrat he recieved Kot, Busia and Ghumgrana.⁵⁶ Sohan Lal Suri gives the evidence of this expedition alliance of Raja of Nabha with Maharaja Ranjit Singh in brief but on the other hand

⁵⁰ Lepel Henry Griffin, *The Rajas of Punjab*, p. 172.

⁵¹ W.H Allen, *History of Punjab; Rise, Progress and Present Condition of Sect and Nation of Sikh People*, Vol. I, p. 274.

⁵² Lepel Henry Griffin, *The Rajas of Punjab*, p. 172.

⁵³ Murray to Coolebooke, 13 December 1828, Foreign Department, Political Proceeding, no.17. (N.A.I)

⁵⁴ Lepel Henry Griffin, *The Rajas of Punjab*, Low Price Publication, Delhi, Reprint 2014, p. 173.

⁵⁵ Resident to Chief Secretary of Government, 29 January 1830, Foreign Department, Political Consultation, no.11.(N.A.I)

⁵⁶ Bikramjit Hasrat, *Anglo Sikh Relations 1799-1849*, p. 65.

according to *Punjab di Sair* eighteen villages were part of Lakhwala which lies in Raikot region.⁵⁷

Lepel Griffin stated that Jaswant Singh had understood that his friendship would not go on to last forever and one day Maharaja Ranjit Singh would usurp his estate so he turned his attention towards British protection and signed a treaty of 3 May 1809 A.D. and therefore he received Ochterlony with utmost cordiality at Nabha.⁵⁸ From *Ludhiana Agency Records* meeting of Ochterlony and Raja Jaswant Singh of Nabha confirms the date of treaty confirmed from C.V. Aitchison.⁵⁹ According to *Punjab di Sair* continuously attacked of Maharaja in Cis-Sutlej areas made Raja of Nabha restless so he along with other Phulkian chiefs went under the protection of British for safety.⁶⁰ As stated by Raja Ram Tota, Cis-Sutlej chiefs got annoyed with the attacks of Maharaja Ranjit Singh therefore they turned towards British Protection.⁶¹

Lepel Griffin unfolds a matter of dispute between Lahore Darbar and Nabha state. Matter was of Mowran village which was situated in Nabha territory. Morwan village was granted to Dhanna Singh Malwayi by Nabha on the request of Maharaja Ranjit Singh and in the exchange village of Manokah was allowed to give to the sister of Jaswant Singh, Rani Sahib Kaur. Rani Shaib Kaur died two months early before the death of Maharaja Ranjit Singh in 1839 A.D. than Kahrak Singh resumed her land. Subsequently, after the death of Dhanna Singh Malwayi in May 1843 A.D., Raja Davinder Singh ordered the Hukam Singh, the son of deceased chief of Mowran to surrender the village.⁶² As per the *Umdat-ut-Twarikh*, Dhanna Singh Malwayi died in March

⁵⁷ Lepel Henry Griffin, *The Rajas of Punjab*, p. 423. See also; V.S. Suri (trans.) Sohan Lal Suri, *Umdat-ut-Twarikh*, Daftar II, p. 60. Also; Giani Lal Singh (trans.) Rai Kali and Tulsi Ram, *Punjab Di Sair*, Punjabi University, Patiala, 1971.

⁵⁸ Lepel Henry Griffin, *The Rajas of Punjab*, p. 423.

⁵⁹ *Records of Ludhiana Agency*, Punjab Government Press, Lahore, 1911, p. 71. See also; C.V. Aitchison, *A Collection Treaties Engagements and Sandas*, vol. viii, Superintendent Government Printing, Calcutta, 1909, p. 196.

⁶⁰ Giani Lal Singh, (trans.) Rai Kali and Tulsi Ram, *Punjab Di Sair*, p. 237.

⁶¹ Amarvant (trans.) Raja Ram Tota, *Guldaste-i-Punjab*, Vol. I, Punjab Historical Studies Deptt. Library, Punjabi University, Patiala, p. 68.

⁶² Lepel Henry Griffin, *The Rajas of Punjab*, pp. 442-445.

instead of May.⁶³ It has been given in British official letter that Raja Nabha had told to British Government that he had given Morwan to Dhana Singh and now Dhana Singh does not obey him so he want Morwan back.⁶⁴

As per *The Rajas of Punjab* when Hukam Singh refused to surrender the village than Davinder Singh of Nabha sent a force and attacked the fort of Morwan and looted more than two Lakh from Hukam Singh. While Raja of Nabha in his defense said that at first the people of the village opened fired upon his troops therefore precautionary action had to be taken. Lepel Griffin in favour of Raja of Nabha tells that no evidence of the removal of treasure was found.⁶⁵ In this connection J.D Cunningham said that Raja got displeased with Dhanna Singh and attacked the Morwan and plundered the property of Dhanna Singh.⁶⁶ However, as per British official letter, Son of Dhana Singh told British Government that he had talked to Raja Jaswant Singh of Nabha that they would discuss the matter with Lahore Government but Davinder Singh, son of Raja Jaswant Singh, attacked on us without discussing the matter.⁶⁷

The matter became very serious and Sikhs of Lahore Darbar blamed British Government for misconduct because Government gave Morwan to Raja without investigating the documents which were presented by Raja to Government. Lahore Darbar held the grant as invalid and declared the documents to be forged.⁶⁸ Here, this is to be noted that Lepel Griffin justifies the Government's step to be correct by stating that "British Government was a Paramount power and no feudatory was competent to transfer the territory to independent power without its consent." Therefore, British Government resumed the village by itself.⁶⁹ But according to J.D Cunningham and the Major Broadfoot village was transfer to Lahore Darbar without the knowledge of the

⁶³ V.S Suri (trans.) Sohan Lal Suri, *Umdat-ut-Twarikh*, Daftar iv, Punjab Ithihaas Parkashan, Chandigarh, 1972, p. 216.

⁶⁴ Foreign Department, Political Prog., 15 June 1844, no. 35. (N.A.I).

⁶⁵ Lepel Henry Griffin, *The Rajas of Punjab*, p. 446.

⁶⁶ Joseph Davey Cunningham, *A History of The Sikhs*, p.269.

⁶⁷ Foreign Department, Political Prog., 15 June 1844, no. 36. (N.A.I)

⁶⁸ Lepel Henry Griffin, *The Rajas of Punjab*, p. 446,448.

⁶⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 448.

British Government thus it was considered as a invalid gift.⁷⁰ Another point should be notice that Lepel Griffin himself agreed that British Government without complete knowledge of matter allowed Raja Jaswant Singh to take possession of Morwan village even though Jaswant Singh failed to provide the original documents to British Government. Herein it should be taken into the account the fact that Lepel Griffin himself confess that action took by British Government irritated Lahore Darbar extremely that became the one of the reason for the Anglo Sikh war.⁷¹ It is found in British official records that Jaswant Singh failed to show the original documents even though British allowed Davinder Singh's authority over Morwan. Ochterlony voted in favour of Raja of Nabha and even permission to take possession over Morwan was given by British official Coolbrooke.⁷² Moreover reason behind annoyance of Lahore Darbar without any doubt was the British Government because when the lawyer from Lahore Darbar tried to talk about Mowran with Major Broadfoot, Major Broadfoot replied to him that in front of Supreme Government subordinates like Lahore Dabar's opinion were of no use because in Cis-Sutlej area British Government was a Paramount power.⁷³

Jind:

The dispute of Patiala, Jind and Nabha and quarrel between Raja of Patiala and Rani Aas Kaur has been discussed in Patiala state matters.⁷⁴ In *The Rajas of Punjab* only names of those villages which were received by Bhag Singh from Maharaja Ranjit Singh has been given when Maharaja came on the expedition of 1806 A.D in Cis Sutlej States. Which are as follow - Ludhiana consisting 24 villages income 15,380 rupees per annum, 24 villages of Jhandiala from same family and income was in total of Rs. 4370, two villages of Kot and Jagraon worth Rs.2000 per year. All were taken from Rani of Rai Alyas of Mahammadan Rajput family of Raikot and from widow of Miah Ghos, he got two villages of Basia district and in following year Maharaja gave him 27 villages of Morinda in Sirhind which were conquered from son of Dharam Singh

⁷⁰ Major George Broadfoot, *Carrier of Major George Broadfoot in Afghanistan and Punjab*, Ahelmarle Street, London, 1888, p. 232. See also; Joseph Davey Cunningham, *A History of The Sikhs*, p.269.

⁷¹ *Ibid.*, p. 450.

⁷² From Lieutenant Colonel A.J Richmond to Currie, Sectary to the Government of India, Foreign Department, Political Prog., 15 June 1844, No. 37-38 (N.A.I).

⁷³ Major George Broadfoot, *Carrier of Major George Broadfoot in Afghanistan and Punjab*, p. 232.

⁷⁴ *Infra*, p. 61-64, 94.

and total income was of 19,255 from these villages all together.⁷⁵ In *Punjab State Gazetteers* it has been given that Maharaja Ranjit Singh gave him Ludhiana comprising Dhandala, Kot, Jagraon and Basia, including 54 villages with an annual rent of 23,260.⁷⁶ According to Khuswant Rai, he acquired land of Ludhiana and Morinda in the expedition of Maharaja Ranjit Singh by paying *Nazarana* in exchange.⁷⁷ While, Bute Shah and Sohan Lal Suri discuss only about Ludhiana fort in brief that it was awarded to Bhag Singh by Maharaja Ranjit Singh in his expedition.⁷⁸ However, Henry Princep and W.H Allen tell that Maharaja Ranjit Singh seized Morinda and sold it to Raja Bhag Singh.⁷⁹ In *Guldaste-i-Punjab* it is given that the area of Ludhiana was given to Bhag Singh and in exchange *nazarana* was levied.⁸⁰

Lepel Griffin discusses the seizure of Fort of Ghumgrana by Raja Bhag Singh, Raja of Nabha and by contingents of Patiala. The fort was owned by Gujjar Singh, son of famous Tara Singh Gheba, who had died lately. Maharaja Ranjit Singh ordered the joint forces to desist the fort and gave it to his favorite Karam Singh Nagla. Karam Singh Nagla requested to Maharaja Ranjit Singh that he also want to take over the villages near the Ghumgrana which had been held by Bhag Singh of Jind, for completeness of his jagir. But Maharaja didn't want to compel his uncle Bhag Singh to restore his villages. So, in consequence, a perpetual fighting and bloodshed took place between both the parties at Ghumgrana.⁸¹

However, Khuswant Rai tells that Jaswant Singh of Nabha and forces of Lal Singh Kaithal came to help the Bhag Singh in seizure of fort. The fort was strong enough to capture, so Bhag Singh called Maharaja Ranjit Singh for help but Ranjit Singh instead of helping his uncle asked the son of Tara Singh Gheba to hold the attack tenaciously. Therefore, Raja Bhag got

⁷⁵ Lepel Henry Griffin, *The Rajas of Punjab*, p. 323.

⁷⁶ *Punjab State Gazetteers*, Vol. XVII, p. 215.

⁷⁷ Khuswant Rai, (trans.) *Tarikh-i- Sikhan*, Vol. I, p. 176.

⁷⁸ Bute Shah (trans.) *Tarikh-i-Punjab*, Vol. I, p. 150. See also; V.S Suri (trans.) Sohan Lal Suri, *Udmat-Ut-Twarikh*, Daftar II, p. 73.

⁷⁹ Henry T. Princep, *Origin of Sikh Power in Punjab*, Military Orphan Press, Calcutta, 1834, p. 62. See also; W.H Allen, *History of Punjab; Rise, Progress and Present Condition of Sect and Nation of Sikh People*, Vol. I, Leaden Hall Street, London, 1846, p. 281.

⁸⁰ Amarvant (trans.) Raja Ram Tota, *Guldaste-i-Punjab*, Vol. I, p. 57.

⁸¹ Lepel Henry Griffin, *The Rajas of Punjab*, p. 326.

angry and went back to Jind. After that Diwan Mokham Chand captured the fort.⁸² As per Sohan Lal Suri the Maharaja captured Ghumgrana himself.⁸³ In the opinion of Henry Princep and W.H Allen, only Ranjit Singh's detachment attacked Ghumgrana after Tara Singh Gebha's death and captured it for the treasury.⁸⁴ Whereas as per *Secular Sovereign Maharaja Ranjit Singh*, villages near Ghumgrana which were three in numbers, Raja of Jind got them when Maharaja had come on his second expedition in Sutlej territories.⁸⁵

In next dealing of Jind and Maharaja Ranjit Singh, Lepel Griffin tells that Jind chief was became security for the ransom of Malerkotla from which Maharaja had demanded the tribute of one lakh rupees. Only 27000 rupees had been paid and for rest of the balance Phulkian chiefs and Kythal became security, in this favor these chiefs received Jamalpura and other territories in pledge from Malerkotla. Jind was compelled to resign the lands given by Malerkotla and Maharaja after some negotiation freed the chiefs from the necessity of paying balance for which they had become sureties.⁸⁶ Nonetheless, as per *Punjab State Gazetteers*, Phulikan and other chiefs demanded one and half lakh rupees for the non intervention of the Maharaja Ranjit Singh, therefore two third of this amount was paid at once and remaining balance of 50,000 rupees were mortgage to Maharaja Ranjit Singh through five villages.⁸⁷ However, Khuswant Rai tells that money demanded for ransom was of 2 Lakh rupees and Malerkotla requested that state did not had sufficient amount to pay Maharaja Ranjit Singh so Maharaja took Malerkotla city under his command. Khuswant Rai further tells that, Diwan Mokham Chand and other official of Lahore were planning to take over the Malerkotla along with Ambala, and gradually to take the possession over Patiala so that their boundary could reach till Jamuna. When, Bhag Singh got intimation he discuss it with Bhai Lal Singh and Chanan Singh. They decide that it would be unwise to let the Maharaja to take over the Malekotla under his charge permanently because in

⁸² Khuswant Rai (trans.), *Tarikh -i- Sikhan*, Vol. I, p. 254.

⁸³ V.S Suri (trans.) Sohan Lal Suri, *Udmat-ut-Twarikh*, Daftar II, p. 77.

⁸⁴ Henry T. Princep, *Origin of Sikh Power in Punjab*, p. 63. See also; W.H Allen, *History of Punjab; Rise, Progress and Present Condition of Sect and Nation of Sikh People*, Vol. I, p. 280.

⁸⁵ M.K Gill, *Secular Sovereign Maharaja Ranjit Singh*, M.P Parkashan, Delhi, 2002, p. 62.

⁸⁶ Lepel Henry Griffin, *The Rajas of Punjab*, p. 326.

⁸⁷ *Punjab District Gazetteers Ludhiana District and Malterkotla State*, Civil and Military Gazetteer Press, Lahore, 1907, p. 6.

*Five Villages were – Lehra, Pohir, Jhamat, Kulahar, Janghera.

future he would create difficulties for them and therefore they placed bid over Malerkotla and offered Maharaja Ranjit Singh 1 Lakh and 25 thousand in exchange of it.⁸⁸ On the other hand, Bute Shah says that 27000 rupees were being paid to Maharaja Ranjit Singh and for reminder Bhai Lal Singh and Raja Jind became the securities from the side of Malerkotla. For this favor Malerkotla gave them 4 forts – Jamalpura, Mehna, Kanganvala, Panjgarai.⁸⁹ While, Sohan Lal Suri states that Maharaja Ranjit Singh demanded 56,000 rupees from Malerkotla. So under constrain Malerkotla chiefs charged citizen of Malerkotla with heavy fines to collect the sum. However, Maharaja Ranjit Singh didn't want to distress the common people but Malerkotla chiefs in reply said that it is quite hard for them to pay such a big amount therefore Maharaja Ranjit Singh decreased the amount and charged them only 7 to 8 thousands rupees.⁹⁰

Lepel Griffin put forth an opinion about Sangat Singh's rule by examining the condition of his state after he took the charge of Jind. He tells that Raja didn't pay any attention to state administration. Sangat Singh was in close connection with Maharaja Ranjit Singh and he paid several visits in 1826 to 1827 A.D to Lahore, even accompanied Maharaja on several occasions. For an example, he went to attend Holi function and accompany him in Jowala Mukhi, a pilgrimage in the Kangra Valley and so on. So, during his visit the Maharaja gave him many villages as a gift but this was not tolerated by the British Government as he was the under British protection therefore he was under the obligation of informing them of every transaction he carried out with Maharaja Ranjit Singh. Griffin writes that "While under the protection of British Government in accepting or purchasing villages from foreign power was most reprehensible." Due to pressure put by British Government, Raja Sangat Singh had to return some of the territories which he had received from Maharaja Ranjit Singh. Nonetheless, he was allowed to keep Manimajra, Maharampur, Musapur etc.⁹¹ By examining the *The Historical Interpretation* fact which reveals that the British were not happy with the Ranjit and Sangat Singh's relation and due to the mal-administration which prevailed in the state.⁹² From the Sohan

⁸⁸ Khuswant Rai (trans.) *Tarikh-i- Sikhan*, Vol. I, p. 252.

⁸⁹ Bute Shah (trans.) *Tarikh-i-Punjab*, Vol. III, p. 47.

⁹⁰ V.S Suri (trans.) Sohan Lal Suri, *Udmat-ut-Twarikh*, Daftar II, p. 89.

⁹¹ Lepel Henry Griffin, *The Rajas of Punjab*, pp. 354-355.

⁹² N.D, *An Historical Interpretation of George Rusell Clerk*, National Archive of India, N.D, p. 132.

Lal Suri and Giani Gian Singh's work one can trace his travels to Lahore even about his rewards which he had got from Maharaja Ranjit Singh.⁹³

Kapurthala:

Lepel Griffin mentions that Fateh Singh succeeded his father and in his first act he made an alliance with Maharaja Ranjit Singh by exchanging turbans and swore in front of Guru Granth Sahib to remain friends forever.⁹⁴ Contemporary sources like Fateh Singh Parbhakar, *Udmat-Ut-Twarikh*, *Zafarnama-i- Ranjit Singh* agree with this event as per Lepel Griffin. He then marched against the Kasur along with his new friend but failed to win over it.⁹⁵

In the autumn of 1805 A.D Maratha Chief Jaswant Rao Holkar came to Punjab and the British army under the command of Lake was chasing him. Although he tried to win Cis-Sutlej chiefs in his side but he failed to do so. Then, he marched towards Amritsar to get assistance from Maharaja Ranjit Singh but according to *The Rajas of Punjab* Maharaja refused to help him under the influence of Bhag Singh and Fateh Singh. But in the opinion of J.D Cunningham and Ram Rao Sukh, only Fateh Singh dissuaded Maharaja not to lend any help to fugitive prince against British Government.⁹⁶ But, according to Bute Shah it was Bhag Singh who advised Maharaja that it would be unwise to accept Holkar's friendship because this step might enrage the British Government.⁹⁷ However, as per Kaniya Lal, Maharaja at his own behalf refused to render any kind of help to Jaswant Rao Holkar. He deliberately made excuses to Holkar about helping him against the British Government.⁹⁸

⁹³ V.S Suri (trans.) Sohan Lal Suri, *Udmat-ut-Twarikh*, Daftar II, p.394, 397, 399-400, 439-43, 445-47, 489, 491. See also; Giani Gian Singh, *Raj Khalsa*, Part II, p. 113.

⁹⁴ Lepel Henry Griffin, *The Rajas of Punjab*, p. 519. See also; Joginder Kaur (ed.), Ram Sukh Rao *Fateh Singh Parbhakar*, Patiala, 1980, p. 118. Also; V.S Suri, (trans.) Sohan Lal Suri, *Udmat-ut-Twarikh*, Daftar ii, p. 59. Also; Amarnath, *Zafarnama-i- Ranjit Singh*, (ed.), Punjabi University, Patiala, 1983, p. 19.

⁹⁵ Lepel Henry Griffin, *The Rajas of Punjab*, p. 519. See also; N.D, *Kapurthala State- Its Past and Present*, N.D, Kapurthala, 1928, p.7.

⁹⁶ Joseph Davey Cunningham, *A History of The Sikhs*, p. 116. See also; Joginder Kaur (ed.), *Ram Sukh Rao's Fateh Singh Parbhakar*, p.181.

⁹⁷ Bute Shah (trans.) *Tarikh-i-Punjab*, Vol. I, Punjab Historical Studies, Punjabi University Patiala, p. 36.

⁹⁸ Jeet Singh Seetal (ed.), *Kanhyia Lal, Tarikh-i-Punjab*, p. 148.

Lepel Griffin tells about the supplementary treaty which was made with Maharaja Ranjit Singh and Fateh Singh on which they agreed not to be in any kind of friendship or in relation with Holkar and on the other hand British Government promised to remain their friend as long as their conduct would remain amicable.⁹⁹

In *The Rajas of Punjab* it is discussed that Fateh Singh started accompanying the Maharaja in his expedition to the south but actually he didn't wish to join him because he was afraid of his weak position in front of Maharaja due to which he unable to refuse. It seems true because according to R.N Vohra and Anju Arora, friendship between both of them was unequal and Fateh Singh was not capable to acclaimed his equal position with regards of Maharaja Ranjit Singh and was a mere vassal, who lead Maharaja's military expedition along with his own troops.¹⁰⁰ Ram Sukh Rao doesn't convey that Fateh Singh was his vassal but in the several points he clearly mentioned out that his position was just reduced to General of Maharaja Ranjit Singh.¹⁰¹ There are several incidents which depicts the incapacity of Fateh Singh in front of Maharaja Ranjit Singh.¹⁰² That's the reason why Fateh Singh went along with him on the expedition of Amritsar (1805) Kasur (1804, 1807) Jhang (1807), and Sialkot (1807).¹⁰³

Lepel Griffin briefly tells about the Metcalfe's journey to meet Maharaja Ranjit Singh that when in 1808 A.D Metcalf reached Kasur he was welcomed by Ahluwalia Sardar Fateh Singh and Diwan Mokam Chand along with their two thousand cavalry to escort him to the camp. Ram Rao sukh in his account testify that Fateh Singh and Bhag Singh went to meet

⁹⁹ Lepel Henry Griffin, *The Rajas of Punjab*, Low Price Publication, Delhi, Reprint 2014, p. 520. See also; Henry T. Princep, *Origin of the Sikh Powers and Political Life of Maharaja Ranjit Singh*, Military Orphan Press, Calcutta, 1834, p. 46. Also; N.D., *Kapurthala State- Its Past and Present*, Kapurthala, N.D, 1928, p. 7.

¹⁰⁰ Fauja Singh and A.c Arora (ed.), V.N Vohra, *Ranjit Singh and Kapurthala state*, Maharaja Ranjit Singh, Publication Bureau, Punjabi University Patiala, 2003. p. 96. See also; Anju Arora, *British Paramountcy and Internal Administration (1858-1948)*, National Book Organization, New Delhi, 2001, p. 8.

¹⁰¹ Joginder Kaur (ed.), *Ram Sukh Rao's Fateh Singh Parbhakar*, Patiala, 1980, p. 29. For detail see pages 121-23, 124, 126-27, 129-30, 140-44, 197-200.

¹⁰² For detail see; V.N Vohra *Ranjit Singh and Kapurthala state*, Maharaja Ranjit Singh, p. 96 also see; Anju Arora, *British Paramountcy and Internal Administration (1858-1948)*, p.8. Also; Joginder Kaur (ed.), *Ram Sukh Rao's Fateh Singh Parbhakar*, Patiala, 1980, pp. 453, 454, 477, 497.

¹⁰³ Lepel Henry Griffin, *The Rajas of Punjab*, p. 522. See also; Bhagat Singh, *History of Sikh Misals*, Publication Bureau, Punjabi University, Patiala, 2009, p. 78.

Lake.¹⁰⁴ But according to Bute Shah, Sardar Fateh Singh and Diwan Mokam Chand had only ten to twelve cavalry men to escort Metcalf to his camp.¹⁰⁵ But a different statement is given in Tarikh-i-Sikha that Fateh Singh was initially been confirmed to escort Metcalf but this idea was being dropped and then Meet Singh Farrania was sent along with Mohkam Chand to welcome the Metcalf.¹⁰⁶

Lepel Griffin explains the character of Fateh Singh as depicted by Metcalf. Metcalf put forward that Fateh Singh's alliance with Maharaja Ranjit Singh in his early life and due to this alliance former is principally indebted to him for his extraordinary rise. Metcalfe justifies his reason by stating that Fateh Singh was used as a ladder, by which Maharaja Ranjit Singh has mounted to the greatness, his remarks are based on these points that he wasn't the member of Maharaja Ranjit Singh's councils nor he was entrusted with his secrets but then also he marches with a considerable forces with Maharaja Ranjit Singh whenever required¹⁰⁷. This judgment about Fateh Singh is undeniable because Fateh Singh helped Maharaja Ranjit Singh number of times in his campaigns even though he never cared for rewards or benefits. Even, some time when Maharaja left Jalandhar Doab¹⁰⁸ or whenever he left for a journey or a campaign without Fateh Singh, than the Fateh Singh was given a charge to look after his territories in his absent.¹⁰⁹ Metcalfe as per given in *The Rajas of Punjab* further tells that Fateh Singh was impressed by Lake and this made him to look at the British Government with the hope of setting him free from the tyranny of Maharaja Ranjit Singh. But here Lepel Griffin didn't discuss about the part in which Lake himself approaches Fateh Singh. Ram Sukh Rao gives fascinating details about a meeting between Lord Lake and Fateh Singh, in which Lord Lake and his officers took off their caps when they received Fateh Singh into their camp. Author gives impression that British took special care to humor Fateh Singh and even Lord Lake proposed to have separate arrangements with him. But Fateh Singh tactfully evaded this agreement. The British General then offered Sonipat and Panipat to Fateh Singh as a mark of his appreciation if he plays a role in setting a

¹⁰⁴ Joginder Kaur (ed.) *Ram Sukh Rao's Fateh Singh Parbhakar*, p. 184.

¹⁰⁵ Bute Shah (trans.), *Tarikh-i-Punjab*, Vol .I, p. 52.

¹⁰⁶ Khuswant Rai, (trans.)*Tarikh -i- Sikhan*, Vol. I, p. 241.

¹⁰⁷ Lepel Henry Griffin, *The Rajas of Punjab*, p. 524.

¹⁰⁸ Fauja Singh and A.c Arora (ed.) V.N Vohra, *Ranjit Singh and Kapurthala state*, Maharaja Ranjit Singh, p. 96.

¹⁰⁹ Joginder Kaur (ed.) *Ram Sukh Rao's Fateh Singh Parbhakar*, pp. 29-30

friendly settlement with Maharaja Ranjit Singh. But Fateh Singh refused to accept this proposal and regarded it as bribe. Then Fateh Singh added that he would get these territories some other day since their friendship will going to be last forever.¹¹⁰ Lord Metcalf's depicted remarks in *The Rajas of Punjab* are baseless that Fateh Singh wanted to through off yoke of Maharaja Ranjit Singh for an example not only in the context of British but there was another incident when the Sardars of Jallandhar doab approached Fateh Singh; they urged Fateh Singh to leave Maharaja Ranjit Singh so that they might turn out Maharaja Ranjit Singh from central Punjab but Fateh Singh refused to do so.¹¹¹

As per the treaty of Amritsar 1809 A.D signed between British Government and Maharaja Ranjit Singh in which Fateh Singh was also there. In this treaty British agreed not to interfere in Maharaja's territories of north and Maharaja agreed upon that no further encroachment will be there to south.¹¹² Treaty of Amritsar 1809 A.D and the presence of Fateh Singh both are confirmed from J.D Cunningham and Ram Rao Sukh's work.¹¹³

Lepel Griffin elucidates that Maharaja was not in favor of this treaty, so he marched towards Ludhiana to occupy it from the British Government and the Fateh Singh was directed by Maharaja to provide 30,000 horses and 10 guns against the British. But arrival of Shah Sujha from Kabul and Multan expedition diverted Maharaja Ranjit Singh's attentions from south.¹¹⁴ But from Kaniya Lal and Sohan Lal Suri's account it may understood that incident which Lepel Griffin depicts, occurred before the treaty that had been signed.¹¹⁵

Lepel Griffin affirms that Fateh Singh was present in the treacherous gain over the fort of Raja Sansar Chand, which had been for long besieged by Amar Singh Thappa. In spring season when Maharaja Ranjit Singh marched for Mutlan he had left Fateh Singh as an incharge of

¹¹⁰ Joginder Kaur (ed.) *Ram Sukh Rao's Fateh Singh Parbhakar*, pp. 181, 183, 186, 187.

¹¹¹ Joginder Kaur (ed.) *Ram Sukh Rao's Fateh Singh Parbhakar*, p. 156. See Also; Fauja Singh and A.c Arora (ed.), V.N Vohra, *Ranjit Singh and Kapurthala state*, p. 96.

¹¹² Lepel Henry Griffin, *The Rajas of Punjab*, p. 525.

¹¹³ Joginder Kaur (ed.), *Ram Sukh Rao's Fateh Singh Parbhakar*, p. 227. See also; Joseph Davey Cunningham, *A History of The Sikhs*, p.352.

¹¹⁴ Lepel Henry Griffin, *The Rajas of Punjab*, p. 526.

¹¹⁵ V.S Suri, (trans.) Sohan Lal Suri, *Udmat-ut-Twarikh*, Daftar II, Guru Nanak Dev University, Amritsar, 1985, p. 90. See also; Jeet Singh Seetal, (ed.) *Kanhyia Lal, Tarikh-i-Punjab*, p. 182.

Lahore and Amritsar.¹¹⁶ These assertions are traceable in Sohan Lal Suri's work.¹¹⁷ In addition he tells that he accompanied Maharaja to Rawalpindi to meet Shah Sujha.¹¹⁸ But according to Sohan Lal and Khaniya Lal, Fateh Singh was not with Maharaja when Maharaja went to meet Shah Sujha.¹¹⁹

Lepel Griffin discusses the siege of Jalandhar where Fateh Singh, Jodh Singh Ramgaria and Mokham Chand marched against Budh Singh. The reason of attack was his refusal to attend Ranjit Singh with contingent in the battlefield.¹²⁰ But Chief Budh Singh without facing combined forces fled across the Sutlej and all of his estates were added up to Lahore.

However, Sohan Lal and Kanhiya Lal tells that only Fateh Singh and Mokham Chand went to Jalandhar, Jassa Singh was not with them¹²¹ and according to Kanhiya Lal reason behind attack was that the Budh Singh had not paid annual tribute to Maharaja Ranjit Singh.¹²² On the contrary Ram Rao tells that Budh Singh had crossed Sutlej before any action could be taken and Fateh Singh attacked Singpuria tribe in Jalandhar with the help of Mohkam Chand.¹²³

Lepel Griffin gives brief detail of Fateh Singh's war services in Punjab proper that he fought against minister of Kabul Fateh Khan.¹²⁴ He also took part in Bhimbar, Rajori and Bhawalpur campaigns. He was too present in Multan expedition and had also established a military post of his own at Talumba. During the campaign of Kashmir he got a charge of Lahore and in 1821 he took part in Mankera fort reduction.¹²⁵ As per given in *Umdat-ut-Tawarikh* he

¹¹⁶ Lepel Henry Griffin, *The Rajas of Punjab*, p. 526.

¹¹⁷ V.S Suri, (trans.) Sohan Lal Suri, *Umdat-Ut-Twarikh*, Daftar II, p. 100,109.

¹¹⁸ Lepel Henry Griffin, *The Rajas of Punjab*, p. 526.

¹¹⁹ V.S Suri (trans.) Sohan Lal Suri, *Umdat-ut-Twarikh*, Daftar II, p.119. See also; Jeet Singh Seetal (ed.), *Kanhiya Lal, Tarikh-i-Punjab*, p.203.

¹²⁰ Lepel Henry Griffin, *The Rajas of Punjab*, p. 526.

¹²¹ Jeet Singh Seetal (ed.) *Kanhiya Lal, Tarikh-i-Punjab*, p. 203. See also; V.S Suri, (trans.) Sohan Lal Suri, *Umdat-ut-Twarikh*, Daftar II, p. 134.

¹²² *Ibid.* p. 134

¹²³ Joginder Kaur (ed.) *Ram Sukh Rao's Fateh Singh Parbhakar*, p. 322.

¹²⁴ Lepel Henry Griffin, *The Rajas of Punjab*, p. 527. See also; Syad Muhammad Latif, *History of Punjab*, Eurasia Publishing House, New Delhi, 1964, p. 318.

¹²⁵ Lepel Henry Griffin, *The Rajas of Punjab*, p. 527.

actively took part in Bhimbar and Mankera but during battle of Rajori Fateh Singh was in Lahore because Maharaja had left him with a charge of Lahore and in concern of Talumba military post he was not alone, Kuttubdin Khan also camped along with him.¹²⁶ But according to Kanhiya Lal he was alone at Talumba.¹²⁷ In addition, When Maharaja Ranjit Singh went for Kashmir expedition Fateh Singh had given a charge of Amritsar instead of Lahore.¹²⁸

Lepel Griffin unfolds a matter of disputes between Fateh Singh and Maharaja Ranjit Singh on 27th December 1825. Fateh Singh got scared by advancement of two battalions of Lahore towards his territory and he fled across the Sutlej with his family and took refuge in Jagraon.¹²⁹ Lepel Griffin tells that Fateh Singh was suspicious about Maharaja from a long time, since Maharaja has seized the territory of his own friend Ramgharia, thus he began to believe that his own faith would be the same. Lepel Griffin judgmentally says that fear of Fateh Singh was a result of his over thinking and exaggeration because Fateh Singh was one of the few men for whom Maharaja had any sincere feeling of regards.¹³⁰ Raja Ram Singh Tota justifies the Lepel Griffin's remarks that Maharaja had exchanged turban with Fateh Singh in the presence of Guru Granth Sahib and he always called him his brother. But Fateh Singh in his mistaken beliefs got scared and fled to the other side of Sutlej.¹³¹ In the opinion of Kanhiya Lal when Cis-Sutlej states came under British then Maharaja's ill intention was to capture the Land of Fateh Singh in the Trans- Sutlej side but Fateh Singh came to know his intention in time. Therefore he went to Jagraon.¹³²

Author of *Kapurthala and Its Past and Present* says that Maharaja was greedy person and to fulfill his rapacious greed, he would never hesitate to invade into territory of his sworn friends and faithful allies. In case of Fateh Singh he inwardly wanted to take over the possession of Ahluwalia chief. But popularity of Fateh Singh didn't let him to achieve his desires. Ahluwalia scented danger and sought help from British Government. Maharaja in 1825 A.D got an

¹²⁶ V.S Suri (trans.) Sohan Lal Suri, *Udmat-ut-Twarikh*, Daftar II, pp. 206, 216, 219, 224.

¹²⁷ Jeet Singh Seetal (ed.), *Kanhiya Lal, Tarikh-i-Punjab*, p. 234.

¹²⁸ V.S Suri (trans.) Sohan Lal Suri, *Udmat-ut-Twarikh*, Daftar II, p. 285.

¹²⁹ Lepel Henry Griffin, *The Rajas of Punjab*, pp. 534-535. See also; Mufti-Ali-ud-Din(trans.), *Ibarnama*, p.351.

¹³⁰ Lepel Henry Griffin, *The Rajas of Punjab*, pp. 534-35.

¹³¹ Amarvant (trans.) Raja Ram Tota, *Guldaste-i-Punjab*, Vol. I, p. 162.

¹³² Jeet Singh Seetal (trans.) Kanhiya Lal, *Tarikh – i-Punjab*, p. 85.

opportunity therefore attacked Kapurthala and seized it. Thus for the safety Ahluwalia Sardar temporarily shifted his headquarter to Jagraon.¹³³

But according to contemporary sources actual reason behind Fateh Singh's fear was his own *Vakil*. Whom he had appointed as an envoy in Lahore darbar Chaudary Kam Bakash; sow the seeds of hatredness between Maharaja Ranjit Singh and Fateh Singh. He treacherously forward wrong information to both parties.¹³⁴ But Ram Sukh rao tells that Sher Ali(Agent of British Government at Kapurthala) was actual culprit behind the forgery who changed the letters of Qadar Bakash.¹³⁵

But in the opinion of Hari Ram Gupta bitterness in friendship occurred when Fateh Singh was building a summerhouse for himself near about one kilometer away from Kapurthala and rumours reached at Lahore Darbar that Fateh Singh was building a fort. Maharaja Ranjit Singh at once summoned Fateh Singh but Fateh Singh got sacred by recalling the fate of chiefs who had been called to Lahore in same manner. He denied cooperating with Maharaja and in counter reply Maharaja Ranjit Singh sent the battalions towards Kapurthalla.¹³⁶

Then Fateh Singh attempted to get protection from British Government for detail see chapter Relation of Cis – Sutlej with British Government.¹³⁷

On the flight of Fateh Singh, Maharaja took over his Trans-Sutlej territories but soon desired for reconciliation. Fateh Singh came back in 1827.¹³⁸ But according to Hari Ram Gupta he came back in 1826.¹³⁹ Lepel Griffin tells that Maharaja took over Phagwara in 1836 A.D from Fateh Singh but he immediately resort it back to Fateh Singh because he thought that the British

¹³³ N.D, *Kapurthala State- Its Past and Present*, N.D, Kapurthala, 1928, p. 8.

¹³⁴ Amarvant (trans.) Raja Ram Tota, *Guldaste-i-Punjab*, Vol. I, p. 162. See also; Bute Shah (trans.) *Tarikh-i-Punjab*, Vol. II, Punjab Historical Studies, p. 266. Also; Mufti-Ali-Ud-Din, (trans.) *Ibarnama*, Department of Punjab Historical Studies, Punjabi University, Patiala, p. 352.

¹³⁵ Joginder Kaur (ed.), *Ram Sukh Rao's Fateh Singh Parbhakar*, p. 32.

¹³⁶ Hari Ram Gupta, *History of the Sikhs*, Vol. VI, Mushiram Manohar Lal Publishers, New Delhi, 2007, p. 47.

¹³⁷ *Infra*, p.47.

¹³⁸ Lepel Henry Griffin, *The Rajas of Punjab*, p. 537.

¹³⁹ Hari Ram Gupta, *History of the Sikhs*, Vol. VI, p. 48.

might interfere in favor of chief.¹⁴⁰ While Mohammad Latif tells that when Maharaja confiscated Phagwara, Fateh Singh believed and hoped that British would interfere in the matter and took his favor but British Government declined active interference and showed only sympathy with chief.¹⁴¹ Sardar Fateh Singh died in October 1837 as per *The Rajas of Punjab*¹⁴² Mohammad Latif advocates death year¹⁴³ in favor of Lepel Griffin but according to *Kapurthalla and its Past and Present* Fateh Singh died in 1836.¹⁴⁴

After death of Fateh Singh his elder son Nihal Singh succeeded to his estate but here Lepel Griffin declared that Maharaja Ranjit Singh and his minister Dyan Singh were guilty for the reason that they were not in favor to allow Nihal Singh to acclaim his territories of Kapurthalla without gaining profit themselves.¹⁴⁵ The point of Lepel Griffin seems true because according to Sohan Lal Suri, *Raj Khalsa*, Sayid Latif and *Kapurthala and Its Past and Present*, neither Maharaja nor Lahore Darbar officers showed any kind of sympathy with Ahluwalia house, that house which had been remained loyal to him from so long. So, he purposely postponed the acknowledgment of Nihal Singh as a chief over the Kapurthalla till Nihal Singh has not paid handsome amount to him.¹⁴⁶ As per British official letter after the death of Fateh Singh, Maharaja ordered to capture Kapurthala and demanded 5 Lakhs from son of late Raja to return it even ordered Jagirdars to pay rent directly to Lahore Darbar.¹⁴⁷

As stated by Lepel Griffin, younger brother of Nihal Singh hatched a conspiracy against Nihal Singh with the help of some Ahluwalia officials. Lepel Griffin narrates the incident of conspiracy that once Nihal Singh was coming from female apartment accompanying with only

¹⁴⁰ Lepel Henry Griffin, *The Rajas of Punjab*, p. 537.

¹⁴¹ Syad Muhhamad Latif, *History of Punjab*, Eurasia Publishing House, New Delhi, 1964, p. 318.

¹⁴² Lepel Henry Griffin, *The Rajas of Punjab*, p. 537.

¹⁴³ Syad Muhhamad Latif, *History of Punjab*, p. 318.

¹⁴⁴ N.D, *Kapurthala State- Its Past and Present*, N.D, Kapurthala, 1928, p. 10.

¹⁴⁵ Lepel Henry Griffin, *The Rajas of Punjab*, p. 538.

¹⁴⁶ V.S Suri (trans.) Sohan Lal Suri, *Udmat-ut-Twarikh*, Daftar II, p.456. See also; N.D, *Kapurthala State- Its Past and Present*, N.D, Kapurthala, 1928, p. 10. See also; Giani Gian Singh, *Raj Khalsa*, Vol. II, Lassen Street, Northridge, U.S.A, p. 165. Also; Syad Muhhamad Latif, *History of Punjab*, p. 318.

¹⁴⁷ From Political Agent to Secretary of Gov. of India, Foreign Department, Political Consultation, 28 Nov. 1836, No. 22.(N.A.I)

one guard when an assassin attacked him but his servant saved him. However, according to *Kapurthala and Its Past and Present* Nihal Singh was being escorted in the protection of two attendants when assassin attacked him while according to *Raj Khalsa* there were two servants with Nihal Singh and also two assassins when incident occurred.¹⁴⁸

As described in *The Rajas of Punjab* when Maharaja Ranjit Singh heard about this tragic incident he summoned both the brothers in Darbar, where he expressed his sympathy with Nihal Singh. However, at the same time he directed him to give Amar Singh, brother of Nihal Singh, a separate maintenance of 30,000 per annum instead of 1 lakh which Amar Singh had demanded. Lepel Griffin again blames Maharaja Ranjit Singh that he played double game in this matter as soon as Nihal left the court, he admitted for favoring Amar Singh because Amar Singh promised to pay a liberal *nazarana*. Thus, Amar Singh was encouraged by him to extort territory of worth one lakh from his brother so Amar Singh did it accordingly and even captured Nihal Singh and didn't released him until he agreed to pay district of Sultanpur for his maintenance.¹⁴⁹

As depicted in *Udmat –ut –Twarikh*, Vakil of Nihal Singh went to Lahore Darbar and told Maharaja that on the instigation of Lakha and others, Amar Singh had attacked Sardar Nihal Singh than Maharaja asked for proper investigation and both were being brought in front of him in his Darbar. When Maharaja asked for the reason behind the misconduct of Amar Singh than Amar Singh replied that he was starving and was got quite distracted due to the lack of means of livelihood. Maharaja on hearing his reply said that he should have referred the matter to him first before taking any step than Maharaja to impart justice ordered punishment for his conduct. It is also to be noted that Captain Wade had also sent a letter in which he had requested to punish Amar Singh for his crime. But, on the Nihal Singh's request Maharaja pardoned him because Nihal Singh said that Amar Singh is like son to him and was astray from path by wicked persons

¹⁴⁸ Lepel Henry Griffin, *The Rajas of Punjab*, Low Price Publication, Delhi, Reprint 2014, p. 538. See also; N.D, *Kapurthala State- Its Past and Present*, N.D, Kapurthala, 1928, p. 10. Also; Giani Gian Singh, *Raj Khalsa*, Vol. II, p. 165.

¹⁴⁹ Lepel Henry Griffin, *The Rajas of Punjab*, pp. 538-539.

and advocated for maintenance of his livelihood. Therefore, Amar Singh was granted maintenance for livelihood on the consent of his own brother.¹⁵⁰

While, according to *Guldaste –i-Punjab* news of dispute between Ahluwalia brothers reached Lahore Darbar but Diwan Sher Ali of Lahore Darbar pacified both brothers and in a sensibly way he managed to stop dispute to rose further, besides it Maharaja put an end on dispute by providing estate to Amar Singh.¹⁵¹

However, Bute Shah tells that Maharaja just sent a letter to Ahulwalia through which he ordered that estate worth rupees 30,000 must be given to Amar Singh and warned both of them to stop fight, also suggested them to live peacefully like good brothers.¹⁵²

On the contrary, it has given in *Punjab di Siar* that Amar Singh didn't captured Nihal Singh under the influence of Maharaja Ranjit Singh instead due to a *zamindar* named Lakha. Under the persuasion Amar Singh again demanded his share and captured Nihal Singh. Diwan Gulam Muhammad with the help of Sandhu Singh Sodhi of Kartarpur got released Nihal Singh and Sultanpur was being given to Amar Singh as a division.¹⁵³

During the time period of Kahrak Singh and Nau Nihal Singh, the Kapurthalla chief Nihal Singh faced troubles continuously from Amar Singh, when Sher Singh became Maharaja; Amar Singh went to Lahore to represent his cause. He tried to win over Maharaja Sher Singh in his side but before Maharaja Sher Singh could take any decision, Amar Singh got drowned in Ravi while he was enjoying trip with Lahore Darbar officials.¹⁵⁴ Amar Singh's death due to drowning is also mentioned in *Ibartnama* and by W.L McGregor likewise given in *The Rajas of Punjab*.¹⁵⁵ Thus premature death of Amar Singh saved Kapurthalla from division.

¹⁵⁰ V.S Suri (trans.) Sohan Lal Suri, *Udmat-ut-Twarikh*, Daftar III, Part IV-V, Guru Nanak Dev University, Amritsar, 1985, p. 47.

¹⁵¹ Amarvant, (trans.) Raja Ram Tota, *Guldaste-i-Punjab*, Vol.II, p. 280.

¹⁵² Bute Shah (trans.) *Tarikh-i-Punjab*, Vol.III, Patiala, p. 360.

¹⁵³ Fauja Singh (ed.) Rai Kali Rai Sahib and Munshi Tulsi Ram, *Punjab Di Sair*, Punjabi University, Patiala, 2012, pp. 182-183.

¹⁵⁴ Lepel Henry Griffin, *The Rajas of Punjab*, p. 539.

¹⁵⁵ Mufti-Ali-Ud-Din, (trans.) *Ibartnama*, Vol. II., p. 356. See also; W.L M'Gregor, *The History of The Sikhs*, Vol. I, Laden Hall Street, London, 1846, p. 149.

Lepel Griffin tells that after the death of Amar Singh he immediately shook hands with Raja Dyan Singh and became friend and received grant from his brother's jagir of Sultanpur by paying the large sum of *nazzrana*.¹⁵⁶

Lepel Griffin defines that after the assassination of Maharaja Sher Singh on 15th September 1843 A.D Lahore Darbar is in chaos because no superior successor had left to proclaim throne. In the opinion of Lepel Griffin Nihal Singh as a descendant of prominent Sikh chief Jassa Singh Ahluwalia was strong claimant, if he would have tried to acclaim it with energy. Despite of it, Nihal Singh stopped to interfere in Lahore politics and began to make excuses to remain absent, further he keep on making excuse from month to month. In Lepel Griffin's observation Nihal Singh was of timid disposition and unexcited person because in the most favorable condition from which he could attain much didn't take any interest.¹⁵⁷ But, according to *Twareakh Raj Khalsa*, Nihal Singh was well aware of circumstances of Lahore Darbar and he had got secret news related which he was sure, that in rupture politics and untrustworthy climate of Lahore Darbar British Government would definitely interfere, so he thought it would be wise not to interfere and on the other side he told every secret of Lahore Darbar to the British Government.¹⁵⁸

Faridkot:

While sharing the matter of Faridkot state Lepel Griffin says that Faridkot state was going through internal as well as external troubles. Situation of Faridkot got worst when Diwan Mokham Chand, minster of Maharaja Ranjit Singh marched against Faridkot and orders the ruler to surrender. But harsh environmental condition of Faridkot helped them against Mokham Chand. Because, it became impossible for Lahore solider to besiege the Faridkot garrison due to scarcity of drinking water. Mokham had to raise the siege but managed to get tribute of 7,000 from Fojju.¹⁵⁹ Statement find similar in *Ibartnama*.¹⁶⁰

¹⁵⁶ Lepel Henry Griffin, *The Rajas of Punjab*, p. 540. See also; Giani Gian Singh, *Raj Khalsa*, Vol.II, Lassen Street, Northridge, U.S.A, p. 166.

¹⁵⁷ Lepel Henry Griffin, *The Rajas of Punjab*, p. 542.

¹⁵⁸ Giani Gian Singh, *Tawareakh Raj Khalsa*, Vol.III, S.G.P.C, Amritsar, p. 335.

¹⁵⁹ Lepel Henry Griffin, *The Rajas of Punjab*, p. 610.

¹⁶⁰ Mufti-Ali-Ud-Din, (trans.) *Ibartnama*, Vol. II, p. 473.

Lepel Griffin further adds that Faridkot was going to face real danger after this siege. Maharaja Ranjit Singh crossed Sutlej on 1808 A.D with his troops and Metcalf was also with him. He himself halted at Khai and sends his force against Faridkot, without any resistant Maharaja took the possession of fort.¹⁶¹ While, according to *Tarikh –i-Punjab*, Raja Jaswant Singh and Bhai Lal Singh came along with *vakeels* of Faridkot at Khai to meet Maharaja .They requested that only few months before Mokham Chand had taken *nazzarana* from them. Now, Maharaja himself came here and they were not able to bear this burden of another *nazzarana*. So, Maharaja gave order to build a *thana* under his command in fort and to deploy 2 thousand *swars* and infantry troops on the consent of Faridkot *Vkeels*. Only Kotkapura was attacked.¹⁶² As per Mufti-Ali-Ud-Din when Maharaja Ranjit Singh besieged Faridkot than many chiefs oppose this and someone told the Maharaja that chief got dissatisfied from him and therefore they had chosen to go under the British protection. So, on the suggestion of his officials, Maharaja agreed to leave Faridkot.¹⁶³ However, according to the *Tarikh-i-Sikhan*, Maharaja demanded the fort and officials of Faridkot with mutual understanding vacated the fort for Maharaja.¹⁶⁴

In his account the Lepel Griffin votes in favor of Metcalf because many British had condemned the diplomacy of Metcalf. They had put blamed over Metcalf that Maharaja was gaining his strength by taking possession over the Cis-Sutlej territories and Metclaf did nothing as he was travelling with Maharaja as mere a spectator. Lepel Griffin justifies, that although British didn't want to permit the Maharaja to carry on his conquest but at that time French invasion apprehension didn't let to do so and after removal of danger, Government changed his policy suddenly.¹⁶⁵ It can be clearly understood that British were not like other powers such as Marathas or Mughals. They have nothing to do with chiefs. They did not want to make Maharaja angry. As it has been told earlier that British wanted to create a buffer zone against French invasion. At that time, Maharaja was strong candidate for them and British let the chiefs suffer until their priorities would not change.

¹⁶¹ Lepel Henry Griffin, *The Rajas of Punjab*, p. 611.

¹⁶² Bute Shah (trans.) *Tarikh-i-Punjab*, Vol. III, p. 43.

¹⁶³ Mufti-Ali-Ud-Din, (trans.) *Ibartnama*, Vol.II, p. 474.

¹⁶⁴ Khuswant Rai (trans.), *Tarikh-i-Sikhan*, Vol.I, p. 263.

¹⁶⁵ Lepel Henry Griffin, *The Rajas of Punjab*, p. 611.

According to *The Rajas of Punjab* each Phulkian chiefs tried to obtain Faridkot from Maharaja Ranjit Singh but Mohkam Singh paid highest bid than Phulkian chiefs for Faridkot.¹⁶⁶In *Guldaste -I -Punjab*, reference of fort transfer to Mokham Chand is given.¹⁶⁷ Phulkian chief got scared from the action of Ranjit Singh because he was establishing permanent post in these areas, they didn't want that Maharaja Ranjit Singh should stay longer and permanent post could also pose risk for their own territories in future. Therefore, they tried to buy Faridkot post as they had done in Malerkotla.¹⁶⁸

Lepel Griffin discuss in his work *The Rajas of Punjab* that when British Government demanded the restitution of all the states of the left side of Sutlej which were triumphed by Maharaja Ranjit Singh during 1808 A.D and 1809 A.D, at that time Maharaja gave Faridkot so unwillingly. Maharaja put forward his claim over Faridkot on the basis of two points. First that Faridkot was a dependency of Kotkapura which was under his possession. Secondly, when he besieged Faridkot in 1807 A.D, owners had made promise to Maharaja Ranjit Singh that they will come under his authority. But Lepel Griffin denied first claim on the behalf of that the Faridkot had become much stronger than Kotkapura and was in no way subject of it. He also denied the second reason of claim. As we have discuss above, in which various sources directly and indirectly pointing that Faridkot state had accepted authority of Maharaja Ranjit Singh willingly. So, as Griffin has said earlier about apprehension of French invasion so on the basis of that term it can be understand that when fear of invasion faded away, British changed their policy at once and curb the activities of Maharaja. But on the contrary Lepel Griffin instead of accepting this, put blame on Maharaja Ranjit Singh that he was giving invalid reasons.

Lepel Griffin further elaborates that Maharaja called back Mokham Chand from Kangra and ordered him to deploy at Philor, opposite site of Ludhiana. Both sides were prepared to start war but Mr. Metcalf's firmness alone prevented this war.¹⁶⁹Bute Shah agrees that Mokhan Chand was called back and Metcalf tried to prevent rupture.¹⁷⁰

¹⁶⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 613.

¹⁶⁷ Amarvant (trans.) Raja Ram Tota, *Guldaste-i-Punjab*, Vol. I, p. 67.

¹⁶⁸ Khuswant Rai *Tarikh-I-Sikhan*, Vol.I, p. 181.

¹⁶⁹ Lepel Henry Griffin, *The Rajas of Punjab*, p. 613.

¹⁷⁰ Bute Shah(trans.) *Tarikh-i-Punjab*, Vol III, p.60.

Lepel Griffin while sharing the information of next phase says that Mokham Chand was not willing to give up Faridkot, he told Maharaja that British were intending to occupy the city and were going to garrisoning the town. However, Lepel Griffin denies his claim and says that Government had no intention to garrisoning the town but it was determined that it should be returned to its real owner. Nevertheless, in the opinion of Mufti-Ali-Ud-Din, British wanted to establish two cantonments in *Doaba*, one in Faridkot and second in Jalandhar.¹⁷¹ As per Bute Shah, when situation got tensed than Metcalf went to meet Maharaja and with mutual understating both parties decided to roll back their militaries. So, then Ochterlony along with his three contingents establish a cantonment in Ludhiana.¹⁷² As it has been discussed in Jind's history that cantonment was made permanent by cheating Bhag Singh of Jind, so it can probably said that British had made intentions of establishing the cantonment in Cis-Sutlej area in order to establish their authority over Cis Sutlej states.

So, on the 3rd April of 1809 A.D Faridkot restored to Sirdar Gulab Singh. Fojju was reinstalled for the help of minor chief. Revenue of the state was very small only yield 14,000 to 12,000 sometimes in bad season it yield only 6,000.¹⁷³ Similar information can be derived from *Punjab State Gazetteers*.¹⁷⁴

¹⁷¹ Mufti-Ali-Ud-Din (trans.) *Ibartnama*, Vol. III, p. 620.

¹⁷² Bute Shah(trans.) *Tarikh-i-Punjab*, Vol. III, pp. 61-62.

¹⁷³ Lepel Henry Griffin, *The Rajas of Punjab*, p. 614.

¹⁷⁴ Punjab State Gazetteers, Faridkot State, p. 11.

Chapter- 4

BRITISH PARAMOUNTCY IN CIS-SUTLEJ STATES

In 1803 A.D after defeating Marathas British came at the top of the Indian ruling table. By this time British became well acquainted with the importance of buffer zone for stable and peaceful ruling. Subsequently, Terror of French invasion started echoing in British arena. Therefore, British started involving in Punjab's politics for safety. Soon afterwards threat of French invasion faded away than British played the cards and brought Cis-Sutlej chiefs under their protection on 3rd May 1809 though chiefs of Cis-Sutlej had autonomously decided to choose British instead the friendship of Maharaja Ranjit Singh but British Government started interfering in the matters of these states. Thus, year 1809 became the origin of British Paramountcy in Cis-Sutlej states. This chapter is based on British Paramountcy as analyzed from *The Rajas of Punjab*.

Patiala:

Lepel Griffin in his work *The Rajas of Punjab* focuses on one of the most important dispute which occurred between the Patiala and the British which was regarding the case of Haryana and Bhatti districts. These districts had been conquered by British from Marathas and Bhattia in 1803 A.D and in 1818 A.D respectively.¹

As this case was lengthy, confusing and took several years to get solve. Therefore, Griffin starts the matter from the early history of this dispute. With descriptive information he tells that Bhattiana was a strip of waste land, nowadays called as Sirsa and Hissar. People of this state were wild and pastoral, were called Bhatti. They were powerful in Rania, Abohar and Sirsa. Raja Amar Singh of Patiala had invaded number of times in their territory and exacted from them a reluctant submission but after his death they regained their independence.² Same statement can be trace in *An Historical Interpretation of George Rusel Clerk*.³

¹ Lepel Henry Griffin, *The Rajas of Punjab*, Low Price Publication, New Delhi, Reprint 2014, p. 177.

² *Ibid.*, p. 178.

³ N.D, *An Historical Interpretation of George Rusell Clerk*, National Archive, India, pp. 287-288.

Lepel Griffin express his view that after conquering the Bhattiana territory in 1803 A.D British Government acted so apathetic to secure it and took no steps to define any boundary till 1818 A.D.⁴

Lepel Griffin shares that Fathebaad was added in Hissar by expelling the Khan Bhadur Khan, a Bhatti Chief in 1810 A.D as a punishment for invading their property.⁵ Sirsa was taken from Zabta Kahn in 1818 A.D.⁶

Lepel Griffin considers Raja of Patiala guilty for the encroachment of land of the British Government. As per Lepel Griffin's views British had removed last barrier of Raja by overthrowing Bhatti so Raja took the benefit of this opportunity and established a post in village Gudhan near the Sirsa. In 1827 A.D he further took step by taking control of Abohar and by beginning fortification.⁷ As per S.N Banerjee, in 1809 A.D Edward Gardiner was deputed for settlement. Edward Gardiner without clearing the boundaries with Patiala started to colonize the territory by assuming that waste land was a part of British territory. He began to grant title deeds to *Zamindars* for cultivation but due to the protest from Patiala state British had to cancel the grants. After this incident Patiala started to colonize the waste land.⁸

Lepel Griffin pointed out that Raja Sahib Singh's act alert British Government so William Faser, District officer wrote about it to the Government. Nonetheless, no action was taken till 1835 A.D, when Charles Metcalf took the charge of district and Mr Faser, Resident at Delhi. They gave the charge of this matter to Mr. Ross Bell, Collector of Hissar.⁹ However, it doesn't seem to be true as per the evidence is being provided in *History of Patiala State* that no enquiry was made on the complaint of Ross Bell. According to the source Mr. Dundas was

⁴ Lepel Henry Griffin, *The Rajas of Punjab*, p. 179. See also; N.D, *An Historical Interpretation of George Russell Clerk*, p. 288.

⁵ Lepel Henry Griffin, *The Rajas of Punjab*, p. 180.

⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 180.

⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 181.

⁸ S.N Banerjee, *History of Patiala*, Vol.II, N.A., p. 40.

⁹ Lepel Henry Griffin, *The Rajas of Punjab*, Low Price Publication, Delhi, Reprint 2014, p. 181. See also; Metcalf to G.Birch, 8 January 1817, *Press List of Old Records In the Punjab Secretariat 1809-1840*, Punjab Government Lahore, 1911, no. 19, p. 120.

deputed to decide the boundary dispute and later in 1830 A.D Mr. Brown was appointed for settlement.¹⁰

Lepel Griffin claims that Patiala had no proof of possession over district. Subsequently reports the principles which were laid by Ross Bell after investigating the case that whatever belonged to Patiala at the time of British conquest of Haryana in 1803 A.D should be adjudged to that state and whatever belonged to the Government which Government had superseded should be adjudged to latter.¹¹ However, according to S.N Banerjee a treaty was drawn up in 1801 A.D between Raja of Patiala and Perron that possession of Patiala in the time of Nazab Quli Khan should remain intact. Even in 1803 A.D Raja of Patiala had got assurance from Lord Lake that his possession in time of General Perron would remain intact and no tribute should be charged ever.¹² S.N Banerjee further states that Mr. Willam Faser's decision had been overruled by his senior officials but when in 1835 A.D Mr. Willam Faser was appointed on the post of Resident at Delhi and Charles Metcalf the Lieutenant- Governor of Agra than he get a another chance to reopen the case. Metclaf was also in his favor. So they pressurize the Raja Karam Singh to accept the proposal according to their own choice. Even they had put burden over the Patiala for the evidences as a proof for such claim while they were the complainants.¹³ From official letter a strict warning to the Raja of Patiala can be seen.¹⁴ In *Press List of Old Records* summary of Ochterlony has been given in which he opposes the Fraser for investigation.¹⁵

So as per the decision of Ross Bell, Fort of Badsikiri, Kassuan consisted of 16 villages were given to Patiala. Gorkhpur consisting 15 villages i.e. Kanhour, Jamalpur, Tohana, Fathebad, Sirsa and Rania etc were made over to British.¹⁶ By attaining information from Official dispatch transfer of villages found similar.¹⁷ According to S.N Banerjee, Gorkhpaur along with 15 villages had given to Mirza Elyas Begam by Major Borquin but later it was restored to Patiala

¹⁰ S.N Banerjee, *History of Patiala*, Vol.II, N.D, p. 41.

¹¹ Lepel Henry Griffin, *The Rajas of Punjab*, Low Price Publication, p. 182.

¹² S.N Banerjee, *History Of Patiala*, Vol. II, N.D, p. 39.

¹³ *Ibid.*, pp. 41-42.

¹⁴ Metcalf to Clerk, Foreign Department, Secret Consultation, 11 Feb 1837, no.16.(N.A.I)

¹⁵ Ochterlony to Metcalf, N.A, *Press List of Old Records In the Punjab Secretariat 1809-1840*, p. 121.

¹⁶ Bell's Report, Indian Political Dispatch to Court of Directors, 1837, no. 29. (N.A.I)

¹⁷ Lepel Henry Griffin, *The Rajas of Punjab*, pp. 183-185.

when Patiala Vakeel Chain Singh lodged a protest against the action of the Perron. He also informs that Ochterlony had accepted the right of Raja of Patiala over the Jamalpur and Tohana and Lord Lake over territory adjoining to the Hansi.¹⁸

Lepel Griffin tries to manipulate the facts that no evidence could ever produce by Patiala but S.N Banerjee affirms that Patiala had shown evidences of Gorkhpur that it belongs to it. But British deliberately rejected it by declaring the document to be forged.¹⁹ Raja had made request personally and had claimed over the numerous territories with evidences. Content is voluminous so matter could not be provide in work.²⁰

Lepel Griffin asserts that decision taken on the behalf of Ross Bell's investigation was just and correct. Even to support his own assertion he pin point his own Home Government's decision.²¹

When decision has been sent to Home Government than Government gives explanation that "It was matter of compromise and not for arbitrary assertion."²² Lepel Griffin gives a statement opposite to Home Government. He states that "Home Government naturally knew less than of Indian Government of the character of Sikh Chiefs."²³ Despite of it that Home Government's order was considered as final order. Even Home Government had issued its decision on the basis of the enquiry and evidences.²⁴ As per scanty information of *Press List of Old Records* Government order to Fraser to deal with Raja with liberal intentions.²⁵

Lepel Griffin comments that Raja Karam Singh made an unreasonable cry against the enquiry. Lepel Griffin in his opinion says that Raja's reason to thwart Mr. Ross was clear that he

¹⁸ S.N Banerjee, *History of Patiala*, Vol. II, N.D., p.39.

¹⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 43.

²⁰ For See the Detail See: Kaka Mall Vakeel to Secretary of Government of India, Foreign Department, Political Consultation, 17 July 1837, No.110-116. (N.A.I)

²¹ Lepel Henry Griffin, *The Rajas of Punjab*, p. 185.

²² For Detail Order of Home Government See; Lepel Henry Griffin, *The Rajas of Punjab*, p. 176.

²³ Lepel Henry Griffin, *The Rajas of Punjab*, Low Price Publication, Delhi, 2014, p. 186.

²⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 187.

²⁵ Metcalf to Ochterlony, 17 June 1817, *Press List of Old Records In the Punjab Secretariat 1809-1840*, p. 125.

would lose the whole land.²⁶ Raja tried to delay the transfer of villages, which is on the records.²⁷ An application was sent by Raja to Government to look into the matter.²⁸

Lepel Griffin simultaneously gives his views in the case. He says that Mr. Ross Bell was experienced officer and no reason was left to re-open the case. Thus it can be said that he wasn't in favor to reopen it.²⁹

Nevertheless the case got reopened on the plea of Patiala on 1st July 1840 A.D. Mr Conolly was selected to made fresh enquiry and he submitted his report to Government as following;

He proposed to give portion of Hissar. So according to the report number of villages to be restored were 119 and villages to be retained were 147 in numbers.³⁰ A plea to reopen the case sent by Raja of Patiala is preserved in records.³¹

Mr. Bell formed a new district name Sirsa by separating Hissar from it. Sirsa was combination of Sirsa, Rania and Abhoar. But later Mr. Ross inclined to give up only forty or fifty villages because he was not in a favor to disturb the accuracy of British boundaries.³² As given in *A History of Patiala State*, Abhor was conquered by Bhai Ram Singh of Jumba in 1783 A.D and his grandson Mehar Singh transferred 1/3 share of it to Patiala. But British declared it as their own territory.³³

Lepel Griffin by completely opposing the Raja Karam Singh of Patiala expresses his views that "Raja had obtained so much when he had right to nothing."³⁴

²⁶ Lepel Henry Griffin, *The Rajas of Punjab*, p. 188.

²⁷ Metcalf to Clerk, 13 February 1837, *Press List of Old Records*, no. 107. (N.A.I)

²⁸ Vakeel of Patiala Urzee to Secretary of Government, Foreign Department, Political Proceeding, 7 Jan 1837, no. 110. (N.A.I)

²⁹ *Ibid.*, no. 111. (N.A.I)

³⁰ Lepel Henry Griffin, *The Rajas of Punjab*, p. 189.

³¹ *Ibid.*, p. 189.

³² *Ibid.*, pp. 189-190.

³³ S.N, Banerjee, *History of Patiala*, Vol.II, N.D., p. 44.

³⁴ Lepel Henry Griffin, *The Rajas of Punjab*, p. 191.

Raja of Patiala opposed this decision but Government warned him that if rejected to accept the proposal than he would get nothing. Therefore he consented to accept. He was made to pay 20 percent as the cost of management from the time they had been under the British possession.³⁵ Raja's denial to accept the decision is available in official records.³⁶

Mr Conolly with regard to Bhattiana frontier proposed that all waste land to be surrender, all that was within the ordinary range of occupation from Sikh villages.³⁷

Lepel Griffin further elaborates that survey got completed in 1842 A.D and surveyor Captain Robinson mentioned 42 villages to be restored to Patiala and 102 to be retained so when transfer was about to happen than Raja again refuse to negotiate. Therefore matter was again sent for redress than suddenly Sikh war broke out which prevented the disposal of the case. Many officials tried to settle the matter but didn't get success till 1855 A.D.³⁸

Finally Supreme Government by considering the previous report of Mr. Conolly sanctioned the order and approved 41 villages to be given to Patiala. Order was issued on 1 May 1856A.D.³⁹

S.N Banerjee concludes that measures adopted to dispose of the dispute were oppressive. British Government took one sided decision. To determine the validity of Sikh claim on the behalf of population and Bhatti in waste land was unjust and deduction of 20% amount for management was not proper.⁴⁰

Lepel Griffin inscribes another matter of interference of British in Phulkian states. He tells that Mahrajikian Sikhs after fall of Mughals referred their disputes to neighbouring Phulkian chiefs. Phulkian chief's had police post near the boundary of village and were always ready to

³⁵ Lepel Henry Griffin, *The Rajas of Punjab*, p. 191-192.

³⁶ Kaka Mall Vakeel to Secretary of Government of India, Foreign Department, Political Consultation, 17 July 1837, no. 110-116.

³⁷ Lepel Henry Griffin, *The Rajas of Punjab*, p. 193.

³⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 194. See Also; Muhhamad Sayed Hasan Khan, *Tarikh-i-Patiala*, Amritsar, 1878, p. 230.

³⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 194.

Ibid., p. 231.

⁴⁰ S.N Banerjee, *History of Patiala*, Vol. II, N.D, p. 46.

send troops into Mahrajkan. Main objective of a chief, whose assistance would be demanded, was to strengthen his own personal influence in Mahrajkan while people of Mahrajkan would gain very less benefit in this foreign interference. Therefore they called British for help.⁴¹ It is to be noted that Mahrajkan was of Phul origin and it was natural to be in social relation with Phulikan chiefs. According to S.N Banerjee people of Mahrajkan had occasionally went to Jind and Nabha for settlement of their dispute because their relation with Patiala was strong and continuous.⁴²

Lepel Griffin states that case was very difficult for British Government because each Phulkian chief claimed his superiority over Mahrajkan but they didn't have any proof of such superiority.⁴³ However, S.N Banerjee tells that Mahrajkan was bond with Patiala for the political-military alliance and even Mahrajkan had claimed that Jind and Nabha had no right over them. S.N Banerjee further tells that when Captain Murray tried to enquire the matter from Mahrajkan they choose Patiala.⁴⁴ It has been given in *An Historical Interpretation of George Rusell* that on 10th February 1824 A.D Mahajkan had executed a voluntary deed at Ambala by placing their affairs into hands of Patiala.⁴⁵ According to the official source, Raja of Nabha had also claimed for supremacy over Marajahkan. He claimed that Ochterlony had also support his claim but Captain Burgles was close companion of Patiala so as a favor he supported Patiala. It is worth to mention here that though Nabha had been considered the rival party by Lepel Griffin but in previous matter of Doladhi village same happened with Raja of Nabha. When Coolbrooke had deliberately favored the Patiala but on the interference of Home Government, Local Government had to change its decision. Even Nabha was claiming that he had proof of supremacy but Government neglected him completely.⁴⁶

⁴¹ Lepel Henry Griffin, *The Rajas of Punjab*, p. 175.

⁴² S.N Banerjee, *History of Patiala*, Vol. II, N.D., p. 25.

⁴³ Lepel Henry Griffin, *The Rajas of Punjab*, p. 175.

⁴⁴ S.N Banerjee, *History of Patiala*, Vol. II, N.D, p. 25.

⁴⁵ N.D, *An Historical Interpretation of George Rusell Clerk*, p. 233.

⁴⁶ Letter of Raja Jaswant Singh Nabha to Metcalf, 30 December 1831, Foreign Department, Political Consultation, no. 52.(N.A.I).

Lepel Griffin informs that idea of dividing the authority between Phulkian chiefs was proposed but Government didn't find it suitable.⁴⁷ As noted in *An Historical Interpretation of George Russell Clerk* that Coolbrooke was not in the favor of double authority to be exercised by Patiala and Nabha.⁴⁸

Then British Government decided to make over the village for term of one year to Patiala as being strongest among the Phukian chiefs. But Patiala Chief got dissatisfied with the decision. Therefore, British Government in august 1833 A.D took the village under their direct control.⁴⁹ As per S.N Banerjee the village was made over to Patiala for term of 5 years.⁵⁰ By inspecting the terms which were asked to Patiala to obey, these terms clearly express that the conditions which were applied were not easy to accept especially one among them in which it has been given that Raja of Patiala would not demand any Revenue or Land tax from Mahrajkan. In reply Raja of Patiala had also expressed his view by saying that Mahrajkan were dependant of Patiala and even they had paid 4000 tribute in 1788 A.D. So without attaining any benefit why would Patiala bear the expenses of an unmanaged village without getting anything in exchange and especially that village which had been remained under his ancestors? So it can be said that without getting any benefit from the territory in shape of tax or gifts not only Patiala even no other ruler would accept the proposal. In actual British Government had planned to take over it but they weren't ready to take over the village which was far away from their territory and needed much attention to manage the wild people of Mahrajkan. So they planned that village should be given to Patiala on trail for management and if Raja failed to do so than they would take over the charge of village. So it was quite clear from the intensions of British Government that sooner or later British Government was going to take over the village.⁵¹

Lepel Griffin by praising British Government claimed that immediate positive change in the behavior of Mahrajkan people was noticed under the British rule. In the opinion of Lepel

⁴⁷ Lepel Henry Griffin, *The Rajas of Punjab*, Low Price Publication, Delhi, Reprint 2014, pp. 175-176.

⁴⁸ Coolbrooke to Murray, 16 February 1829, B.N 29, L.N 36 cited in N.D, *An Historical Interpretation of George Russell Clerk*, p. 234.

⁴⁹ Lepel Henry Griffin, *The Rajas of Punjab*, Low Price Publication, p. 176.

⁵⁰ S.N Banerjee, *History of Patiala*, Vol. II, N.D., p. 27.

⁵¹ For Detail See; N.D, *An Historical Interpretation of George Russell Clerk*, pp. 237-241.

Griffin, establishment of civil court in the Mahrajian village and liberal rules were the reason due to which Mahrajian people became successful and sincere.⁵²

Lepel Griffin further exclaimed that Mahrajian people started believing in British Government in very confident manner that they even begged that a Thanna might be placed in their land. For the proof he gives an example that Mahrajian had always refused for such post to Phulkian Chiefs.⁵³ But it has been given in *An Historical Interpretation of George Rusell Clerk* in quite opposite manner that for three years matter of Mahrajian village's administrative reforms remained untouched. Therefore several important members of Mahrajian community had to go to Ambala to meet Clerk. Clerk than elected some head men, who were to look after their matters of dispute. But this process got failed and people requested the Government to establish a Thana so that their matter could solve immediately. But Government was not willing to put burden on them of the expenditure therefore Government refused to make a Thana in Mahrajian.⁵⁴

Lepel Griffin in his account tries to give another example to show that his Government's rule was just and liberal which seems to be his major purpose and to highlight his Government's achievements through his work.

Lepel Griffin further told that it was them who told the Mahrajian Sikhs that it was forbidden in Sikh religion to kill female infant in womb. Mahrajian in reply told that anarchy had prevailed in their reign since they had accepted Sikh religion. So they were not aware of the doctrines of Sikh scriptures. It can be observed that Lepel Griffin is indirectly telling that Phulkian chiefs were anarchist ruler.⁵⁵

Lepel Griffin says that only after the interference of British the wild people of Maharajkian, who weren't acquainted with any law and regulations could became aware of it and thus able to change their life. But it isn't true because as per sources in Mahrajian well organized administrative structure exist even prior to the British Interference. It is true that when

⁵² Lepel Henry Griffin, *The Rajas of Punjab*, p. 177.

⁵³ *Ibid.*, p.177.

⁵⁴ N.D, *An Historical Interpretation of George Rusell Clerk*, pp. 243-242.

⁵⁵ Lepel Henry Griffin, *The Rajas of Punjab*, p. 177.

their dispute became challenging for them than they went to seek help from mediators, which belonged to Phulkian families but they never wanted to surrender their freedom to any other foreign powers because they were great lover of personal freedom.⁵⁶

Lepel Griffin discusses another matter which was related with the adjustment of *Chaharumi* villages in which Patiala and many Sikh chiefs were co-sharers. These villages were total 97 in numbers and claimed their independency and demanded their separation from Patiala. In 1850 A.D Colonel Mackeson in his investigation report, reported that division should be directed and villages should be assigned to different claimants. Division was suggested on the basis of topographical consideration and ruled out that Patiala would able to collect the revenue and exercise full jurisdiction while co-shares would collect only revenue and British would be their controller in every other aspect.⁵⁷ However, in the *History of Patiala* it has been given that in letter of Ochterlony (29 October 1821 A.D), letter of Captain Ross (6 February 1822 A.D) and in *sanad* of Viscount Harding (22 September 1847) accepted the right of Patiala over these villages but Lepel Griffin doesn't mentions about them.⁵⁸ In the opinion of S.N Banerjee, after the Anglo Sikh war British power underwent though a change in which petty Sikh chiefs of Cis-sutlej tract were absorbed in British territory and decision of readjustment of land of petty chiefs of this area was taken. Thus Mackeson was being appointed.⁵⁹

Lepel Griffin gives his views and says that "Patiala state, as had been several times shown in its history, has felt no scruples in possessing itself of the territories of its weaker neighbors." However S.N Banerjee says that Lepel Griffin was indulge in tirade against Patiala for the violence against *Chaharumi*. As to the violence there is little proof assertion. On the other hand he questioned the credibility of treaties, which British Government had warranted to several princes of India and usurped their rights inappropriately.⁶⁰

⁵⁶ N.D, *An Historical Interpretation of George Russell Clerk*, pp. 232. See also: Metclaf to Coolbrooke, 28 April 1836, *Press List of Old Records In the Punjab Secretariat 1809-1840*, no. 187.

⁵⁷ Lepel Henry Griffin, *The Rajas of Punjab*, pp. 218-219.

⁵⁸ S.N Banerjee, *History of Patiala*, Vol. II, N.D., p. 118.

⁵⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 118.

⁶⁰ S.N Banerjee, *History of Patiala*, Vol. II, N.D., p. 119.

Lepel Griffin in his work reports that four villages Budali, Budiala, Tolah Majra and Moti Majra were exchanged with Naya Shahar and Badalah because on the basis of topographical factors. Lepel Griffin also shares that Raja didn't oppose this decision.⁶¹ But according to S.N Banerjee the land which was assigned to Patiala in exchange was not good in yielding and annual income fell short more than 3,000 rupees as compared to his old territories.⁶²

According to Lepel Griffin share of a Patiala in crop produce was 5/8th.⁶³ But as per S.N Banerjee share of Raja was 2/5th to 1/3rd of the production.⁶⁴

It has been register in *The Rajas of Punjab* that on the 1st November of 1861 A.D Maharaja Narinder Singh was awarded with the most exalted order of the Star of India at Allahabad. At same time he was appointed as a member of Governor General's council for making Law and Regulations.⁶⁵ *Sanad* of title and adoption is register in *A Collection of Treaties and Sanads*.⁶⁶ Abdul Majid confirms the honor.⁶⁷ Same record is given in *Punjab State Gazetteers*.⁶⁸

Lepel Griffin says that unluckily the most enlightened ruler could not live longer and died in the beginning of the November 1862 A.D.⁶⁹ Death year also given same in *A Short History of Patiala State*.⁷⁰

Lepel Griffin shares that after death of Patiala chief his successor was minor so as per *paper of requests* of 1858 A.D a council of regency was to be appointed.⁷¹ Despite of this a paper

⁶¹ Lepel Henry Griffin, *The Rajas of Punjab*, p. 222.

⁶² S.N Banerjee, *History of Patiala*, Vol. II, N.D, p. 120.

⁶³ Lepel Henry Griffin, *The Rajas of Punjab*, p. 223.

⁶⁴ S.N Banerjee, *History of Patiala*, Vol. II, N.D, p. 115.

⁶⁵ Lepel Henry Griffin, *The Rajas of Punjab*, p. 256.

⁶⁶ C.V, Aitchison, *A Collection of Treaties and Sandas*, Vol. I, Government Printing, Calcutta, 1892, p. 207.

⁶⁷ Col. Mohd. Abdul Majid, *A Short History of Patiala State*, Rajindra Press, May 1910, p. 8.

⁶⁸ *Punjab District Gazetteer*, Vol. XVII-A, Punjab Government Press, Lahore 1904, p. 50.

⁶⁹ Lepel Henry Griffin, *The Rajas of Punjab*, p. 258.

⁷⁰ Col. Mohd. Abdul Majid, *A Short History of Patiala State*, p. 8.

⁷¹ A Council of Regency consisting of three old and most capable ministers of the state may be selected by the British Agent on the advice of other two Phulkian Chiefs.

of Maharaja's command was being produced, A *Dastar-ul-Amal* or rules of practice drawn on 13th October 1860.⁷² Official document advocates Lepel Griffin's information.⁷³

Lepel Griffin describes that according to this paper it has suggested that pre-existed ministers of the state should be remain on the post and no council of regency should be formed as it could be injurious to Patiala state to appoint such council.⁷⁴ Same clause is given in official document.⁷⁵

Lepel Griffin further elaborates that British agent than contact with the other Phulkian chiefs even they approved the continuance of the ministry at Patiala and told the agent that *sanad* of Lord Canning had granted the Maharaja full sovereignty so Maharaja was full independent to make such arrangements.⁷⁶ Official documents once again approve the information provided by Lepel Griffin to be true.⁷⁷

However, Government declined this proposal and gave clarification that Narinder Singh had always looked at British Government as their friend and there is no reason to believe that Maharaja had any thought of setting a code of rules to oppose the agreement of 1858 A.D. Therefore, on the basis of this statement Government held that agreement of 1858 A.D must assumed to be remain in force.⁷⁸ Government's justification in the favor of implementation of rule of 1858 A.D is traceable in official document is same.⁷⁹ However, if we check the opinion

⁷² Lepel Henry Griffin, *The Rajas of Punjab*, p. 262.

⁷³ Punjab Government to Agent of Cis-Sutlej States, 25 November, 1862, Foreign Department, Political A, no.374. (N.A.I)

⁷⁴ Lepel Henry Griffin, *The Rajas of Punjab*, p. 263.

⁷⁵ Punjab Government to Agent of Cis-Sutlej States, 25 November, 1862, Foreign Department, Political A, no.374. (N.A.I)

⁷⁶ Lepel Henry Griffin, *The Rajas of Punjab*, p. 264.

⁷⁷ Punjab Government to Agent of Cis-Sutlej States, 25 November 1862, Foreign Department, Political-A, no. 374. See Also; Agent of Cis-Sutlej States to Punjab Government, 26 December 1862, Foreign Department, Political -A, no. 200.(N.A.I)

⁷⁸ Lepel Henry Griffin, *The Rajas of Punjab*, p. 266.

⁷⁹ Punjab Government to Indian Government, 24 January 1863, Foreign Department, Political-A, no. 199. See also; Indian Government to Punjab Government, 13 March 1863, *Ibid.*, no.201.; Political Dispatch of Indian Government

of Lepel Griffin, his view is much bold than British Government's reply he openly claimed that "The term full sovereignty was a loose rendering". He explicitly state that "If a full sovereignty" meant a power such as this, the right of Government, as a paramount would altogether disappear. Full Sovereignty," as far as *sandas* are concerned is a conventional term."⁸⁰

However, according to A.C Arora under the pretext of council of regency British had under taken the responsibility of minor chief's education. Minor chiefs were supposed to grab western education. By this they would remain loyal and faithful to British Government. Literally the purpose of British Government was to make them more European than Indian.⁸¹

As per Lepel Griffin during these year atmosphere of Patiala was 'one of intrigue' in which only few have labored for the advantage of their prince and country while many were thinking to create disturbance in every department of state to cover up their own deficiency.⁸² According to A.C Arora there was no doubt to say that there was great fraction in the council but Lepel Griffin does not reveal that the reason behind this fraction was British agent Major General R.G Taylor. A.C Arora tells that he actively and openly interferes in the state matters. Therefore, due to interference of British Agent, the Council of Regency in three Phulkian states had to be resolved by British Government.⁸³ That's why Punjab Government invested Maharaja Mahinder Singh with full powers, prior to his 18th Birthday.⁸⁴ However, Lepel Griffin says that council was dissolved due to split between two parties of Diwan Kulwant Rai, Head of revenue office and Bakshi Bir Singh, Commandant of forces.⁸⁵

to Secretary of State, 30 March 1863,no.12.and also Political Dispatch of Secretary of State to Indian Government , 15 August 1863, No. 60.

⁸⁰ Lepel Henry Griffin, *The Rajas of Punjab*, p. 266.

⁸¹ A.C Arora, *British Policy towards Punjab States, 1858-1905*, Jalandhar, 1982, p. 143.

⁸² Lepel Henry Griffin, *The Rajas of Punjab*, p. 267.

⁸³ For detail see; A.C Arora, Assumptions of Direct Political Control of Phulkian States by Punjab Government, *Punjab History Conference Proceeding*, March 1971, p. 262-278. See also; Foreign Department, Political A Proceeding, August 1870, p. 231-241.(N.A.I)

⁸⁴ Punjab Government to Indian Government, Foreign Department, Political A Proceeding, August,1870, no. 231, para 3-4.(N.A.I)

⁸⁵ Lepel Henry Griffin, *The Rajas of Punjab*, p. 268.

Nabha:

Lepel Griffin gives the conversance of the troubles which occurred after the death of Raja Bharpur Singh of Nabha. He tells that Raja Bharpur Singh died after severe illness as he fell ill when he had went to attend the marriage function of her Aunt Mehtab Kaur's son Attar Singh. Mehtab Kaur was widow of Sardar Arjun Singh. A group of strong political party circulated a rumor that reason of death was not normal and Raja was being given a poison.⁸⁶ Nonetheless, Giani Gian Singh tells that Bharpur Singh's aunt secretly liked him but when she found out that Bharpur Singh had an affair with Kishan Kaur, a daughter of Punjab Singh Bhaggi. She got jealous and when Raja came to attend her son's wedding, Naraian Singh of Jaito mixed up the poison in the food of the Raja on the order of the Mehtab Kaur.⁸⁷

Turning point came in the story on 4th January 1864 A.D when someone killed Mehtab Kaur in the courtyard of her home in Amritsar and murderer made no attempt to rob her jewel but as per the popular rumors murderers were sent by powerful political parties of Nabha. Soon police succeeded in solving the murder mystery of widow lady Mehtab Kaur and arrested four men under the charge of murder. One of them named Hirsia Singh confesses that crime had actually committed by the Mehtab Singh of Jaito. Here another twist came in story because Mehtab had been released from the jail of Nabha who was undergoing the imprisonment under the charge of theft and was released before his term of his sentence had been expired. When Raja Bhagwan Singh investigated the matter, name of Sirdar Gurbakash Singh who was the prime Minister of Nabha came to the light in case of releasing the culprit earlier.

Lepel Griffin further tells that there was little doubt that Gurbakash Singh had been the instigator of the murder and that other members of the court had assisted him in this crime. He appears to have believed that magical arts of Methab Kaur had caused illness and death of Late Raja Bharpur Singh of Nabha, so he determined to take revenge due to some private grievances against lady and because of her bad character. But Gurbakash Singh denied these charges and protested for his innocence and asserted that his enemies wanted to ruin him and therefore they

⁸⁶ Lepel Henry Griffin, *The Rajas of Punjab*, p. 475-476, 481- 482.

⁸⁷ Giani Gian Singh, *Raj Khalsa*, Vol. II, Lassen Street, Northridge, U.S.A, p. 96.

had planned this conspiracy against him. Gurbakash Singh blamed Munshi Singh of the opposition that he had committed the crime in order to hide his evil act.

In the regard of this complex case Lepel Griffin tells that it become evident that investigation must be held under the supervision of English authority. It took great length of time to get a final decision over this matter. At final, the British Government of Punjab and the British Government of India acquitted Gurbakash Singh on 25th July of 1865 A.D.⁸⁸

In *Raj Khalsa* the story of death case has been depicted from different angle that when Raja Bahrpur Singh was near to death he called Gurbakash Singh and Bhagwan Singh in his room and asked the Gurbakash Singh that after his death do take the revenge from Methab Kaur of his death and ordered Bhagwan Singh that after his death perceived Gurbakash Singh as his father. So when Bhagwan Singh got throne with the help of Gurbakash Singh he ordered to Gurbaskh Singh to take vengeance of his brother's death from Mehtab Kaur. Therefore Gurbaskh Singh to free the Methab Singh and Hira Singh from imprisonment got signature of Raja Baghwan Singh and made it authorized by stamping of Munshi Sahib Singh over the document. Gurbakash Singh had selected them for the murder of Mehtab Kaur. Hira Singh and Mehtab Singh successfully murdered the Mehtab Kaur but they got caught by Police and accepted the charges. On the consent of opposition party, Political Agent Taylor charged only Gurbakash Singh for the murder conspiracy. The son of Gurbakash Singh was being arrested on the signal of opposition party. The matter became heated in the Nabha Darbar so British Government had to intervene in the case. Government investigated every witness. When every evidence were going against Gurbakash Singh than his son suggested him that he must show that document on which he had got the signature of Raja Bhagwan Singh and of Munshi Sahib, to prove himself innocent. But by showing this document Raja Bhagwan Singh could also get into trouble thus Gurbakash Singh showed loyalty towards his master in this most crucial time and denied to show the evidence and took all the blame.⁸⁹ Similar story also found in *Sidhu Brara Da Ithihaas* in brief.⁹⁰

⁸⁸ Lepel Henry Griffin, *The Rajas of Punjab*, pp. 482-484, 486-487.

⁸⁹ Giani Gian Singh, *Raj Khalsa*, Vol. II, pp. 96-97.

⁹⁰ Balwant Singh Historian, *Sidhu Brara Da Ithihaas*, New Lal Bhag, Patiala, 1986, p. 130. See Also: Ravinder Singh Sodhi, *The Shahi Country of Nabha*, S.C.P Publishers, Nabha, 2012, p. 22.

According to *The Rajas of Punjab*, Raja Bharpur Singh had died without any successor so other Phulkian chiefs with the help of Political Agent of Ambala, gathered to select the rightful heir of Nabha on the basis of the terms of *Sandas* of 1860 A.D and 1862 A.D. As per the terms, if a ruler died without selecting a successful heir than a fine or *nazrana* of 1/3rd of gross annual of state should be taken on the next succession. However, Phulkian chiefs wanted to save Nabha from this payment therefore Raja of Patiala and Jind stated that the prince Bhagwan Singh, who was the younger brother of Raja Bharpur Singh had recognized by late Raja as his successor and treated him always in such a manner that one day he might get the throne, so therefore before his death Raja Bharpur Singh had called him and exhorted that after getting throne follow his example of loyalty to serve the British Government. Phulkian chiefs declared this confirmation of Raja Bharpur Singh as a proof that Raja of Nabha prior to his death acknowledged his brother should succeeded him. So they urged that British Government should exempted Nabha state from fine.⁹¹ *Raj Khalsa* advocates the above statement.⁹²

As per given in *The Rajas of Punjab*, British Government replied that Government has given much to them and Raja Bharpur Singh had never declared the Bhagwan Singh as his successor so Government was bound to implement the terms of *sanad* of 5 March 1862 A.D thus payment of the *nazarna* was demanded on the installation of new chief Bharpur Singh. Installation took place on the 17th February 1864 A.D and the rulers of Patiala, Jind, Faridkot were also present. A *khillat* of 15 trays, 3 jewels, 2 arms, a horse and an Elephant were presented.⁹³ The exact statement is traceable in preserved official files. ⁹⁴A Point is worth to add here that new chief of Nabha was selected on the basis of the *sandas* of 1860A.D and 1862 A.D that the successor would be chose by the British authority with the consultation of the chiefs of Patiala and Jind. However, it may be discerned easily that this procedure which was applied in this case was an exceptional because this type of concession was not provided to the other

⁹¹ Lepel Henry Griffin, *The Rajas of Punjab*, p. 479.

⁹² Giani Gian Singh, *Raj Khalsa*, Vol. II, p. 95. See also : Clause III of the *Sanad* of 5 May 1869. C.U Aitchison, A Collection of Treaties Engagements, Central Archeological Library, New Delhi, 1960, p. 292. or see Appendix IV. See also; Jeet Singh Seetal (trans.)Kanhya Lal, *Traikh – i-Punjab* ,Punjabi University, Patiala, 1968, p.106.

⁹³ Lepel Henry Griffin, *The Rajas of Punjab*, p. 480.

⁹⁴ Foreign Department, Political A, January 1864, nos. 267-270. See also: Foreign Department, Political -A, March, 1862, nos. 51-A, 51-B, 51-C.(N.A.I)

princely states except to the two other Phulkian states that if a Ruler died without choosing a successful heir than British Government had the right to appoint the rightful heir. Actually this provision was the product of the clever statesmen of British Government because on one hand they assured the perpetuity of the princes of their houses and on the other hand it benefited the British Government as they could show their right as a paramount power over the Native states. Even on the other hand they get economical benefits also. As per the rule *nazrana* of $1/3^{rd}$ of the value of one year's income of the state was being demanded on the failure of the adoption.⁹⁵

Jind:

Lepel Griffin in Jind matters talks about a village Antaina in detail, which Sangat Singh had received from Maharaja Ranjit Singh as a gift during his visit to Lahore. The village was held by Ram Singh, who lived in the south of Sutlej. Maharaja Ranjit Singh claimed over it as it was dependency of Lahore. However, claim was not admitted by British Government yet. Sangat Singh suddenly attacked over it and took it, so Ram Singh complained about it to the British. When Sangat Singh was called upon for explanations he put forth his point that he had got it from Maharaja Ranjit Singh as a grant but Government denied his appeal on the ground that under British protection exchanging land without their permission was not acceptable. So, therefore he directed to return the villages to its owner.⁹⁶ However from *Press list of Old Records* a different point came to light that on the request of Ram Singh British not only compel Sangat Singh to return the land but also fined Sangat Singh for the restoration of the property of the claimant Ram Singh. So British Government charged him for plundering the property and ordered him to deposit the fine into Ambala treasury. Than Raja paid the fine and it was given to Ram Singh.⁹⁷ It is to be noted here that it was an act of paramountcy which wasn't applied first time over Jind but it had been used multiple times, even when Ochterlony had met with Raja Bhag Singh and asked Raja to give up the territory to Rani Dya Kaur without any benefit in exchange which he had gained from Maharaja Ranjit Singh. This matter has been discussed in

⁹⁵ A.C Arora, *British Policy towards The Punjab States*, p. 85.

⁹⁶ Lepel Henry Griffin, *The Rajas of Punjab*, p. 356.

⁹⁷ E. Colebrooke to Cpt. Murray, 30 May 1828, Book no. 28, *Press List of Old Records In the Punjab Secretariat 1809-1840*, Punjab Government Lahore, 1911. Also see; C.M Wade to Murray, 4 June 1828, Book no. 28, Also see; Wade to Murray 5 July 1828; Also; Colebrooke to Murray , 11 August 1828 and also see; Colebrooke to Murray 25 Nov. 1828.

detail earlier in Jind state.⁹⁸ Mean while British declared that protected chief would not be enter in the negotiation or correspondence with Lahore from now onwards.⁹⁹

As noted in *The Rajas of Punjab* it also became impossible to prevent the Cis-Sutlej chiefs to carry on the independent negotiation with Maharaja Ranjit Singh when almost every chief's agent was at court of Lahore. Same was in the case of Raja of Jind; mismanagement of Jind increased by time because Raja Sangat Singh deserted his capital and had gone to Sangrur. On the contrary, he was in constant contact with Maharaja Ranjit Singh and he didn't bother to break his connection with him despite of several warnings issued to him by British. Soon when Raja Sangat Singh was about to visit Lahore than British Government had to issue a circular to cancel his visit.¹⁰⁰ By examining the sources a probable fact can be derived out that although Raja Sangat Singh had pre-informed the British Government about his visit even though British had got information from the *Vakils* that motive of visit was just to join the festival even then British cancelled his trip.¹⁰¹ The act of British paramountcy broke his heart and young chief suddenly died next day.¹⁰²

In the words of Lepel Griffin long dispute regarding succession had put a negative impact on restless people of Jind. As a consequence people of Balanwali rose in rebellion in 1836 A.D, Balanwali was situated near Bathinda. After the death of Raja Sangat Singh charge of the village came under British. So they were called upon to pay revenue. They had been enjoying the light assessment. But they were not satisfied with new arrangements so they attacked Mr. Edgeworth when he was passing through their village. British believed that villagers did this on the

⁹⁸ Lepel Henry Griffin, *The Rajas of Punjab*, p. 330.

Infra, p. 50-56.

⁹⁹ Captain Wade to Colebrooke, 20 February 1829, *Press List of Old Records In the Punjab Secretariat 1816-1840*, Vol. V, Punjab Government Lahore, 1915, p. 107. no. 97/28. Also; R.R Sethi, *The Mighty and Shrewd Maharaja*, S.Chand, Delhi, 1960, p. 62.

¹⁰⁰ Lepel Henry Griffin, *The Rajas of Punjab*, pp. 359-360.

¹⁰¹ N.D, *An Historical Interpretation of George Rusell Clerk*, National Archive of India, N.D, p. 133. See also; Captain Wade to Clerk, 1 Sept. 1833, 99/118, *Press List of Old Records In the Punjab Secretariat 1816-1840*, Vol. V, p. 189.

¹⁰² Giani Gian Singh, *Raj Khalsa*, Part II, U.S.A, N.D, p. 114. See also; Clerk to Fraser, 7 January 1835, Foreign Department, Political Consultation, no. 37-41.(N.A.I)

instigation of Akali who resorted in a nearby village called Gurusar. The leader of this rebellion was Gulab Singh Gill, large number of Jind troopers joined him as he had served in the Jind cavalry. These insurgents were being encouraged by Mai Sul Rai, she was widow of Prince Partab whose brother Dal Singh was their leader and Bhai Chakian village was also helping them. Insurgents also tried to lure the people of Maharajkian but they denied joining the hopeless undertaking. The rebellion was of short term but on 17th march rebels captured *thannah* of Balanwali thus strong detachment was sent to stop them. Later Dal Singh, Lukha Singh and Mai Sul Rai also got captured. Leader Gulab Singh got killed in this action. Number of prisoners were captured and sent to Ambala and a detachment was placed till tranquility could completely be restored.¹⁰³ However, at some points statement recorded in official sources doesn't match. Like, as per the records Mr. Edworth was appointed at Balanwali, he was attacked when he was on duty.¹⁰⁴ As per official documents, Mahrajakian Sikhs were warned by British Government and Government had distributed several proclamation of strict warnings in Mahrajkian village that if they tried to help Balanwali than be ready to face the consequences.¹⁰⁵ It has also given that Dal Singh was killed by people of Mamdot.¹⁰⁶ According to *Press List of Old Records* many Akali joined this after crossing the Sutlej as well as *zamindar* of Kotkapura also came to help the insurgents.¹⁰⁷

Lepel Griffin in his *The Rajas of Punjab* tells that on 26th January 1864 A.D Raja Sarup Singh died at the age of fifty one. In the opinion of Lepel Griffin, amongst all the Phulkian Chiefs he was the truest ally of British Government though British had disappointed him by disallowing him to inherit whole territory of Jind. Yet he never let his disaffections to influence

¹⁰³ Lepel Henry Griffin, *The Rajas of Punjab*, p. 381-382.

¹⁰⁴ Metcalf to Lord Auckland, Foreign Department, Political Proceeding, 30 April 1836, no. 44.(N.A.I)

¹⁰⁵ Edgeworth to Metcalf, Foreign Department, Political Proceeding, 25 March 1836, no. 46. (N.A.I)

¹⁰⁶ Wade to Clerk, Foreign Department, Political Proceeding, 14 April 1836, no. 58.(N.A.I) See also; Political Agent of Ludhiana to Sec. of Gov. of India, 2 May 1836, no. 56.(N.A.I)

¹⁰⁷ Mackeson to Wade, 7th April 1836, *Press List of Old Records In the Punjab Secretariat 1816-1840*, Vol. V, p. 259.

his loyalty. Raja Sarup Singh had been nominated for the title of 'Knight Grant Commander of the Star of India' in September 1863 A.D but unfortunately he died before receiving the title.¹⁰⁸

Thus installation of new chief over Jind throne was required therefore Raghbir Singh, son of Raja Sarup Singh was worthy to take the charge. The installation of Raghbir took place on 31st March of 1864 A.D in the presence of British official and Phulkian Chiefs.¹⁰⁹

Raja Raghbir Singh had barely taken his seat when rebellion broke out in the newly gained territory of Dadri. The reason of rebellion was revenue was so high than their ex-chief Nawab of Dadri. Raja Sarup had applied the methods of British assessment in Dadri but Griffin justifies the British Government's revenue system by stating that assessment methods which were applied by British were very light and Raja Sarup Singh was very fond of money and used to took large share of the produce than British Government. In case of Dadri the assessment was also far higher, if assessment would have been fixed by British officers than it would be less oppressive.¹¹⁰ According to *Punjab States Gazetteers* reason of rebellion was British revenue system and its assessment was much higher than neighboring villages of Dadri.¹¹¹ It should noted that it was not first incident when people opposed the tyrannical revenue policy of British Government it had also happened in case of Balanwali and in Lajuana, both were the parts of Jind and British policy was being implanted there forcefully therefore people agitated against British policy. Lepel Griffin tries to justify that British policy was just and benevolence for people but Raja Sarup Singh changed the policy by raising the assessment. However, Balanwali was first under the rule of chiefs but later on British took under them and impose their revenue policy over people of Balanwali thus they started rebellion.

¹⁰⁸ Lepel Henry Griffin, *The Rajas of Punjab*, pp. 409-410. See Also; Somerset Playne, *Indian State; A Biographical, Historical and Administrative Survey*, London, 1921, p. 412. Also; Punjab State Gazetteers, *Phulkian States*, Vol. XVII, p. 217. Also; Behari Lal Dhingra, *Jind State*, National Archive Delhi, p. 2.

¹⁰⁹ Lepel Henry Griffin, *The Rajas of Punjab*, Low Price Publication, Delhi, Reprint 2014, p. 412. See also; Somerset Playne, *Indian State; A Biographical, Historical and Administrative Survey*, p. 412. Also; Punjab State Gazetteers, *Phulkian States*, Vol. XVII, p. 216.

¹¹⁰ Lepel Henry Griffin, *The Rajas of Punjab*, p. 321.

¹¹¹ Punjab State Gazetteers, *Phulkian States*, Vol. XVII, p. 217.

Main excitors of the discontent in Dadri were Headmen of villages because their positions were reduced to a simple *Lambardar*. Hakim Kasim Ali Khan, who has been mentioned before was the instigator of rebellion. Near about 50 villages broke into open, they captured police station of Badrah and Seikhawati, robbers were especially called for help on the promise of pay and plunder.¹¹² It is worth to mention here that it was well expected that frustrated *jagirdar* will agitate in future because British Government had neglected their right instead to please Raja Sarup Singh they had issued an order in favor of him. Lepel Griffin himself wrote that Government had pledged to minor *jagirdar* for protection in 1803 A.D but government altered its decision in 1861 A.D by saying that Government was bound till 1858 A.D only. It can be assume that Government needed powerful allies not minor *jagirdars*.¹¹³

Lepel Griffin explains next the action taken by the new Raja Sarup Singh of Jind to stop rebellion. Raja along with two regiments of infantry, 1500 strings, 350 horses and 4 guns marched to Dadri without taking help of other Phulkian states. On 14th of May he attacked the village Charki which was near Dadri, where insurgents had gathered and Raja dispersed them easily by using guns. Within few days he attacked over the Mankina and Jahju villages' mob and got succeeded in normalizing the situation.¹¹⁴

Kapurthala:

Lepel Griffin in the Kapurthalla matters mentions that in 1860 A.D, Suchet Singh's case related to separation of *jagir* was again started, Colonel Lake Commissioner of Jalandar wrote to Government that brothers were reconciled and they have interchanged agreement in which Suchet Singh agreed to live with Raja Randhir and Raja in return promised to leave the land given by Government and to continue the grant. Therefore, no change would occur in will, only difference would be that Suchet Singh would become a dependant instead of *jagirdar*.

¹¹² Lepel Henry Griffin, *The Rajas of Punjab*, p. 321.

¹¹³ *Ibid.*, p. 405.

¹¹⁴ Lepel Henry Griffin, *The Rajas of Punjab*, Low Price Publication, Delhi, Reprint 2014, p. 321. See also; Punjab State Gazetteers, *Phulkian States*, Vol. XVII, p. 217.

Government of the Punjab agreed to accept the proposal because of the services provided by Raja Randhir during mutiny. Thus Suchet Singh's land was again included in Kapurthala.¹¹⁵

However, on the behalf of official document one point more to be added along with following conversation that Commissioner also suggested that the amount of 1500 rupees which had been collected in the form of excise from the territories of Bhunga and Wyan by the Government from the past 4 years should also returned to Suchet Singh.¹¹⁶ Rest of the content found same in other documents too.¹¹⁷

Lepel Griffin further depicts that in 1866 A.D brothers again quarreled, this time not only Suchet Singh but Bikram Singh also was estranged by Raja Randhir Singh. Bikram Singh wrote to Government that the provision of his father's will should be put in force as directed by Government of India. But Punjab Government refused by saying that existing arrangements could not be disturbed. Bikram Singh pleaded to Government of Punjab that separation was his absolute right to claim.¹¹⁸ But Government of Punjab declined to reopen the case.¹¹⁹ As it has mentioned earlier, when in 1853 A.D Suchet Singh after having quarrel with Raja demanded his share, Government allotted him Wyan and Bunga instead of Phagwara. At that time, Government made an excuse to Suchet Singh about Paghwara that it was reserved for Bikram Singh because in future he might demand his share.¹²⁰ But on the contrary, when Bikram Singh demanded his share, Government made another excuse to Bikram that as it had been given to Suchet Singh. In reply Government told that "Rule of primogeniture should be followed and when under native rule it had been set aside it was only the result of an arbitrary exercise of power." Lepel Griffin justifies that in the case of Kapurthalla which had been exceptionally treated in 1852 A.D. The Raja had been entitled to primogeniture for some year has been disregarded so Government was not bound to Bikram Singh after 16 years because Rule of primogeniture had already been

¹¹⁵ Lepel Henry Griffin, *The Rajas of Punjab*, p. 565.

¹¹⁶ From Lake to Government of Punjab, Foreign Political Proceedings, 27 December, 1859, no. 209. (N.A.I).

¹¹⁷ Giani Gian Singh, *Tawarikh Raj Khalsa*, Vol. III, S.G.P.C, Amritsar, p. 355.

¹¹⁸ Lepel Henry Griffin, *The Rajas of Punjab*, Low Price Publication, Delhi, Reprint 2014, p. 565. See also; Giani Gian Singh *Tawarikh Raj Khalsa*, Vol.III, S.G.P.C, Amritsar, p. 355.

¹¹⁹ From Government of Punjab to Bikram Singh, 7 June 1866, no. 136. (N.A.I)

¹²⁰ Lepel Henry Griffin, *The Rajas of Punjab*, p. 561.

accepted earlier.¹²¹ Reason behind sudden behavior change was Queen's Proclamation of November 1, 1858 A.D. In proclamation it had been formally announced the adoption of a new and kind policy towards native princes. It had been said very clearly in the terms that no encroachment would be taken place here after on the territories of the princes. Under these changed circumstances the British authorities were likely to adopt a more considerate attitude towards the Raja Randhir Singh of Kapurthalla.¹²² Quite impressive volume of correspondence was being exchanged between Bikram Singh and Punjab Government; However, Government opposed his claim with firmness and supported the Raja because of changed in British policy after 1857 A.D. In changed attitude Government said that question of the will could not be re-open after 15 years, as he had chosen to remain with Raja and had enjoyed great advantages which he could not otherwise get, and Government had conferred on Raja the highest mark of honor, Star of India therefore Government couldn't lower his position or to bring the existing status of his chief ship into questions. Government than communicated to Bikram Singh that since his request could not be fulfilled, it would be better for him to maintain amiable relation with his brothers. But on the other hand, Bikram Singh argued that he was entitled to claim his separation by will of his father and had been confirmed by Government also in 21st February 1853, and Phagwara was being reserved for him and now Government must accept his appeal.¹²³

According to *The Rajas of Punjab* Suchet Singh joined with his brother Bikram Singh and demanded separation of his share which had been earlier reunited with Kapurthala. Terms of the agreement were not carried out on these two terms which he referred as follow—

- (i) Suchet had authority to raise the assessment.
- (ii) He would be able to use all powers as Collectorate.

But neither assessment enhancement provided nor absolute Collectorate powers were given.¹²⁴

¹²¹ Lepel Henry Griffin, *The Rajas of Punjab*, p. 566.

¹²² A.C. Arora, John Lawrence and Kapurthala State, *Punjab History Conference Proceeding*, Punjabi University, Patiala, March, 1970, p. 156.

¹²³ A. C .Arora, Kapurthalla Will Case, *The Punjab Past and Present*, Punjabi University, Patiala, October 1971, pp. 309-310.

¹²⁴ Lepel Henry Griffin, *The Rajas of Punjab*, p. 567.

But in Official correspondence from Suchet Singh to the Government of Punjab, Suchet Singh seems to have requested for his three terms which were violated were as follow

First appeal, value of his territory Bunga and Wyan had fallen from one lakh to 54000 under British Government settlement and in re-incorporation made with Raja Randhir in 1860 A.D, he had been given rights to raise his assessment.

Second request, He was allowed to use revenue powers without any kind of restrictions but was allowed only for summary suits.

Third request, Which Lepel Griffin didn't mention, was the matter of inheritance. It had remained prime cause of anxiety of Princely Chiefs under British Government. The matter has been discussed in detail in other chapter. In agreement the Talukas are to descend to the male heir lawfully begotten, whereas it had been understood before that all his children were to inherit.¹²⁵

Lepel Griffin further shares that the Punjab Government referred the case to Government of India for the final decision. Final decision came in 1868 A.D in which Government approved the will of 1852 A.D. In the decision, appeal for separation was approved. Raja appealed against this order but his appeal got rejected.¹²⁶ However, Lepel Griffin didn't tell that what was the reason due to which the appeal of Randhir Singh got rejected as the reason was none other than the John Lawrence about whom it had been discussed earlier that he was always in favor of separation of Kapurthala.¹²⁷ He ordered that brothers had a right to demand partition of the state in accordance with will of their late father and directed the Local Government to give effect to the application of both younger brothers.¹²⁸ In reply he

¹²⁵ Foreign Department, Political-A, March 1867, no. 135-138. (N.A.I).

¹²⁶ Lepel Henry Griffin, *The Rajas of Punjab*, p. 569. See also; N.D, *Tawarikh Raj Khalsa*, Vol. II, p. 646.

¹²⁷ Foreign Department, Political Proceeding, February 1868, no. 195. (N.A.I). See also; A.C. Arora, Kapurthalla Will Case, *The Punjab Past and Present*, Punjabi University, Patiala, October, 1971, p. 310. See also; A.C. Arora, John Lawrence and Kapurthala State, *Punjab History Conference Proceeding*, March, 1970, p. 157.

¹²⁸ From Government of India to Government of Punjab, Foreign Department, Political Proceedings, February, no. 195, no. 123. (N.A.I).See also; R.N.Vohra, Assumption of Administration of Kapurthala, *Punjab History Conference*, Punjabi University, Patiala, March, 2003, p. 327. See also; N.D, *Tawarikh Raj Khalsa*, See also; Vol. III, p. 646. See also; A.C. Arora, Kapurthalla Will Case, *The Punjab Past and Present*, October 1971, p. 310. Also;

said that Lord Canning at the Darbar in 1860 A.D clearly appeared to have related only to fact namely that the execution of the will was held in abeyance and conveyed no promise that Will would never be carried out, on the behalf of this both brothers would legally get their share. Suchet Singh had already given separate land and could not claim anything or raise question to increase in amount until the expiry of his settlement. Bikram Singh should be given land worth one lakh rupees per annum, and both brothers would exercise criminal and civil jurisdiction within their respective territories. However if they liked they could come under British suzerainty or could remain under Raja. On failure of male issue lawfully begotten the appanages would revert to the Raja of Kapurthala.¹²⁹ It may be noted that above reply which is given in *The Rajas of Punjab* found same but only difference is that Lepel Griffin had nowhere mentioned John Lawrence, he has given it under the name of the Government of India and in this reply, he also mentioned the male inheritance but didn't mentioned it in Suchet Singh's grievances, which Suchet Singh had forwarded to Government after quarreled with Bikram Singh in 1866 A.D. Lepel Griffin had mentioned only two terms of Suchet Singh. It had been discussed earlier.

According to Lepel Griffin, Raja Randhir Singh was moved by this decision; he then decided to appeal to the Secretary of state of India.¹³⁰ But his appeal to Secretary of India is not given in *The Rajas of Punjab*. He sent a memorial of appeal addressed to the Secretary and pointed out that in accordance with Hindu Law of succession which was prevalent among the Sikh chieftains of the Punjab the whole principality belonged to him as the eldest son of the Raja Nihal Singh, allowing Suchet Singh and Bikram Singh to exercise the criminal and civil jurisdiction was a cleared violation of his rights as a ruler of state. That's why the will of the late Raja had been formerly annulled by the Lord Canning in his speech

A.C. Arora, John Lawrence and Kapurthala State, *Punjab History Conference Proceeding*, March 1970, p. 157. Also; Lepel Henry Griffin, *The Rajas of Punjab*, p. 569.

¹²⁹ Lepel Henry Griffin, *The Rajas of Punjab*, pp. 569-570. See also; From Government of India to Government of Punjab, Foreign Department, Political Proceeding, No. 195, No.123, (N.A.I). See also; Giani Gian Singh, *Tawarikh Raj Khalsa*, Vol. III, p. 646.

¹³⁰ Lepel Henry Griffin, *The Rajas of Punjab*, p. 570.

of Phagwara in 1860 A.D.¹³¹ But according to *Raj Khalsa*; Raja had sent his Diwan Mathra Das to meet the Secretary.¹³² According to Anju Arora, Raja Randhir thought that John Lawrence might not forward his request in original form because it contained the copies of John Lawrence's Minutes, which he had written and which could be likely to reflect adversely upon him. So Raja Randhir Singh circulated his memorandum copies between his friends in England and Raja was also asked to withdraw these Minutes from his memorandum.¹³³

In February, final decision came from Secretary of State of India that Lord Canning in 1860 A.D in open Darbar had conferred him the title of Raja because of his good services in 1857 A.D and given him Kapurthalla as existed before his father's death by discarding the will of his late father under the Queen's proclamation – Policy which was aimed to respect the rights of Princes however Government of Punjab had taken speech of Canning in a wrong context and believed that the Canning had conveyed no promise that will would never be carried out. So, to clarify the misunderstanding Secretary of State shares that it would be unjust to lower the rank of dignity and authority of Raja to mere a chief ship, which had been remained a faithful ally in important time. So it was decreed that Kapurtahla's full possession should be given to Raja and for the sovereignty of the state the two younger brothers should be given money instead of any land. But as far as the matter of criminal jurisdiction was concerned two brothers were to be held under subordination of Raja and after their death,

¹³¹ Memorial from Raja Randhir Singh to Secretary, 4 September 1868, Foreign Department, Political-A, October, no. 329. (N.A.I)

* Lord Canning, Viceroy and Governor- General, paid personal to Kapurthala State and Durbar held at Phagwara on 31st January, 1860. He publicly appreciated Raja Randhir for his services during the Revolt and spoke "In consideration of your loyalty I bestow upon you, your old estate in Bari Doab, In perpetuity, and the will of your late father being set aside, your authority is restored in your principality as before, including the ilaquis of Wyan an Bunga."

For detail see C.U Atchison, *A Collection of Treaties and Sanadas*, Vol. I, Calcutta, 1931, p.138. Or see in Appendix IV or in Memorandum of Kira Ram, The Vakil of Raja Randhir Singh, quoted from Lepel Henry Griffin, *The Rajas of Punjab*, Low Price Publication, Delhi, Reprint 2014, p. 568.

¹³² Giani Gian Singh, *Tawarikh Raj Khalsa*, Vol. III, p. 646.

¹³³ Anju Arora, *British Paramountcy and Internal Administration (1858-1948)*, National Book Organization, New Delhi, 2001, p. 90.

land revenue would be reverted to the Raja.¹³⁴ Kavar Bikram Singh and Suchet Singh sent a counter- appeal to the Secretary of the state of India in defense of their claim and for upholding the decision of Governor- General in council. The Secretary of state overruled their decision.¹³⁵

Lepel Griffin further says that this voluminous and lengthy case was finally settled and younger brothers could not be expected to challenge the verdict hereafter. Since British Government as paramount power has full right to decide the question of Kapurthala state as also of other native states.¹³⁶ Though this right pertaining to Government had not been mentioned in any *sandas* or agreement at all, yet it was never challenged by concerned parties at any stage of the case.¹³⁷

But, here few points should be noted at the end, according to A.C Arora when verdict was given by Secretary of India, John Lawrence had already left India and had been replaced by Lord Mayo; former was in favor of will.¹³⁸ Suchet Singh and Bikram Singh assert in support of their claim that once will had been confirmed and reaffirmed by British authority so it could not be legally set aside. Secondly, Kapurthala was not treated as same as other Phulkian states. In 1858 A.D Phulkian chiefs had sent paper of request (Case of Phulkian Chiefs Papers of Request)¹³⁹ in their sixth request Government gave approval to them that Government would never interfere on the behalf of relatives or dependants of the chiefs. Only would interfere if it would be necessary to do so but Kapurthala State will case differed from the Governor-General to the Governor-General.¹⁴⁰ After 1857 A.D revolt and due to the

¹³⁴ Lepel Henry Griffin, *The Rajas of Punjab*, pp. 571-573. See also; Dispatch from Secretary of State of India to Viceroy in Council, 12 February, 1869, No. 27, Foreign Political Department, Political-A, April 1869, no. 101. (N.A.I). See also; Giani Gian Singh, *Raj Khalsa*, Vol. II, p. 173.

¹³⁵ Lepel Henry Griffin, *The Rajas of Punjab*, p. 574. See also; Dispatch from Secretary of State of India to State of India, Foreign Political Department, 12 February, 1869, No. 27 (N.A.I)

¹³⁶ Lepel Henry Griffin, *The Rajas of Punjab*, p. 575.

¹³⁷ Anju Arora, *British Paramountcy and Internal Administration (1858-1948)*, p. 70. See also; A. C .Arora, Kapurthalla Will Case, *The Punjab Past and Present*, October 1971, p. 316.

¹³⁸ A.C .Arora, John Lawrence and Kapurthala State, *Punjab History Conference Proceeding*, March 1970, p. 161.

¹³⁹ *Infra*, p. 176- 182.

¹⁴⁰ A.C .Arora, Kapurthalla Will Case, *The Punjab Past and Present*, October, 1971, p. 316.

services rendered by Raja, situation got changed.¹⁴¹ Lord Canning the first Viceroy under Queen's Proclamation was in favor of Raja Randhir Singh and averted the John Lawrence's policy.¹⁴²

¹⁴¹ Anju Arora, *British Paramountcy and Internal Administration (1858-1948)*, National Book Organization, New Delhi, 2001, p. 71.

¹⁴² A.C Arora, Kapurthalla Will Case, *The Punjab Past and Present*, October, 1971, p. 317.

Chapter- 5

SUCCESSION AND DISPUTE MATTERS OF CIS-SUTLEJ STATES

As given in the previous chapter study of this chapter also revolves around the British interferences in Cis Sutlej states. British Government as a Paramount power considered its legitimate right over these states. British interfered in every matter of Cis-Sutlej states whether it was political or non-political. Study of this chapter is to analyze the succession matters and disputes among Cis-Sutlej states as suggested by Lepel Henry Griffin in his work *The Rajas of Punjab*.

Succession Matters:

Patiala:

Lepel Griffin tells that ruling period of Raja Karam Singh was full of problems because after her mother his bother started demanding his right. Rani Khem had also tried to get him throne by intriguing against Sahib Singh ten years ago. Kehm Kaur died in June 1821 A.D. But younger brother Ajit Singh got support from the Gopal Singh, who was his chief advisor.¹ Hasan Khan supports Lepel Griffin's account.² According to S.N Banerjee Raja of Nabha was also in the support of Ajit Singh.³

Lepel Griffin further shares that in 1820A.D Ajit Singh started living in Delhi and had rejected *jagir* of 12 villages. Soon he became debtor of many people but he didn't take it serious and took a step further by assuming the title he declared himself a Raja equal to Ala Singh. The title of Raja had been granted to Ala Singh by Ahmed Shah Abdali.⁴ Hasan Khan tells the same story.⁵ According to Giani Gian Singh prince had started to create connections with enemies of Raja. So when Raja Karam Singh came to know about him than Raja Karam Singh tried to stop

¹ Lepel Henry Griffin, *The Rajas of Punjab*, Low Price Publication, Delhi, Reprint 2014, p. 167.

² Muhhamad Sayed Hasan Khan, *Tarikh-i-Patiala*, Safir-Hind, Amritsar 1878, p. 274.

³ S.N, Banerjee, *History of Patiala*, Vol. II, N.D, p. 10.

⁴ Lepel Henry Griffin, *The Rajas of Punjab*, p. 167.

⁵ Muhhamad Sayed Hasan Khan, *Tarikh-i-Patiala*, p. 275.

him to meet his enemy thus Ajit Singh got angry and left to Delhi and when Raja Karam Singh got news about his brother's debt he at once called him back because his family's name could be disgrace.⁶ It has been given in the official letter of Ochtherlony that Ajit Singh went to meet Birch before going to Delhi. He put forward a demand to get a portion from his brother.⁷

In the opinion of Lepel Griffin, Ajit Singh had no right to adopt the title because no one had adopted it except Ajit Singh. Despite of it Raja was eager to reconcile with his brother. Therefore he sent his minister Brakat Ali Khan to Captain Murray to arrange peace between brothers. As a result proposal was forward to prince. In proposal, a list of 21 towns and forts was given so he might choose a residence of his own choice. But Ajit Singh's evil friends made this negotiation intricate. Under their influence Ajit Singh demanded share in territory.⁸ Hasan Khan advocates the remarks of Lepel Griffin.⁹

In the views of Lepel Griffin, method of primogeniture was being applied in princely states to rule. He demanded that either the town Saifabad, Bathinda or Sunam to be given to him. But this could not be possible. Raja offered him towns such as Dhodhe, Mansurpur, Barnala or Hariana. Then, Ajit Singh demanded the territory of Rani Aas Kaur which was resumed recently. Thus negotiation got to an end due to unacceptable demands of Ajit Singh.¹⁰

Lepel Griffin tells that Ajit Singh had perceived that British Government would not support his claim and that he might receive nothing. Therefore he agreed to accept an estate of Rs.30,000 and a personal allowance of 5,000 as an addition to *jagir* of Rs. 15,000. But at the last moment he refused to accept the provision and return to Delhi.¹¹ Hasan Khan tells that Ajit Singh accepted the proposal because Charles Metcalf had said that his demands are unjust and he cannot claim over Patiala even not worthy to assume title of Raja. Therefore, Metcalf suggested Rs.50,000 for him.¹²

⁶ Giani Gian Singh, *Raj Khalsa*, Part II, Lassen Street Northridge, U.S.A, N.D, p.55.

⁷ Collection of the Letters of Ochtherlony to Metclaf, Ganda Singh Collection, Punjabi University, Patiala.

⁸ Lepel Henry Griffin, *The Rajas of Punjab*, p. 168.

⁹ Muhhamad Sayed Hasan Khan, *Tarikh-i-Patiala*, p. 276.

¹⁰ Lepel Henry Griffin, *The Rajas of Punjab*, p. 168.

¹¹ *Ibid.*, p. 168.

¹² Muhhamad Sayed Hasan Khan, *Tarikh-i-Patiala*, p. 276.

In Delhi he lived till 1828 A.D and later accepted the provision which was made for him and went to live in Patiala along with his brother.¹³ It has been given in *Press List of Old Records* that British Government said that Government could not interfere anymore in their personal dispute because attempts to reconcile were now out of their reach.¹⁴

Lepel Griffin states that Raja Karam Singh was loyal to British because during the period of financial troubles he provided help of 20 Lakh rupees to British Government.¹⁵ Proof of loan of 20 Lakh rupees has been provided in *Press List of Old Records*.¹⁶

In the beginning of the rule of Mohinder Singh, Lepel Griffin didn't give much information. Only significance which he shares was to construct a canal from Satlej near Ropar for irrigation in Amabla and Patiala. Maharaja Narinder Singh wanted to construct this canal but his sudden death stopped all project talks. Only in 1870 A.D canal project could have started. Construction of Patiala canal was in the hands of British and expenses was to be borne by both in proportionate value.¹⁷ According to C.V, Aitchison in the construction of two other Phulkian chiefs were also included and date on the agreement is 26 March of 1873 A.D given.¹⁸ However it has been given in *Punjab State Gazetteers* that canal work started in 1882 A.D.¹⁹

Maharaja Mohinder Singh presented university college of Lahore Rs. 70,000.²⁰ This information found similar in *Punjab State Gazetteer*.²¹

Lepel Griffin notifies that in May 1870 Maharaja was nominated for Knight of the most exalted order of star of India.²² Colonel Abdul Majid advocates the statement.²³

¹³ Lepel Henry Griffin, *The Rajas of Punjab*, p. 169.

¹⁴ From Elliot to Metclaf, 21 January 1824, *Press List of Old Records In the Punjab Secretariat 1809-1840*, Punjab Government Lahore, 1911, no. 24.

¹⁵ Lepel Henry Griffin, *The Rajas of Punjab*, p. 170.

¹⁶ From A. Sterling to Murray, 28 May 1827, *Press List of Old Records In the Punjab Secretariat 1809-1840*, no. 27.

¹⁷ Lepel Henry Griffin, *The Rajas of Punjab*, p. 270-271.

¹⁸ C.V, Aitchison, *A Collection of Treaties and Sandas*, Vol. I, Government Printing, Calcutta, 1892, p. 211-227

¹⁹ *Punjab District Gazetteer*, Vol. XVII A, Punjab Government Press, Lahore 1904, p. 50.

²⁰ Lepel Henry Griffin, *The Rajas of Punjab*, p. 272.

²¹ *Punjab District Gazetteer*, Vol. XVII A, p. 50.

²² Lepel Henry Griffin, *The Rajas of Punjab*, p. 273.

At the end Lepel Griffin gives brief detail of Patiala state's area, revenue, population etc. According to him area of Patiala state was 5412 square miles. Population was approximately 16, 50000. Revenue was 38,00,000 per year. Military force comprises 8,000 men. 100 men were for British general service.²⁴ According to Khazan Singh area of state was same but annual revenue was 82,65,101.²⁵

Lepel Griffin also shares the total revenue of 1868-69 A.D was 42,78,928.²⁶ Khazan Singh agrees with this value of revenue.²⁷

Maharaja was entitles to 17 guns salute and was on the second rank in Viceroy's Darbar whereas Maharaja of Jammu and Kashmir was at first place.²⁸ Colonel Majid gives same information regarding the rank and salute to Maharaja Patiala.²⁹

Nabha:

Lepel Griffin explicates that Raja Jaswant Singh of Nabha along with external issues was engaged in internal troubles as well. In 1818 A.D Kanwar Ranjit Singh the elder son of Jaswant Singh rebelled against him under the influence of evil advisers and of Sardar of Lidhran. But British Agent Captain Brich's efforts brought about reconciliation between the father and the son, and Raja Jaswant Singh of Nabha restored the confiscated estate to Kanwar Ranjit Singh. But this reconciliation was of short term and trouble reoccurred in 1822 A.D. The Raja Jaswant Singh of Nabha believed that Kanwar Ranjit Singh was intriguing again so he reassumed his possession. The dispute was prolonged. In 1824 A.D Raja Jaswant Singh threw him in jail along with his supporters. He proposed to disinherit the Kanwar in favor of his second son. The whole case was referred to the British authorities. Governor General consulted the matter with Charles Metcalfe, the resident at Delhi. After agreeing with the viewpoint of Metcalfe, Governor General ordered that no restrain should be put upon the Prince Ranjit Singh and his companion and they

²³ Col. Mohd. Abdul Majid, *A Short History of Patiala State*, Rajindra Press, May 1910, p. 8.

²⁴ Lepel Henry Griffin, *The Rajas of Punjab*, p. 273.

²⁵ Khazan Singh, *History and Philosophy of Sikh Religion*, Part-I, Nawal Kishore, Lahore, 1914, p. 294.

²⁶ Lepel Henry Griffin, *The Rajas of Punjab*, p. 274.

²⁷ Khazan Singh, *History and Philosophy of Sikh Religion*, Part-I, p. 294.

²⁸ Lepel Henry Griffin, *The Rajas of Punjab*, p. 273.

²⁹ Col. Mohd. Abdul Majid, *A Short History of Patiala State*, p. 9.

should be released at once from confinement. According to Lepel Griffin “There is ample evidence to show that the conduct of the prince had been wild and extravagant and that the Raja had some reason to be dissatisfied with him. This is established by the various agreements drawn up at the various times by the prince, and attested by the Sir David Ochterlony but they also prove that these serious charges were without foundation.” Various orders were being issued by Captain Ross and Murray in which they alleged that character of Raja Jaswant Singh was so infamous moreover he was acknowledged instigator of extravagances of the Prince. So authority on this behalf of this judgment freed the Prince.³⁰

Ravinder Singh Sodhi and *Raj Khalsa* gives another reason for father son dispute according to these sources Raja Jaswant Singh was married to 4 queens and Prince Ranjit was son of the eldest queen but Raja Jaswant Singh loved his younger queen Har Kaur very much and was under her influence. Rani Har Kaur demanded throne for his own son Davinder Singh so Raja Jaswant Singh on the demand of her queen, confiscated the lands of Kanwar Ranjit Singh. But as noted in *Itihaas Sidhu Brara Da* Raja Jaswant Singh was married to 5 queens instead of 4 queens but Har Kaur was fourth.³¹

Lepel Griffin didn't discuss the reason behind the action taken by Raja Jaswant Singh in 1824 A.D against his son Prince Kaur Ranjit. A lengthy record of the case is noted in Captain Birch's diary. In which Raja Jaswant Singh's statement and appeal is given. Raja Jaswant Singh in his appeal revealed that his son tried to kill him by poisoning his milk. In this gruesome act prince bribe the servants and made a deal with them to mix up the milk with poison by cheating. These servants were under the service of Raja Jaswant Singh of Nabha. Raja named the frauds as Nanuoo, the washer of pots (who poisoned the milk), Hazuree (cook), Man Singh and Raja Singh Ludhur whereas these last two who planned the death were the companion of Kanwar Ranjit Singh. Raja also gave the names of his two servants Jeeta Singh and Sher Singh (Jemadar- a servant at lower post) as witness which told the Raja Jaswant Singh about the conspiracy which was being plotted against him. On the other hand they had been also approached to join the

³⁰ Lepel Henry Griffin, *The Rajas of Punjab*, Low Price Publication, Delhi, Reprint 2014, pp. 427-429. See also; Bhai Gurmukh Singh Ji Gurmukh, *Twarikh Nabha*, Bazzar Mayi Sewa, Amritsar, N.D, pp. 13-14.

³¹ Ravinder Singh Sodhi, *The Shahi Country of Nabha*, S.C.P Publishers, Nabha, p. 17. See also; Giani Gian Singh, *Raj Khalsa*, Vol. II, Lassen Street Northridge, U.S.A, N.D, p. 82.

opposition to murder the Raja. In Birch's diary deposition of accused have been given. Statements which are noted down are of Nanuoo, Hazuree, Raja Singh Ludhur, Jeet Singh, Sher Singh, Loharoo (who served the milk to Raja) and *Urzee* (request) of Kanwar Ranjit Singh.³² These testimonies were recorded in the presence of Deputy Superintendent (British official) and the lawyers of both sides. Interrogative questions which were asked by Deputy to accused are also given. Although it is not easy to trace the truth because statements given by the witness or the accused were not accordingly matched with the incident. But every deponent point out Raja Singh and Man Singh as main conspirators and told that they were backed by the Kanwar Ranjit Singh. In defense Raja Singh denied all charges and on the other hand Kanwar Ranjit Singh urged that he was innocent and he put the whole blame upon Man Singh. If we set aside the case of murder conspiracy and not to blame to Kanwar Ranjit Singh or to say Raja Jaswant Singh forged everything to get rid of his son apart from it in this case Raja Jaswant Singh's complaint application point out an another aspect of the case that it wasn't the first chance of conspiracy which took place against Raja Jaswant Singh. Raja Jaswant Singh mentioned about two other attempts. In the first attempt Kaur Ranjit at the instigation his wife and his father-in-law tried to kill Raja. But Luckily Raja got saved. On the middleman ship Raja Jaswant Singh pardoned Kanwar Singh and Kanwar Ranjit Singh agreed not to offend Raja in future. Second, notwithstanding this agreement made through Ochterlony, Kanwar Ranjit Singh again challenged the authority of the Raja Jaswant Singhof Nabha at the forts of Dhurro and Ludhar with the help of Ludhar Sardars. When Raja of Nabha went to teach a lesson to his son, Captain Birch saved Kanwar Ranjit Singh from Raja Jaswant Singh's anger and persuaded Raja to forgive him. In another Raja Jaswant Singh sent Kanwar Ranjt Singh to Dhuroo far away from his rule because Raja no more trust him but in Dhuroo Kanwar Ranjit Singh confined *Jemadar* and turned out the soldiers with the help of Akali Khushal Singh and Kanwar Ranjit Singh even rejected the order of the Captain Ross. Therefore Captain Ross ordered to Jaswant Singh to take

³² Depositions of Naunoo, Hazurre, Raja Singh Ludhur, Sher Singh and Kanwar Ranjit Singh are registered in Captain Birch's work. Captain Birch was Agent to David Ochterlony and had acted as head in the absence of the David Ochterlony in the affairs of the Ciz –Sutlej states. All Statements are recorded along with the Interrogative questions. For detail see: Captain G. Birch, *Selection from Notebook Kept by Captain G. Birch 1818-1821*, Superintendent, Government Printing Punjab Lahore, pp. 99 -127.

Dhuroo from Kanwar Ranjit Singh by force. So when Kanwar Ranjit Singh made a third attempt to kill Raja Jaswant Singh by insidiousness. Raja appealed to British Government to allow him to inflict a signal punishment on Kanwar Ranjit Singh, Man Singh and Rajah Singh. One thing is quite interesting that after the bitterness occurred in father-son relation, Kanwar Ranjit Singh went to Ambala (Ambala was directly under the British) for his safety.³³ It is to be noted that even though some sources say that Raja Jaswant Singh was under the command of his queen did everything but Kanwar Ranjit Singh in his appeal to British Government has not mentioned about the Har Kaur and in second point it should be understood that Captain Ross, Murray and David Ochterlony's various orders showed immoral conduct of Prince than why British Government acquitted the Prince from all charges and took his side? Lepel Griffin justifies this question with a lame excuse that Rajah Singh Ludhar was untrustworthy character and was acknowledged instigator of the extravagances became the reason of Prince's acquittal. It should be noted that Rajah Singh was on constant feud with Raja Jaswant Singh over matter of Lidhran (Sonthi Sikh and Lidhran dispute has been discussed separately) So charges of conspiracy against Kanwar Ranjit Singh could not be neglected easily. Although whatever the matter was, answer to this question ended with the early death of Kanwar Ranjit Singh. Otherwise results could be different. Kanwar Ranjit Singh died on 17 June 1832 A.D.³⁴

Lepel Griffin highlights a point which prevails in Sikh States that sudden death of important person was rarely considered a natural death as in the case of Ranjit Singh who had been pursued by the bitter enmity of his father. The widows of deceased blamed the Raja for the death because dead body had bore some marks which seemed to be foul play. Whereas Prince Santokh Singh only son of Kanwar Ranjit Singh died suddenly just two years before. So ultimately in general belief everyone blamed Jaswant Singh for death. But no evidence found and soon mother of Prince wrote to George Clerk that Raja Jaswant Singh had nothing to do with

³³ Captain G. Birch, *Selection From Notebook Kept By Captain G. Birch 1818-1821*, pp. 99 -127.

³⁴ Lepel Henry Griffin, *The Rajas of Punjab*, p. 429.

death of Prince. So no further action was taken.³⁵ *Sidhu Brara Da Ithiaas and Raj Khalsa* confirms the closing of the case as it is given by Lepel Griffin.³⁶

Lepel Griffin impart the information of coronation of Davinder Singh that on 5th October of 1840 A.D he was installed as Raja after the death of his father Jaswant Singh and the agent of Governor General was present at that time and a *Khillat* conferred upon him.³⁷ But According to Giani Gian Singh he gets the throne on 15 October instead of 5 October.³⁸

In the opinion of Lepel Griffin, Raja Davinder Singh was not wise administrator. Lepel Griffin describes that when his elder brother died, Davinder Singh was ten years old at that time, since then he got recognized as an heir to throne. He had thus, from his earliest years been surrounded by the flatters and wicked people. In his teenage his Brahman tutor highly influenced him and filled his mind with exaggerated estimate of his power, pride and importance. As the result he became so arrogant. Thus old feud which had been for long prevailed in families of Nabha and Patiala revived with great bitterness. In this context Muhhamad Latif though agrees with the character of the Davinder Singh but he gives the reason of Brahman tutor's influenced different to Lepel Griffin. According to Latif, Brahman intoxicated his mind by claiming that English power would soon going to disappear and one day, which was approaching fast that Nabha would alone become a supreme power in whole Punjab.³⁹ While, according to *Soorbir Khalsa*, Davinder Singh considered himself as incarnation of Krishan and would spent most of his time with females and took less interest in politics.⁴⁰ As given in *Punjab di Sair*, Raja was interested in religious matters rather than political affairs. Under the influence of Brahman he considered himself God even people of Nabha started worshipping him.⁴¹

³⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 429.

³⁶ Giani Gian Singh, *Raj Khalsa*, Vol. II, p. 83. See also; Balwant Singh Historian, *Sidhu Brara Da Ithihaas*, New Lal Bhag, Patiala, 1986, p. 123.

³⁷ Lepel Henry Griffin, *The Rajas of Punjab*, p. 436. See also; *District and States Gazetteers of Undivided Punjab*, Vol. V, B.R Publishing Corporation, Delhi 1895, p. 299. See also; Bhai Gurmukh Singh, *Tawarikh Nabha*, p. 15.

³⁸ Giani Gian Singh, *Raj Khalsa*, Vol. II p. 85.

³⁹ Syad Muhhamad Latif, *History of Punjab*, Eurasia Publishing House, New Delhi, 1964, p. 333.

⁴⁰ Bishan Singh Giani, *Panth Parkash Soorbir Khalsa*, Master Sunder G.A.V Khalsa College, Amritsar, N.D, p. 81.

⁴¹ Giani Lal Singh (trans.) Rai Kali and Tulsi Ram, *Punjab Di Sair*, Punjabi University, Patiala, 1971, p. 282.

Lepel Griffin exchanges his view in *The Rajas of Punjab* about relations of Nabha and Jind through the matter of succession of the Jind. When Raja Sangat Singh of Jind died without having any son, the main claimants were Sardar Sarup Singh of Bazidpur and his cousin Sardar Sukhan Singh from Badrukhan. It took too long to choose the rightful claimant. Nabha and Patiala wanted to attain benefit so they decided to support one who would choose them as their influencer. Nabha demanded the Sangrur as gift for Jind throne and Sarup Singh agreed to Nabha's demand but when the Government accredited Sarup Singh's claims over Jind. He refused to fulfill his promise which he had promised to Nabha. Moreover Sarup Singh tried to torn up the agreement which was believed to take place between Nabha and Jind.⁴² On the other hand George Rusell conveys that the claimants of throne were not only Sarup Singh and Sukha Singh there were other claimants too which were named as Raja Jaswant Singh, Rani Sabha Kunwar senior widow of Sangat Singh and Rani Bhagbhari the senior widow of Partap Singh the younger brother of Raja Fateh Singh but Government rejected their claims.⁴³ After this Raja of Nabha tried to get Jind for himself he offered the proposal of 4 Lakh Rupees as a *Nazarana* in the recognition of his title to inherit the title of Jind territories but clerk rejected the offer.⁴⁴

The settlement which took place between Nabha and Jind about which Lepel Griffin is talking also found in George Rusell's correspondences but Geroage Rusell tells further that these rulers sent deputation to Agra to request Government but Government dismissed their appeal.⁴⁵ Thus, be that as it may be the Raja of Jind was agreed to gave Sangrur to Nabha but after the rejection of proposal of Nabha that the Sarup Singh should be made Raja by Government so no reason would left for Raja of Nabha to claim anything from Raja of Jind because Sarup Singh had got recognitions from British Government without any help of Nabha.

Lepel Griffin tells that after installation of Raja of Jind only revenge Raja could take for the breaching of the faith was to deny any type of title or honor to Raja Sarup Singh. As it has

⁴² Lepel Henry Griffin, *The Rajas of Punjab*, p. 439.

⁴³ Clerk to Metcalf, 1 September, 1836, cited in N.D, *An Historical Interpretation of George Rusell Clerk*, National Archive of India, N.D, p. 169.

⁴⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 181.

⁴⁵ Metcalf to Clerk, 15 Aug.1836 and Bushby to Metcalf , 6 Aug.,1836,cited in N.D, *An Historical Interpretation of George Rusell Clerk*, p.185.

been mentioned in preceding paragraph about the agreement between the Nabha and Jind so no need to repeat it.⁴⁶

Lepel Griffin in his work discusses the lapse of Kaithal. Kaithal state was under the Bhakian family who had created good connections with Phulkians. When chief of Kaithal died without having any heir apparent and Government was about to gain control over Kaithal than Nabha, Patiala and Jind tried to obstruct the Government and tried to get succession for the nearest claimants. But Government was determined to get the escheat and to claim their right they sent a detachment therefore Phulikan chiefs by perceiving the mood of Government pretended to be in the Government's side. But inwardly Phulkian chiefs believed that sooner or later their estates would also lapse to paramount power.⁴⁷ In this regard Satish Chandra Mittal presents a different scenario that Phulkian Chiefs confronted the decision of the British and requested to Mr Greathed(Special agent at Kaithal) to transfer the rule of Kaithal to them as it was belonged to their family. As per Satish Chandra annexation of Kaithal was injustice.⁴⁸ George Rusell Clerk sent a letter to Patiala and also to Jind and Nabha in which he clearly warned the Phulkian Chiefs that if they dared to opposed the Government than they should get ready for severe punishment.⁴⁹ That's why Phulkian Chiefs stopped interfering in the matter of Kaithal. Explanation given by Lepel Griffin of the intentions of Phulkian families for helping the Kaithal family can be trace in which exact reason are mentioned.⁵⁰ A letter of Phulkian Rajas also gives the explanation of their role. In brief, they were telling that they were in Kaithal to share the sorrow and their intentions were not to oppose British.⁵¹ It can be said that strict warring of British forced them to change their sides under the fear that they might lose their own territory.

⁴⁶ Lepel Henry Griffin, *The Rajas of Punjab*, p. 439.

⁴⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 441.

⁴⁸ Satish Chandra Mittal, *Haryana: A Historic Perspective*, Atlantic Publishers, Haryana, 1986, p. 40.

⁴⁹ Clerk to Raja Karam Singh of Patiala, 11 April 1843, cited in N.D, *An Historical Interpretation of George Rusell Clerk*, p. 221.

The Copies of this letter was also sent to Raja of Nabha and of to Jind.

⁵⁰ Envoy of the Court of Lahore to Thomson Esquire, Foreign Department, Foreign Consultation, 19 April 1843, no. 65-75.(N.A.I)

⁵¹ Letter to George Clerk, Foreign Department, 19 April 1843, no. 68. (N.A.I)

Jind :

As stated in *The Rajas of Punjab* Raja Sangat Singh left no son after his death to rule. He had married three times but his wives bore him no child. His nearest cousins were Sarup Singh, Sukha Singh and Bhagwan Singh they were the Sirdars of Badrukhan and Bazidpur, who had long ago got separated from Jind. The right of nearest collateral relative was not prevailed in the Sikh states. So British as a Paramount power have right to annexed the state as their escheat. However British Government didn't take action for some time, meanwhile Mai Shaib Kaur, Mother of Sangat Singh was appointed as Regent to run the administration till final decision.⁵² As per *An Historical Interpretation of the George Rusell Clerk* British Government didn't took action because Phulkian chiefs had refused to pay the tribute in the exchange of right of succession of the escheat.⁵³

Lepel Griffin himself agrees that first intention of British Government was to annex the whole state of Jind but then numerous claimants rose up to claim their right over the Jind chief ship. Three widows of late chief Rani Subha Kaur, Nand Kaur and Sukha Kaur claimed their right over Jind. However, British rejected their appeal by saying that such a large state like Jind cannot be put into the hands of young women this could be dangerous for the state.⁵⁴ According to *An Historical Interpretation of the George Rusell Clerk*, British Government changed its intention to take over the Jind by noticing some facts that remoteness of estate, their poverty, scattered position could create problems. Thus these facts changed their mind so they preferred the tribute collection scheme.⁵⁵

⁵² Lepel Henry Griffin, *The Rajas of Punjab*, p. 362-363.

⁵³ Clerk to Metcalf, 23 March 1835 cited in N.D, *An Historical Interpretation of George Rusell Clerk*, p. 67.

⁵⁴ Lepel Henry Griffin, *The Rajas of Punjab*, Low Price Publication, Delhi, Reprint 2014, pp. 363-364. See also; Wade to W.H Tulloh, 2 Feb. 1835, 106/9, *Press List of Old Records In the Punjab Secretariat 1809-1840*, p. 227.

⁵⁵ N.D, *An Historical Interpretation of George Rusell Clerk*, p. 69. See also; Government of India to officiating Sec. to Government of Agra, 13 July 1835, Foreign Department, Political Consultation, no. 20.

As specified in *The Rajas of Punjab*, widow of Sangat Singh's father also assert their right over Jind. Sahib Kaur was the eldest among them and was mother of Sangat Singh. Second widow was Khem Kaur.⁵⁶

Next claimant as per Lepel Griffin was Rani Bhagbari who was the senior widow of Prince Partap Singh. She claimed the right over Jind as being the favorite widow of Raja Bhag Singh's favorite son in whose favor he had issued a will. But Government dined his claim by stating that her son had never succeeded his father.⁵⁷

Lepel Griffin tells that Raja of Nabha tried to advance a claim as the descendant of the same house. But Government disallowed his claim. He also tried to offer *nazarna* of 4 Lakh Rupees on the recognition of his claim over the Jind.⁵⁸

Only remaining claimants were Sraup Singh and Sukha Singh chiefs of Bazidpur and Badrukhan respectively. Right of Sarup Singh as collateral successor seemed good for British. He was the elder son of Karam Singh who was elder son of Bhup Singh. Even rule of primogeniture applied in which Government was most interested.⁵⁹ Although Raja Patiala was in favor of Sarup Singh but he also preferred a feeble claim.⁶⁰

Lepel Griffin apprise that right of Sarup Singh was admitted but questioned arose that what principle should be apply to the disposition of the several portion of the territories. This territory consisted three portions; first portion which was possessed by Late Raja Gajpat Singh the districts of Jind and Sufidon, Second was the portion of grants which were given by Mahraja

⁵⁶ Lepel Henry Griffin, *The Rajas of Punjab*, pp. 364-365. See also; N.D, *An Historical Interpretation of George Rusell Clerk*, p. 67.

⁵⁷ Lepel Henry Griffin, *The Rajas of Punjab*, p. 366-367. See also; N,D, *An Historical Interpretation of George Rusell Clerk*, p. 68.

⁵⁸ Lepel Henry Griffin, *The Rajas of Punjab*, pp. 367-368. See also; Jaswant Singh Nabha to Sect. of State, 5 Nov.1836, Foreign Department, Political Consultation, no. 83.(N.A.I). Also; N.D, *An Historical Interpretation of George Rusell Clerk*, p. 68.

⁵⁹ Lepel Henry Griffin, *The Rajas of Punjab*, Low Price Publication, Delhi, Reprint 2014, p. 321. See also; Clerk to Wade, 23 March 1836,106/91, *Press List of Old Records In the Punjab Secretariat 1809-1840*, Punjab Government, Lahore, 1911, p. 259.

⁶⁰ N.D,*An Historical Interpretation of George Rusell Clerk*, p. 68. See also; R.H Scott to Government of Agra, 21 Dec.1835, Foreign Department, Political -C, no. 20. (N.A.I)

Ranjit Singh to Jind previous to treaty of 1809 A.D which includes Luhdiana, Morinda and Basia and third were grants bestowed by Maharaja subsequent to that treaty. However, Sarup Singh claimed over the whole territory including ancient and modern acquisition on the basis of the Hindu Law. But on the other hand British Government rejected his appeal on the ground that these laws can applied only on the personal and private property as Sikh had already abandoned the Hindu faith.⁶¹ It is important to consider that if British Government was in favor of implementing the law as per treaty of 1809 A.D then it was automatically and logically a condition in which Article 3⁶² could have been justly applied. But Government instead of it used his paramount power and overruled his own policy for his own benefits which Lepel Griffin cunningly tried to hide.⁶³ In the official records Sarup Singh's request to British Government justifies the above statement.⁶⁴

Next Lepel Griffin talks about Maharaja Ranjit Singh's claim. He tells that Maharaja asserted his right to all the estates which he had granted to Jind both previous and after the treaty. But his right to former was declined by Government. He also tried to give an example of Hindu Law like Sarup Singh but according to Government after the treaty Maharaja has no right to the territory of the left side of Sutlej. By this treaty Cis-Sutlej Chiefs has got exception from the dependence of the Maharaja Ranjit Singh.⁶⁵

Lepel Griffin enunciates British Policy towards Jind and Maharaja in detail through the letter of Governor General. In which Governor General agreed only to return those territories which Maharaja Ranjit Singh had given to Jind after the treaty of 1809A.D but his claim over territory prior to treaty got rejected by Governor General. Government declared that Raja Sarup Singh should succeed the acquisition of Gajpat Singh and remaining territories including

⁶¹ Lepel Henry Griffin, *The Rajas of Punjab*, p. 370-371. See also; Clerk to Wade, 12 March 1836, *Press List of Old Records In the Punjab Secretariat 1816-1840*, Vol. V, p. 259.

⁶² Article 3- The Chief shall remain in the exercise of same rights and authority within their own possession, which they were enjoyed before they were taken under British Protection. For more detail see; Appendix II.

⁶³ C.U Atchison, *A Collection of Treaties and Engagements*, Vol.III, Government Printing, Calcutta, p. 232.

⁶⁴ For detail of the request of Raja Sarup Singh of Jind to British Government, Also see; Saroop Singh to Government of India, 4 July 1834, Foreign Deptt., Political Prog. no. 5-19.(N.A.I)

⁶⁵ Lepel Henry Griffin, *The Rajas of Punjab*, pp. 372-373. See also; Captain Wade to Mackeson, 15 July 1835, *Press List of Old Records In the Punjab Secretariat 1816-1840*, Vol. V, p. 241.

Ludhiana should lapse to the British Government.⁶⁶ From *Press List of Old Records* along with the information that territory were given to Maharaja only those which he had given to Raja Jind after 1809 A.D.⁶⁷ a fact also came into light that Captain Wade had suggested Indian Government that Government should taken the benefit from the lapse of Jind state by putting the Ludhiana tenure at better footing.⁶⁸ In *An Interpretation of George Russell Clerk* it has also given that they were not only looking to captured Ludhiana by attaining benefit for this opportunity instead Clerk had also suggested that Government should not approve the claim of Ranjit Singh as they had done before in many cases.⁶⁹ It is worth to mention here that it was quite clear that British were after the Ludhiana which they had got from Bhag Singh by hook and crook and lapse of Jind state gave them golden chance to fulfill their desire to occupy the Ludhiana without any resistance. However, intention of British official were to usurp all the state but constant appeal of Phulkian chiefs and Maharaja Ranjit Singh as on the other side of Sutlej didn't let them to do so.⁷⁰ Kanyia Lal also approves that Sarup Singh was only allowed to take the possession of the territory of Gajpat Singh.⁷¹

Lepel Griffin discuss the opinion of Government of India about the Jind succession in which Government says that succession to chiefship among Sikhs was very improper and its very impracticable to laid general rules for the succession of the property in Sikh States because rules for the succession to the property are arbitrary and were variously modified in accordance with the usage. Government also declined to accept the claim of widows over Jind. So by applying the

⁶⁶ Lepel Henry Griffin, *The Rajas of Punjab*, pp. 374-376.

⁶⁷ Captain Wade to Mackeson, 17 July 1835, *Press List of Old Records In the Punjab Secretariat 1816-1840*, Vol.V, p. 241. See also; Wade to Clerk, 18 August 1835, *Press List of Old Records In the Punjab Secretariat 1816-1840*, p. 245.

⁶⁸ Clerk to Metcalf, 23 August 1835, no.102/55, *Press List of Old Records In the Punjab Secretariat 1816-1840*, Vol. V, p. 247.

⁶⁹ N.D, *An Historical Interpretation of George Russell Clerk*, National Archive of India, p. 135.

It should also be noted that Rs. 500 per month British Government had to pay to Jind for cantonment in Ludhiana.

⁷⁰ Foreign Department, Political Consultation, 22 August 1835, no. 94. (N.A.I)

In this document Phulkian Chiefs sent their request to Government that George Russell Clerk, Political Agent of Ambala had sent his report on the succession of Jind case without any enquiry and without consulting with them so therefore the will send their application to every official.

⁷¹ Jeet Singh Seetal (trans.) Kanhiya Lal, *Tarikah-Punjab*, Punjabi University, Patiala 1968, p. 107.

rule of primogeniture Government gave throne to Sarup Singh.⁷² Official Letters confirms this statement.⁷³ As per the decision Government divided the Jind into Three portion which are given in following list

Territories which were given to Raja Sarup Singh -

Parganah	No. of Villages	Estimated Revenue
• Jind Proper -	140	1,20,000
• Sufidun -	25	42,000
• Assowanda -	26	42,000
• Salwan -	8	42,000
• Balwali -	108	20,000
• Saugrai -	11	50,000
• Bhowki -	1	4,000
Jichewal, Samut, Mhelmun.		
Total	322	2,36,000. ⁷⁴

According to Kaniya Lal only Safidun, Sangrur, Baliwali areas were given to Sarup Singh to rule.⁷⁵ However as per official records Jind proper consists 50-55 villages and total revenue could be gathered was Rs. 1,00,000. In Sangrur or Saugrai total villages were 7 and revenue amount was same. 9 villages were in Slawan and estimated revenue was Rs. 5,000 only. On the other hand total estimated of revenue was Rs. 1,41,000.⁷⁶

⁷² Lepel Henry Griffin, *The Rajas of Punjab*, pp. 374-376.

⁷³ Secretary of State to Government of Agra, Foreign Department, Political Consultation, no. 37-41.(N.A.I)

⁷⁴ Lepel Henry Griffin, *The Rajas of Punjab*, p. 377.

⁷⁵ Jeet Singh Seetal (trans.) Kanhiya Lal, *Tarikah-Punjab*, p. 107.

⁷⁶ Secretary of State to Government of Agra, Foreign Department, Political Consultation, no. 37-41.(N.A.I)

To be restored to Maharaja Ranjit Singh

- Hulwara, Talwandi, - 1 9,000
- Mudkee, Gyaspurah

Total 9,000⁷⁷

Official records confirm the land restored to Maharaja Ranjit Singh which were same as given in *The Rajas of Punjab*.⁷⁸

Territories to be restrained by British

- Basia - 16 16,000
- Ludhiana - 77 85,000
- Morinda - 36 44,000
- Mudki - 8 10,000
- Jandiala - 9 11,000
- Total - 146 1,66,000

- Chuhal - --- 2000
- Dialpurah - --- 3,000
- Scattered - --- 11,000
- Villages

Total ... 16,000⁷⁹

Whereas territorial list of British possession which has been given in *The Rajas of Punjab*, it does not match with the official records. As per the official records Ludhiana comprises 55 villages and estimated revenue was of Rs. 55,000, Morinda having 24 villages with Rs. 30,000 value in total and Buhsia consisting 18 villages with total value of 20,000. Even a

⁷⁷ Lepel Henry Griffin, *The Rajas of Punjab*, p. 377.

⁷⁸ Agra Secretary to Government of India, Foreign Department, Political Consultation, 18 Jan. 1836, no. 5. (N.A.I)

⁷⁹ Lepel Henry Griffin, *The Rajas of Punjab*, p. 378.

village has not mentioned by Lepel Griffin were Isowal which consists 5 villages and total revenue was Rs. 8,000. Total revenue amount was Rs. 1,35,000 as per official records.⁸⁰

Lepel Griffin tells that mother and widows of late chief were not happy with the decision of British Government. According to widows, Jind chiefship should not be given to inferior ranked Sarup Singh though urged that their claim should be recognized. Rani Suha Kaur and other widows complained that they were treated with great harshness and their privacy in the female apartments was also invaded. So they urged for special enquiry to reconsider their claim. But as per British Government the complaints of Rani had little foundation therefore Government rejected their appeal.⁸¹ From *Press List of Records* brief notice about appeal of Mai Shaib Kaur against Sarup Singh⁸² and rejection by British can be seen.⁸³

Lepel Griffin write that Sarup Singh didn't abandoned his wish to obtain the possession of which had been held by his ancestors. When matter of Kythal rose up in 1843 A.D it gave him another chance. The lapse of this territory was made on the same principle as Jind succession had regulated. That collateral relative should inherit only that portion which was possessed by his ancestors. But Raja Sarup Singh of Jind and Raja of Patiala tried to obtain the right of succession for the second cousin of late Bhai of Kythal. In a hope that if this were once allowed than the right of Sarup Singh to entire territory of Jind would be admitted. However, they didn't succeed in it because Government had ordered to resume the Kythal. Three Phulikan chief tried to oppose British Government's decision by encouraging the rebellion secretly in Kythal against British. But British troops crush the rebellion with success.⁸⁴ By obtaining information from *Press List of Records* and from *Raj Khalsa* role of Jind along with other Phulkian states in helping the insurrection in Kythal can be traced same as Lepel Griffin depicts.⁸⁵

⁸⁰ Secretary of State to Government of Agra, Foreign Department, Political Consultation, no. 37-41. (N.A.I)

⁸¹ Lepel Henry Griffin, *The Rajas of Punjab*, p. 380.

⁸² Mai Shaib Kaur to Clerk, *Press List of Old Records In the Punjab Secretariat 1809-1840*, book no. 37, p. 592.

⁸³ Metcalf to Clerk, 8 March 1838, *Press List of Old Records In the Punjab Secretariat 1809-1840*, book no. 38, p. 602.

⁸⁴ Lepel Henry Griffin, *The Rajas of Punjab*, p. 383.

⁸⁵ Clerk to J.Thoamson, 17 April 1843, *Press List of Records of The N.W.F Agency*, 1840-1845, p. 377; See also, J.Thoamson to Clerk, 30 April 1843, p. 381. See also; Giani Gian Singh, *Raj Khalsa*, Vol.II, p. 118.

British Government on resuming the Kythal gave Mahala Gabda to Raja Sarup Singh in exchange of Sufidon. Mahala Gabda comprises 23 villages worth Rs. 30,042 and latter consist of 38 villages worth 33,380. The villages Sufidon was excluded from it because it was place where *Smadhan* of Raja Jind's ancestor were made.⁸⁶ *Punjab State of Gazetteer and Press List of Records* confirm the exchange of lands.⁸⁷

As noted in *The Rajas of Punjab* total area of Jind was 1236 miles with population of 3,50,000 and total revenue was approximately between six to seven lakhs.⁸⁸ According to *Memoranda of Information*, population of Jind was 3,11,000.⁸⁹

Kapurthala:

Lepel Griffin expatriates that Raja Nihal Singh died on 13 November 1852 A.D, fourth ruler of Kapurthala; before he breathed last he executed a *Wasseatnama* or a will which he sent to Board of Administration for approval. In which it was said:

1. After his death his eldest son, Kanwar Randhir Singh, the heir apparent should become the ruler of state and there brothers should live in peace and Harmony.
2. Kanwar Bikram Singh and Kanwar Suchet Singh should each be given an estate of net value of one lakh of rupees without paying any Government *nazrana* and three brothers should live in peace and Harmony.
3. Kavar Randhir Singh should be allowed to look after the state matters and criminal jurisdiction of all three shares, in case those two brothers are dissatisfied with the management of *Foujdari* affairs in their *jagirs* or shares, than their criminal jurisdiction might be taken over by the British Government

⁸⁶ Lepel Henry Griffin, *The Rajas of Punjab*, p. 384.

⁸⁷ Punjab State Gazetteers, *Phulkian States*, Vol. XVII, Punjab Government Press, Lahore 1904, p. 216. See also; A.F Richmond to R.N.M.C Hamilton, 1 August 1843, *Press List of Records of The N.W.F Agency*, 1840-1845, p.397.

⁸⁸ Lepel Henry Griffin, *The Rajas of Punjab*, p. 321.

⁸⁹ N.D, *Memoranda of Information Regarding Certain Native Chiefs*, N.D, p. 2.

4. He advised his sons that every one of them should serve the British Government to the utmost of his power and should consider it as a great honor and benefits for their continuance in the ruler depends upon the blessing of God and the protection of the British Government.

These four statements of Nihal Singh's will found similar in every source which Lepel Griffin has mentioned, for an example in official Government Records of Delhi Archive, Punjab History Conference Proceeding and in *Twareekh Raj Khalsa* III.⁹⁰

But some points which are only given in *The Rajas of Punjab* found objectionable. As compare to the second point of will here Lepel Griffin says that if Government wished to get *nazarana* from each of them than two brothers shall get a proportionate increase in their shares, more land equal to the amount of the Government *nazzarna* shall be added to share of each brother from estate of elder.⁹¹

According to *Tawareekh Raj Khalsa* and A. C Arora it may be observed that it was not a wise decision to made provision of separation of state and Nihal Singh had lack of political foresight for not keeping integrity of his state. Because sooner or later will was bound to the separation of state and *wasyiat* would encourage two younger brothers to adopt intransigent attitude towards their elder brother.⁹² As given in *Raj Khalsa* that even though in the will of Raja Nihal Singh, Raja Randhir was consider predecessor but this will favored his other two sons and it was not good for existence and integrity of Kapurthala state. Because total income amount of state was Rs. 5, 77, 763 out of which 2 lakh he had told to be given to his sons without paying any *nazarna* and remainder Rs. 3, 77,763 left for Randhir Singh. After calculating expenditure and by adding *nazarana* cost only Rs.20, 331 left for Randhir Singh for personal expenses.⁹³

⁹⁰ Will of Raja Nihal Singh of Kapurthala, Foreign Deptt., Political Consultation, No. 185-186.(N.A.I).See also; A.C Arora, John Lawrence and Kapurthala State, *Punjab History Conference Proceeding*, March 1970, Punjabi University, Patiala. p.150. Also; N.D, *Tawarikh Raj Khalsa*, Vol. III, S.G.P.C, Amirtsar, p. 352.Also see; Lepel Henry Griffin, *The Rajas of Punjab*, p. 554.

⁹¹ *Ibid.*, p. 554.

⁹² A.C Arora, Kapurthalla Will Case, *The Punjab Past and Present*, October 1971, p. 298.

⁹³ Giani Gian Singh, *Raj Khalsa*, Vol.II, p. 171.

But here point should be added that Raja Nihal Singh couldn't even write his will without British instigation. It can be traced in Lepel Griffin's *The Rajas of Punjab* that "Nihal Singh didn't like his eldest son and it was the only attitude of British Government which compelled him, much against his will to leave power and State to Randhir Singh (it is also mentioned in *Raj Khalsa*), who asserted that his brothers were illegitimate and their mother, was of lower caste."⁹⁴

Regarding fourth point it may be recapitulated that Nihal Singh had adopted hostile attitude towards the British during First Anglo –Sikh war and as a 'signal punishment' for that he had been deprived of his Cis- Sutlej possession. However, he had been left in the independent possession of his estate in the Jullandhar doab. During the second Anglo Sikh war, The Ahluwalia chief had remained loyal to British and express his readiness to support their army. By doing this he had succeeded in winning trust of British Government. So in 1849 A.D Governor General Lord Dalhousie paid visit to Kapurthala and awarded him the title of Raja. Thus he had learned his personal experience that disloyalty to the British Government would cost him reduction, perhaps extinction, from his state, so for him and for his state it would be better to serve the British Government.⁹⁵

According to Lepel Griffin, Agent of Randhir Singh addressed the Board of Administration on the death of Raja, that three brothers didn't approve of the will and had no desire to divide the estate. Similar words with bit change has been observed in *Raj Khalsa* and in *Punjab Past and Present* that Randhir Singh tactfully won on 17 September 1852 A.D, his younger brothers signed an covenant agreement in which they solemnly declared that they would accept any arrangement which their respected brother Raja Randhir Singh would make to administer the affairs of state. They also wrote a *Khureeta* to the Commissioner of Trans-Sutlej states to the effect that they desired to live together and would not agree to the division of the state as per given in will. This *Khureeta* was forwarded to the Board of Administration later for approval.⁹⁶

⁹⁴ Lepel Henry Griffin, *The Rajas of Punjab*, p. 556.

⁹⁵ A.C Arora, Kapurthalla Will Case, *The Punjab Past and Present*, October 1971, p. 300.

⁹⁶ *Khureeta* from Bikram Singh and Suchet Singh to the Commissioner, Trans-Sutlej States, 20 September 1852, Foreign Political Proceeding, p. 22. (N.A.I). See also; Giani Gian Singh, *Raj Khalsa*, Vol. II, p. 172. Also; A.C Arora, John Lawrence and Kapurthala State, *Punjab History Conference Proceeding*, March 1970, p. 150.

Lepel Griffin tells that Board members were in doubt that how to proceed with regard to Kapurthalla. John Lawrence, senior member of Board, proposed to resume land in lieu of the *nazarna* or to take the outlying lands such as Phagwara and also to resume political and criminal power exercised by the late Raja⁹⁷ but here Lepel Griffin didn't discuss the John Lawrence's purpose behind executing will, which is traceable in John Lawrence's Minutes and A.C Arora's papers that he didn't seems to have been happy with the reconciliation of the Kapurthala(he had acted as the Commissioner and the Superintendent of Trans-Sutlej states) he was in favor of disintegration of state, which he expressed in his three Minutes. He suggested that full and fair advantage should be taken from the death of Raja Nihal Singh and evils of old arrangement should be changed. (He pleaded that by new arrangement Government should take over Phagwara, Bhunga and other outlying lands and must assume the power of police). John Lawrence said that if these proposals should be accepted "They would lessen the evils inseparable to the existence of so large and independent jurisdiction in the heart of the Jalandhar Doab".⁹⁸ It may be noted that, these suggestions are not much different from the main provision of will. Therefore, one is inclined to suspect it, that Nihal Singh had drafted his will due to the convenience of John Lawrence. The suspicion derives further strength from John Lawrence's testimony, in which he had discussed the question of will in which he supported the partition of state among the brothers whenever he found a favorable chance to do so. Nevertheless, John Lawrence was a staunch advocate of reducing the state as well as reducing the powers of Raja and he strongly held that this occasion should not be missed.⁹⁹

This is to be noted that *Raj Khalsa* and official document gives the reason quite different that late Raja was under influence of her second Rani Heera, with whom he had married by his own desire. So, he deliberately wrote will by which Rani Heera's son Suchet Singh and Bikram Singh could get plentiful benefits.¹⁰⁰

⁹⁷ Lepel Henry Griffin, *The Rajas of Punjab*, pp. 556-557. Giani Gian Singh, *Raj Khalsa*, Vol. II, p. 172.

⁹⁸ Minutes of John Lawrence, 11 October 1852, 1 December 1852, Foreign Deptt., Political Proceeding, pp-25-27, 29-30. (N.A.I).

⁹⁹ A.C Arora, John Lawrence and Kapurthala State, *Punjab History Conference Proceeding*, March 1970, p. 152. See also; A.C Arora, Kapurthalla Will Case, *The Punjab Past and Present*, October 1971, p. 302.

¹⁰⁰ Giani Gian Singh, *Raj Khalsa*, Vol. II, p. 352. See Also; Foreign Department Political Consultation, 8 October 1852, no. 185-186.

But other two members opposed the entire proposal on the ground of policy of good faith. The Governor-General in council after examining decided that the Kapurthala state should remain undivided for the present, but if discord would arise than the will of late Raja should have effect given to it. In that case share would become ordinary *Jagirs* into which our administration would enter. Regarding to view of John Lawrence council replied, Raja might be persuaded but not compelled to give lands in lieu of *nazarna*. This ruling was given before the mutiny and also before the policy Government of India in its dealing with the Native States had become as clear and as consistent as it was at present.¹⁰¹ Thus no changes were made. Followings words found same in Lepel Griffin's book even in *Raj khalsa*.¹⁰²

Lepel Griffin tells that only after few months of peace, younger brother Suchet Singh started a quarrel with his brothers. He began to desire for division of his share. Raja Randhir Singh didn't want the division of state; he only wished to allow Suchet Singh 25,000 a year, similar amount he was giving to Bikram Singh. So, Suchet Singh suggested that he would accept the outlying lands of state as his share. Government of India agreed for this proposal .On the contrary, Raja Randhir Singh was against his brother, he petitioned against Suchet Singh and Government of India. But without consent of Raja, Tans Sutlej Commissioner himself divided off the two Taluqas of Wayan and Bunga and made them to Suchet Singh in April 1854.¹⁰³

But in the views of other documents reason behind quarrel was different. First is that Bikram Singh was not only supporting Raja from behind but also he wrote that Suchet Singh was inexperienced and was under the influence of a wretch (Sewa Ram), who was taking him away from the right path.¹⁰⁴ Raja also put forth two arguments for setting aside will of his late father- first, the two younger brothers were illegitimate and second, it was not the custom to divide lands of a Chief ship.¹⁰⁵ On the contrary, as could be expected, John Lawrence rejected these proposals and willingly sanctioned the division of Suchet Singh's share. In regard to fiscal prospects of the state John Lawrence remarked that Raja must reduce his expenditure and if he did not prove

¹⁰¹ C.L Tupper, *Indian Political Practise*, Vol. II, Longmans, Green and Co., London, 1893, p. 49.

¹⁰² Lepel Henry Griffin, *The Rajas of Punjab*, pp. 557-558. See Also; Giani Gian Singh, *Raj Khalsa*, Vol. II, p. 172.

¹⁰³ Lepel Henry Griffin, *The Rajas of Punjab*, p. 560.

¹⁰⁴ From Bikram Singh to Commissioner Trans-Sutlej states, 27 July 1853, Foreign Department, Political Proceedings. (N.A.I).

¹⁰⁵ Giani Gian Singh, *Raj Khalsa*, Vol. II, p. 356.

economical, he must suffer like other improvident persons. John Lawrence seemed to be having this earnest wish, and quarrel provided him the opportunity for ordering the partition of estate not only in accordance with the will of their late father but also due to his own wish.¹⁰⁶ John Lawrence recommended to his Excellency in Council that their previous decision allowing the provision of will to be carried out if the brothers so desired it, should be upheld. Accepting the recommendation of John Lawrence the council gave order for the execution of will. Lepel Griffin again does not share these crucial judgments.¹⁰⁷

But soon Suchet Singh reconciled with his brothers and he presented the Commissioner an agreement by which he consented to accept the small jagir with judicial powers. Lepel Griffin gives Justification about the particular reasons, which compelled Suchet Singh to seek compromise; He did not want to reside at Bunga. Lepel clarify that there were only three large towns, Sultanpur, Phagwara and Kapurthala where Raja himself live. Phagwara was reserved for Bikram Singh, in future if he might demand his share. Sultanpur was favorite shooting palace of Raja, who would rather have given up Kapurthala. Only Wyan and Bunga were suitable for Suchet Singh.

While according to Giani Gian Singh when government sanctioned the share to Suchet Singh they immediately took over the charge of Judiciary of Bhunga and Wyan into their own hands without permission of Suchet Singh. He was completely shocked by government's action, confirming it a blow to his pride, he decided to cancel his decision. British government was playing "Monkey's role in Cats fight"(a famous story Monkey and two cats).¹⁰⁸ Thus in *Punjab Past and Present*, A.C Arora tells that separation procedure were unjust. Accordingly, Wyan and Bunga were marked for the Suchet Singh. At first Phagwara was considered for Suchet Singh in place of Bhunga but then the idea was dropped. Phagwara was being made reserved for third brother by saying that in future he might demand for partition. It appeared inappropriate to transfer it to third brother because he hadn't demanded any share and was living peacefully. As stated earlier, that as member of the Board of Administration John Lawrence had suggested to serving away of Bhunga and Phagwara from

¹⁰⁶ A.C Arora, John Lawrence and Kapurthala State, *Punjab History Conference Proceeding*, March, 1970, p. 153.

See also; A.C Arora, Kapurthalla Will Case, *The Punjab Past and Present*, October 1971, p. 303.

¹⁰⁷ From Government of India to Chief Commissioner Punjab, 9 September 1853, Foreign Political Proceeding. (N.A.I).

¹⁰⁸ Giani Gian Singh, *Raj Khalsa*, Vol. II, p. 355.

Kapurthala state in lieu of *nazarana*. When provision of will could not be enforced due to the reconciliation among brothers, now when he had got the opportunity to execute his plan, for which he had long desired and he was up as it in the capacity of Chief Commissioner. More significant still Bikram Singh at this time did not desire partition of the state but despite that a more important place, Phagwara was being reserved for him so cunningly.¹⁰⁹

When Wyan and Bunga were made over to Suchet Singh, within month he requested to Chief Commissioner to withdraw his application for partition. So Commissioner, Mr. Edgeworth forwards a letter with his remarks that both brothers agreed for accord. Suchet Singh would accept Rs.50,000 instead of Rs.10,0000 and without any powers. Thus will would remain unbroken, and it should be considered that if two shares of brothers would be deducted, the Raja would have barely sufficient to carry on the administration and *nazzarna* might fall into arrears.¹¹⁰

Correspondingly, the commissioner recommended that Suchet Singh's request should be favorably consider an agreement between the two brothers confirmed, also pointed out for the consideration of the Chief Commissioner that if lands worth two lakhs of rupee be deducted from the whole state, the reminder would be barely sufficient for the necessary expenses of administration of the state, and in all probability, the Raja would be drawn into debt as a consequence of which the British Government might to take land in lieu of cash, thereby in favor of ruining the state John Lawrence rejected these recommendation.¹¹¹

It is to be noted that Lepel Griffin gives justification about Government's action that Government was not anxious like late Raja Nihal that state should remain intact. It was necessary to take these bold steps or otherwise new problems would arise again in future.¹¹²

A.c Arora further tells that John Lawrence gives statement about rejection that two brother had given ample time to settle their affairs, but Suchet Singh had demanded for separation of his share and the proceeding had gone far too advance to be revoked and

¹⁰⁹ A.C Arora, Kapurthalla Will Case, *The Punjab Past and Present*, October 1971, p. 304.

¹¹⁰ Lepel Henry Griffin, *The Rajas of Punjab*, p. 562.

¹¹¹ Giani Gian Singh, *Raj Khalsa*, Vol. II, p. 355

¹¹² Lepel Henry Griffin, *The Rajas of Punjab*, p. 563.

impossible to transfer the action. As given earlier John Lawrence was in favor of separation and rejected the proposal.¹¹³ Then Raja Randhir Singh requested to Chief Commissioner to stop partition, the Commissioner replied that “your dispute in case had continued for two year, therefore I cannot interfere in your matters anymore.” So the matter was set at rest.¹¹⁴

Faridkot:

Lepel Griffin shares that after 1800 A.D Sardar Charat Singh succeeded his father Hamir Singh by attacking him. He had also repulsed the attack of Diwan Nanu Mal, minister of Patiala during the minority of Raja of Patiala. After all these he was not much fortunate to rule because his disinherited uncle, Dal Singh, who was waiting for his turn. He gained this opportunity in 1804 A.D and attacked Faridkot at night. Charat Singh got killed in this surprised attack. His wife and his three children Gulab Singh, Pahar Singh and Sahib Singh however managed to escape.¹¹⁵ As per *City of Faridkot* after securing the Faridkot from Patiala his reputation got increased as warrior so he started feeling that there was no danger left and situation were completely under his control so he cut down his arm forces and Dal Singh took benefit of this opportunity.¹¹⁶

Dal Singh couldn't enjoy his success for long. Fojju Singh, Sardar of Sher Singhwalia, brother-in-law of Late Charat Singh assassinated him. Gulab Singh was made chief and Fojju became his Diwan or minister.¹¹⁷ Same information is given in *City of Faridkot*.¹¹⁸

On 5th November 1826 A.D someone assassinated Raja. Lepel Griffin tells that Sahib Singh, younger brother of Raja was prime suspect for assassination but due to lack of evidences,

¹¹³ A.C Arora, Kapurthalla Will Case, *The Punjab Past and Present*, October, 1971, p. 305.

¹¹⁴ A.C Arora, John Lawrence and Kapurthala State, *Punjab History Conference Proceeding*, March 1970, p. 155.

¹¹⁵ Lepel Henry Griffin, *The Rajas of Punjab*, p. 609.

¹¹⁶ Fauja Singh and R.C Rabra, *City of Faridkot Past and Present*, Punjabi University, Patiala, 1997, p. 20.

¹¹⁷ Lepel Henry Griffin, *The Rajas of Punjab*, p. 609.

¹¹⁸ Fauja Singh and R.C Rabra, *City of Faridkot Past and Present*, p. 21.

Captain Murray had to set him free from murder charge.¹¹⁹ Similar statement can be seen in source *A City of Faridkot* and *Press of Old Records*.¹²⁰

Lepel Griffin further writes that new Raja Attar Singh (son of Gulab Singh) also died in very next year. So Pahar Singh got throne after death of his nephew.¹²¹ Information of death can be seen in *Press List of Old Records*.¹²²

Dispute Matters:

Patiala :

Village Bugar was became another matter of interference of British Government between Patiala and Nabha. But later British authority said that this would be a breach of agreement of protection. So village was made over to Nabha.¹²³ According to S.N Banerjee at first Commissioner of Ciz-Sutlej claimed that this village belonged to British Government but later British Government changed their decision and gave village to Nabha.¹²⁴

Matter of Khumanun village also came under the consideration along with the Chaharumi village. According to Lepel Griffin, Khumanun village consists of 58 villages and situated near Sirhind. He tells that after British Protection number of small village had started claiming virtual independence from chiefs so to lighten the labor British Government transfer their matter to Phulkian Chiefs. But in 1846 A.D Colonel Mackeson suggested that Khumanun village should be taken under British possession but Government didn't approved suggestion.¹²⁵ While S.N Banerjee shares that Khumanun village comprises 97 villages and as far as concern of jurisdiction of village the British Government's policy got changed in forties to fifty.

¹¹⁹ Lepel Henry Griffin, *The Rajas of Punjab*, p. 615.

¹²⁰ Fauja Singh and R.C Rabra, *City of Faridkot Past and Present*, p. 23. See also; Metcalf to Murray, 22 November 1826, *Press List of Old Records In the Punjab Secretariat 1809-1840*, Punjab Government, Lahore, 1911.

¹²¹ Lepel Henry Griffin, *The Rajas of Punjab*, p. 616. Fauja Singh and R.C Rabra, *City of Faridkot Past and Present*, p. 23.

¹²² Colbrooke to Murray, 6 September 1827, *Press List of Old Records In the Punjab Secretariat 1809-1840*, p.233.

¹²³ Lepel Henry Griffin, *The Rajas of Punjab*, p. 227-228.

¹²⁴ S.N Banerjee, *History of Patiala*, Vol. II, N.D, p. 120.

¹²⁵ Lepel Henry Griffin, *The Rajas of Punjab*, pp. 228-229.

Government attempted to reverse its previous policy in order to bring more and more territories under their rule. By baseless argumentation the agents of British Government tried to wriggle out the previous commitments. In some cases they succeeded in their motives and in some cases compromise was reached. Same policy was adopted in matter of Khumanun village.¹²⁶

According to the *The Rajas of Punjab* case got reopen in 1855 A.D. While administration was given to Patiala but Government kept to themselves as a mark of suzerainty of military service. The latter was commuted into an arrival value of Rs.4128. The claim of escheat was allowed to drift till year 1855 A.D. The British Government wanted to know the cases of lapse and their value. It was laid upon Patiala to furnish a complete value. In 1857 A.D British was being informed about the value of Rs.1650. But authority considered it very small as compared to the total share of 225. However in 1860 A.D Government transfer the village to Patiala.¹²⁷ As per *Punjab State Gazetteers* Khumanun village was transferred in 1860.¹²⁸ However, as per S.N Banerjee village was transferred to Patiala in return of *nazrana* of Rs. 1,76,360 . This amount was deducted from the debt which British Government owned to Patiala. But Lepel Griffin didn't mention about it.¹²⁹

Nabha.

Disputes among the Chiefs were in common so during the minority of Raja Bharpur Singh a new case got registered as given in *The Rajas of Punjab*. This time matter of dispute was related to a village named Bhai Rupa. The village was built by Bhai Dhanna Singh than he named it after the name of Bhai Rupa Chand.¹³⁰ Aside from it, Balwant Singh tells that village was built by Bhai Rupa himself.¹³¹ On the contrary Lepel Griffin says that he dies before carrying out his project.¹³² The village was held in shares by chiefs of Nabha, Patiala, Malod, Bahdour and Jind. The village was managed by Bhaikian and Kangar. Share of Bhakian was

¹²⁶ S.N Banerjee, *Histrory of Patiala*, Vol.II, N.D, p. 121.

¹²⁷ Lepel Henry Griffin, *The Rajas of Punjab*, pp. 230-231.

¹²⁸ Punjab State Gazetteers, *Phulkian States*, Vol. XVII, Punjab Government Press, Lahore 1904, p. 49.

¹²⁹ S.N Banerjee, *History of Patiala*, Vol. II, N.D, p. 123.

¹³⁰ Lepel Henry Griffin, *The Rajas of Punjab*, p. 463.

¹³¹ Balwant Singh Historian, *Sidhu Brara Da Ithihaas*, New Lal Bhag, Patiala, 1986, p. 129.

¹³² Lepel Henry Griffin, *The Rajas of Punjab*, p. 463.

given to them by Phul chiefs and share of Kangra was under the Rai Bhaktyar. After the death of Rai Bhaktyar, Raja Nabha took possession of the village. The rights of the village belonged to several chiefs which was the main cause of dispute. However the matter was fixed in 1851 A.D.¹³³

Lepel Griffin discuss some other disputes between Nabha and Patiala one of them was matter of Phulsaheri and Kowlsheri, Kowlsheri belonged to Patiala whereas Phulsaheri was under Nabha. In 1820 A.D Raja Jaswant Singh Nabha complained about the encroachment of Phulsheri by Kowlsheri landlords. After the investigation decision was given in Nabha's favor but Patiala chief sent his troops in Kowlsheri by stating that inhabitants of his village must be protected from hostile villages. Lepel Griffin says that this unnecessary action led to a contention and bloodshed.¹³⁴ From S.N Banerjee and Suraj Narain's work above dispute matter can be trace in same manner as given in *The Rajas of Punjab*.¹³⁵

Second subject of dispute was the boundary between the village of Bahdour and Kangar. The former belonged to Dip Singh and Bir Singh who had some relations with Patiala chief and latter belonged to Nabha, and dispute referred to the British authorities who considered claims of Raja of Nabha to be legitimate. Consequently, decision was given in the favor of Nabha.¹³⁶

Lepel Griffin furnishes the detail of important case of Sunti and Sikh of Lidhran vs Nabha. The Sikhs of Lidhran and Sunti were members of the Nishanwalia confederacy they came under the possession of Sardar Sangat Singh, Jai Singh, Dassunda Singh, Mohar Singh

¹³³ Lepel Henry Griffin, *The Rajas of Punjab*, p. 464. See also; Balwant Singh Historian, *Sidhu Brara Da Ithihaas*, New Lal Bhag, Patiala, 1986, p. 129. See also: C.V.Aitchison, *A Collection of Treaties Engagements and Sanadas*, Vol. VIII, Central Archeological Library, New Delhi, 1960, p. 290

¹³⁴ Lepel Henry Griffin, *The Rajas of Punjab*, pp. 426-427.

¹³⁵ S.N Banerjee, *A History of Patiala*, Vol. II, N.D, p. 24. See also; Suraj Narain Rao, *Ciz-Sutlej States*, Unpublished thesis, Punjab University, Chandigarh, 1964, p. 187.

¹³⁶ Lepel Henry Griffin, *The Rajas of Punjab*, p. 427. See also; Captain G Birch, *Selection From A Note Book Kept by Captain G. Birch*, Punjab Government Printing, Lahore, 1921, p. 92. See also; S.N Banerjee, *A History of Patiala*, Vol. II, N.D, p. 24.

after the battle of the Sirhind in 1763 A.D. The history of Sunti and Lidhar Sikh can be verified from *Tawarikh Khalsa* as same.¹³⁷

In 1827 A.D Sunti and Sardar of Lidhran forwarded a complaint about the tyranny of Raja of Nabha to the agent of the Governor General. Their objections were that the Nabha treated them as his vassals and had demanded fifty horses from Lidhran and seventy horses from Sunti but Raja had no right to make demand as they were not his vassals. Political Agent gave verdict in Nabha's favor as the matter was of serious concern thus he referred it to Agent of Ambala. So, Ambala Agent gave judgment that Government could not interfere in this matter therefore supremacy of Nabha got approval.¹³⁸

Lepel Griffin further describes that chiefs keep on denying any kind of right of Nabha chief over them and which documents Nabha chiefs showed to British of his supremacy over them the minor chiefs of Sunti and Lidhran declared the documents to be forged. So in 1836 A.D case went to Sir George Clerk and he investigated it carefully and he opinioned that Raja Nabha was only a head of family and later became a feudal lord. Afterwards, in Sunti case Nabha successfully asserted his supremacy when co-parcenary rights of the Sikhs were not clearly understood. George Clerk's decision was based on these assumptions that undoubtedly, under the Sikhism no such thing as feudal supremacy or vassalage had ever existed. But as the more important chiefship gradually increased in power, their smaller neighbors were compelled either for protection against other or to avoid absorption altogether to place them under the protection of strong chief who could able to defend them and in return they were supposed to give service in filed. Same happened in Sunti and Lidhran case.¹³⁹ George Clerk's opinion about Sikh rule found same in his letters but he gave another statement about Sunti Sikhs which is missing in *The Rajas of Punjab* where he said that he agreed that Sunti Sikh and Lidhran were independent members of Niahsanwala confederacy therefore Nabha owing no supremacy over them but it did

¹³⁷ Lepel Henry Griffin, *The Rajas of Punjab*, p. 431. See also; Giani Gyan Singh, *Tawarikh Raj Khalsa*, Vol. III, S.G.P.C, Amritsar, p. 650.

¹³⁸ Lepel Henry Griffin, *The Rajas of Punjab*, p. 431. See also; Colebrook, The Resident to The Murray, 25 September 1827, cited in N.D, *An Historical Interpretation of The Correspondence of Sir George Russell Clerk*. (N.A.I).

¹³⁹ Lepel Henry Griffin, *The Rajas of Punjab*, p. 432.

not mean that they could have never been conquered by a neighboring chief between the time period of fifty years.¹⁴⁰

Lepel Griffin tells about the past that Lidhran Sikh made alliance with the Raja Nabha by marrying the daughter of Jai Singh with Raja Jaswant Singh Nabha thus cemented their relations. As regard the Sunti Sikh on the several occasion fought against Nabha. Thus the relations between Nabha and Sunti Sikh were different from those of Nabha and Lidhran Sikhs. Once Sunti Sikh seized a village named Almoh along with thirty six adjacent villages but on the approach of Ahmed Shah Duraani they together with Manja Sikh crossed the Sutlej to stop him. In their absence Nabha took possession of Almoh and half of its attached villages. Than Sardar Jassa Singh Ahluwalia and Sirdar Himmat Singh acted as arbitrators between Nabha and Sunti as a result they assigned Almoh to Nabha and thirty five villages to be held in co-parcenary tenure between them. Therefore, Sunti Sikhs were compelled to accept the decision but they remained on very bad terms with Nabha also systematically opposed the state in every possible way.¹⁴¹ The above extracted paragraph can be tracked down identically from *Raj Khalsa*.¹⁴²

Lepel Griffin briefs that in 1834A.D George Clerk reversed the decision of Raja Nabha in disputed inheritance in Lidhran.¹⁴³ Actually, George Clerk was at first in favor of Raja but he found out that Raja wanted to win over the Sunti and Lidhran Sikhs, than he alerted his decision and rejected the claim of Nabha's supremacy.¹⁴⁴

Government of Indian didn't consider it convenient to declare the Sikhs of Sunti and Lidhran independent of Nabha. Raja of Nabha directed to dispense their service altogether except on the occasion of birth of a son , the marriage of one of his daughter , the death of reigning prince or at time of actual war . Thus dignity of Nabha was duly considered therefore Sunti and Lidhran relived from the tyranny of which they had bitterly complained.¹⁴⁵ However in the letters from Metcalf to Clerk given in *An Historical interpretation of Correspondences of Sir*

¹⁴⁰ N.D, *An Historical Interpretation of George Rusell Clerk*, p. 259.

¹⁴¹ Lepel Henry Griffin, *The Rajas of Punjab*, p. 433.

¹⁴² Giani Gian Singh, *Raj Khalsa*, Vol. II, p. 84.

¹⁴³ Lepel Henry Griffin, *The Rajas of Punjab*, p. 434.

¹⁴⁴ N.D, *An Historical Interpretation of George Rusell Clerk*, p. 260.

¹⁴⁵ Lepel Henry Griffin, *The Rajas of Punjab*, pp. 434-435.

George Rusell Clerk, British Government or Metcalf ordered in his first letter that agreement entered in both parties must be maintained in both sides and in second letter he quoted that Sunti and Lidhran Sikhs appeared to ready to consent to the occasional services.¹⁴⁶ It may be noted that British Government in 1827 A.D gave themselves approval to Nabha over the Sunti Sikhs and Lidhran Sikhs and even said that British Government would not interfere in this matter. Nonetheless, Government interfered in dispute in the following year. When in 1833 A.D Sunti Sikh head Sudh Singh was charged for creating disorder and fined as well as imprisoned by Nabha than George Clerk persuaded the Raja of Nabha to release him. Even once Murray had put forth a plan to bring the Sunti and Lidhran under British jurisdiction.¹⁴⁷

As per given in *The Rajas of Punjab* Sunti Sikhs vs. Nabha case arose again in 1864. Dispute was for the division of the village share between them and the Nabha state. A long discussion had been started with regard to this point. Thus every British officer in Cis-States had tried to settle the dispute by compromise. Lord Canning, Viceroy and Governor General directed that an authoritative settlement should be made, if could possible.¹⁴⁸

Lepel Griffin describes that an arrangement was made by Commissioner of the Cis-Satluj states, he collected the fact and in the co-operation of the Maharaja of Patiala and the Raja of Jind, he allowed 5000 per year to Sunti Sikh from the Nabha treasury and freed them from all deduction.¹⁴⁹

Lepel Griffin notifies that Sunti Sikhs refused to accept this proposal and appealed to Secretary of the State, who accepted the request and pointed out that arrangements was not adequate and he entitled 10,641 rupees after assessment. Than after long investigation which extended over some year, concluded final report which was got approved by Government of India. Here a point should be noted that Lepel Griffin didn't explained the matter in detail and skip it by saying that this matter was voluminous and there was no need to check the details.

¹⁴⁶ N.D, *An Historical Interpretation of George Rusell Clerk*, p. 261.

¹⁴⁷ For detail see: N.D, *An Historical Interpretation of George Rusell Clerk*, pp, 25-257.

¹⁴⁸ Lepel Henry Griffin, *The Rajas of Punjab*, Low Price Publication, Delhi, Reprint 2014, p. 489. See also; Giani Gian Singh, *Raj Khalsa*, Vol. II, p. 97.

¹⁴⁹ Lepel Henry Griffin, *The Rajas of Punjab*, p. 490. See also; Agent to Lt. Governor Cis-Sutlej Sates to Punjab Gov. 13 March 1861, Foreign Department, Part A, April 1861, No. 51, para 5. (N.A.I).

Whereas, the case no doubt, presents a typical example of the policy of the British Government. It was a clear demonstration of the fact that British authorities considered it their ultimate right as Paramount power to interfere as a supreme authority on the behalf of the feudatories of a state even in the violation of the existing engagements with that particular state, and impose their decision upon a chief much against his wish. For example: In June 1861A.D Raja represented to Governor General that the complaints of the Sunti Sikhs could not be listened. He significantly referred to Article 7 of the *Sanad* of 5 May 1860 in which it was given that British Government would not interfere or hear the complaints from the relatives, *Jagirdars*, dependants and servants of the states.¹⁵⁰

The Governor General in reply to Raja said that Sunti Sardars had been given six months¹⁵¹ to accept the decision and informed that in the case of the refusal Government would not interfere on their behalf in the future.¹⁵²

According to *The Rajas of Punjab*, Commissioner in his final report entitled Sunti Sikhs to attain their shares from total 50 villages including 14 new villages as well as from old 36 villages. The share of the Sunti Sikh was being admitted 7/16 and share of Nabha was considered 9/16 and amount due was Rs. 24,500 towards Sunti Sikhs. Out of this legitimate deduction the value of Rs. 11,502-11-0 was being allowed, giving balance of Rs 12,997-5-0. Discussed value of Sunti Sikhs found similar in official records.¹⁵³

¹⁵⁰ Punjab Government to Government of India, 25 June 1861, Foreign Department, Part A, July 1861, No.408; *Kharita from Raja of Nabha* to Governor General in the same proceeding.(N.A.I)

¹⁵¹ Sunti Sikhs were allowed 5000 from Nabha treasury but they rejected proposal and appealed against it. The Governor General approved the arrangement considering it to be fair for the both parties and he ordered that six months to be given to the Sunti Sikhs to think over matter and in the case of their refusal the offer would be withdrawn at the end of the term Government would be not Interfere on their behalf again. At a Same time he Lieutenant Governor warned raja to treat Sunti Sardar fairly. For detail see; Punjab Gov. to Gov. of India 26 March 1861, Foreign Deptt., Part A, April 1861, no. 50. See also: Govt. of India to Pub. Gov., 8 April 1861, Foreign Deptt., Part A, April,1861, No. 42. (N.A.I).

¹⁵² Governor General to Raja of Nabha, 26 July 1861, Foreign Department, Part A, July 1861, Nos. 409 and 410. (N.A.I)

¹⁵³ Lepel Henry Griffin, *The Rajas of Punjab*, pp. 491-492. See also; Agent to Lt. Governor Cis-Sutlej States to Punjab Government, 11 December 1868, Foreign Department, Pol. A, March 1869, No.82, Para 103-104.(N.A.I)

Lepel Griffin apprise the services of Jaswant Singh to the British Government during Gurkha campaign of 1810 A.D and in that of Bikaner in 1818 A.D and in the beginning of the Kabul campaign in 1838 A.D although offer was not necessary and British Government declined it but Government thanked him for his friendly spirit. He also gave a loan of six lakhs rupees to Government. On 22 May 1840 A.D Raja Jaswant Singh died at the age of 66 years.¹⁵⁴ Above information provided by Lepel Griffin find equivalent in *District and State Gazetteers of Undivided Punjab* and *Patiala State and East Punjab States Unions*.¹⁵⁵ However, according to Harbans Singh date of Gurkha campaign in which Jaswant Singh helped the British Government was 1814 A.D instead of 1810 A.D.¹⁵⁶

Jind:

Lepel Griffin share that Raja of Jind was willing to get two villages Badrukhan and Bumahanawali which were part of Thanesar district. *Jagirdar* were also willing to come under the jurisdiction of Raja Jind. At first British denied giving it but later on Raja proposed to purchase the interest of British government in these villages. The transfer of villages was allowed on the payment of twenty years purchase which was Rs. 12,870.¹⁵⁷ According to A.C Arora, Badrukhan chief Diwan Singh had complained later that transfer of Badrukhan was made without their consent and at that time they were minor.¹⁵⁸

Lepel Griffin describes next about the Sujuarah village's revolt in his work. Sujuarah village was situated on the boundary of Rohtak which rose in revolt when a *Telishdar*, who had been sent by Jind to measure the cultivated area for settlement. This settlement model was adopted from English system of revenue. Villagers killed the *Tesildar* in contradiction. On hearing this Raja marched against insurgents with his forces but on the advice of Government he issued an order to grant free pardon to all of them except leaders if they would go back to home

¹⁵⁴ Lepel Henry Griffin, *The Rajas of Punjab*, p. 435.

¹⁵⁵ *District and States Gazetteers of Undivided Punjab*, Vol. IV, B.R Publishing Corporation, Delhi 1895, p. 299. See also; Ganda Singh, *The Patiala and East State Punjab Union*, Patiala, 1951, p. 60.

¹⁵⁶ Harbans Singh, *Encyclopedia of Sikhism*, Vol. II, Punjabi University, Patiala, 2011, p. 360.

¹⁵⁷ Lepel Henry Griffin, *The Rajas of Punjab*, pp. 394-395. See also; Krishan Betab, *Ithihaas Riyast Jeend*, Sunami Gate, Sangrur, 2007, p. 76.

¹⁵⁸ A.C Arora, *British Policy towards Punjab States*, Export India Publication, Jalandhar, 1982, p. 158.

quietly. Idea to issue Proclamation worked effectively thus majority of insurgents went back and revolt got normalized without any loss of single life.¹⁵⁹ Whereas *Giani Gian Singh* says that for more than 5 months people of village Lajuana not Suujarah keep on fighting with Sarup Singh's force. Both parties had to suffer a lot of damage. Than Patiala force came to help Raja and after a gruesome fight leader of insurgents and 17 other got injured.¹⁶⁰ As per Rai Kali, numbers of people were killed in both sides as a result Raja of Jind destroyed whole village in anger.¹⁶¹ According to Krishan Betab people of Lajuana not Suujarah were against the revenue policy of Raja which was based on British Government's settlement. Under their leader Bhoora Singh they were ready to fight with combine forces of Patiala and Jind. Simultaneously, British Government ordered Raja Jind that minimum loss of life and goods must be occurred also suggested to flee insurgents by scaring them with the gun fires. But this trick didn't work so at last British Government said that issue a proclamation to insurgents that if they will not help them to capture Bhoora Singh than they should keep it in their mind that they will have to face the canons of Government. Later they were attacked with canons. Thus forces captured the insurgents.¹⁶² It should be noted that Lepel Griffin here trying to hide the actual fact probably he is trying to prove that British Government was most successful of all other ruler because British Government do justice with everyone and even its policy of revenue were also generous as he do at number of point in *The Rajas of Punjab*. Therefore, in his attempt of glorification of British Lepel Griffin conceal the facts by stating the proclamation suggestion of British Government to Raja of Jind. By which no causality occurred. However, this wasn't happened first time when people got annoyed by unjust policy of British Government for an example rebellion of Balawali was also a result of faulty revenue policy of British Government.

Raja of Jind jointly sent a paper of request with Phulkian chiefs which have been discussed separately.¹⁶³ He got a sanad from British Government in which he got full sovereignty over his new acquired possession.¹⁶⁴

¹⁵⁹ Lepel Henry Griffin, *The Rajas of Punjab*, p. 390.

¹⁶⁰ Giani Gian Singh, *Raj Khalsa*, Vol.II, p. 120.

¹⁶¹ Giani Lal Singh (trans.), Rai Kali and Tulsi Ram, *Punjab Di Sair*, Punjabi University, Patiala, 1971, p. 285.

¹⁶² Krishan Betab, *Ithihaas Riyast Jeend*, Sunami Gate, Sangrur, 2007, p. 72.

¹⁶³ *Infra*, pp. 176-182.

Nineteen villages, adjoining his new state of Dadri were given to him on the payment of *Nazrana* of Rs. 4, 20,000. But a new question rose regarding the new territory made over to Cis-Sutlej chiefs had reference to their right to resume rent free grants at their pleasure. According to rule all rent free tenure were exempted from the control of the chief. But confusion rise when no regulation had issued about rent free grants which exist before the transfer of territories to chiefs. Government's said that full powers must be allowed to chiefs in their newly gained lands and directed its official not to interfere in the matter. However, Home Government's views were different, that new owners of the granted territory could not encroach upon the right of *Jagirdars* which had been recognized by British Government at the time when area had been bestowed upon *nawab* of Jhajjar. Phulikan chiefs were not happy with this decision so they protested against this decision. But according to *Sanad* of 1860 they had got full right over their possession and British Government could not listen to the appeal of *Jagirdar* or relatives as per the clauses of *sanad*. So, therefore Government reversed its order of 1861 A.D and gave the full authority to Phulkian chiefs over their new possession.¹⁶⁵ From official dispatch clash of the decision among British statesmen can be seen over the right of chiefs in newly acquired territories.¹⁶⁶

When in 1860 A.D Darbar was held Nabha got dissatisfied by the precedence of Jind over Nabha because Nabha always consider itself the representative of Phulkian family because of *chaudriat* had been hereditary in his family. But British Government gave precedence Jind over Nabha by saying that Jind had served them well during wars and mutiny.¹⁶⁷

¹⁶⁴ Lepel Henry Griffin, *The Rajas of Punjab*, pp. 397-398. See also; C.V. Aitchison, *A Collection of Treaties Engagements and Sanadas*, p. 267. See also; Somerset Playne, *Indian State; A Biographical, Historical and Administrative Survey*, London, 1921, p. 412.

¹⁶⁵ Lepel Henry Griffin, *The Rajas of Punjab*, pp.401-406.

¹⁶⁶ Dispatch of Secretary of State to India, 15 November 1861. no. 28.(N.A.I)

¹⁶⁷ Lepel Henry Griffin, *The Rajas of Punjab*, pp. 407-408. See also; N. D, *Memoranda of Information Regarding Certain Native Chiefs*, N.D, p. 3. See also; Krishan Betab, *Ithihaas Riyast Jeend*, p. 76.

Chapter – 6

CIS-SUTLEJ STATES SERVICES IN ANGLO-SIKH WARS AND IN REVOLT OF 1857 A.D

It is a universal truth that every kingdom and empire has to experience external or internal wars and revolts, which could literally overturn the plank. Even British Empire could not remain untouched. It had to face several wars and battles though it had successfully wiped out its strongest opponents. Anglo-Sikh wars and revolt of 1857 A.D were the disturbances which shook the roots of British Empire for some time. British had to put a lot of energy and wealth to hold on. In this exhausting struggles British had got assistance from his ally; chiefs of Cis-Sutlej. In this chapter, services of Cis-Sutlej states in Anglo Sikhs wars and in revolt of 1857 has been analyzed as given by Lepel Griffin in his work *The Rajas of Punjab*.

Patiala:

Lepel Griffin in his work focuses more on the reasons of failure of Cis Sutlej chiefs in providing the services towards British in the war of 1845 A.D rather to focus on the war. He blames the chiefs for their ungratefulness. He explains that British had saved them from the wrath of Maharaja Ranjit Singh and when fear of Lahore chief faded away than British protection became for them as a restraint.¹ *Punjab State Gazetteers* depicts the same story.²

As the war approaches Raja Karam Singh wanted to help British with uttermost devotion but unfortunately he fell seriously ill and died on 23rd December, a day after the battle of Firozshahr. So, he was succeeded by his son Narinder Singh.³ Abul Majib confirms death date to be same.⁴ According to S.N Banerjee, he died two days after the battle started.⁵ However, Henry

¹ Lepel Henry Griffin, *The Rajas of Punjab*, Low Price Publication, Delhi, Reprint 2014, p. 201.

² Punjab State Gazetteers, *Phulkian States*, Vol. XVII, Punjab Government Press, Lahore 1904, p. 49.

³ Lepel Henry Griffin, *The Rajas of Punjab*, pp. 201-202.

⁴ Colonel Mohd. Abdul Majid Khan, *A Short History of Patiala State*, Rajinder Press, Patiala, May 1910, p. 5.

⁵ S.N Banerjee, *History of Patiala*, Vol.II, N.D, p. 84.

Wilson's report point out to a new fact in his report he has told that "They are doing well in Ferozpur but mischief are going on in Patiala and Raja has been poisoned." ⁶

Lepel Griffin shares that though Patiala chiefs served well during the war but British Government was not satisfied with his performance as compared to 1857 A.D. In this war Cis-Sutlej chief's feelings were attached more with Khalsa Army. ⁷ *Punjab State Gazetteers* gives the same reason. ⁸

Lepel Griffin in brief shares the role of Patiala during war tells that as compared to other chiefs Patiala did well. But at some time his troops were not under his control because of their attachment with Lahore troops. By giving an example of Gongrana and Badowal he blames that the conduct of Patiala troops was unsatisfactory. ⁹ From the official letter it gets clear that Patiala troop's relative were in Lahore army that's why their sympathy was more with the Lahore than with British. ¹⁰

Lepel Griffin further shares that at the conclusion of war Raja Patiala received a grant of *sanad* for his service and loyalty during the war. Raja had requested for the right of his former possession thus by receiving *sanad* he secured his and his successor's right over his hereditary states. ¹¹ It is worth to add that policy of British Government in pre thirty years had seized number of territories by applying several tactics over Cis Sutlej Chiefs. Jind and Kythal are the example. Therefore, it is not a matter of surprise that British policy should not have caused some alarms in mind of chief of Patiala and led him to request for the confirmation of his possession. Copy of *sanad* is register in C.V, Aitchison's work. ¹²

Not only he had received *sanad* rather also received a land from British Government which had taken from Nabha as punishment. He also got a house belonged to rebel chief of

⁶ Henry Wilson Report, 6 January 1846, Special Collection, Ganda Singh Records, Punjabi University, Patiala.

⁷ Lepel Henry Griffin, *The Rajas of Punjab*, p. 202.

⁸ Punjab State Gazetteers, *Phulkian States*, Vol. XVII, p. 49.

⁹ Lepel Henry Griffin, *The Rajas of Punjab*, p. 203.

¹⁰ Governor Genral Minte, 17 November 1846, Foreign Department, no.4-5, Secret Consultation, 26 December 1846, no.1280-1313. (N.A.I)

¹¹ Lepel Henry Griffin, *The Rajas of Punjab*, p. 203.

¹² C.V Aitchison, *A Collection of Treaties and Sandas*, Vol. I, Government Printing, Calcutta, 1892, p. 200.

Ladwa.¹³ Reference of land was taken from Ladwa chief as given in *Punjab State Gazetteers*.¹⁴ Reference of house gained from Ladwa through British is given in *A Short History of Patiala*.¹⁵

In *The Rajas of Punjab* a report of Governor General is given. In which reasons behind the failure of chiefs in providing help is given. It has also been discussed that how and why people of Cis-Sutlej opposed British Government. This lengthy report can be trace in several documents.¹⁶ But prime points which should be noted that common people opposed the British rule though they had been living under the British rule since 1809 A.D. Therefore, Anglo Sikh war forced British to implement precautionary measures for future. People's sympathy with Khlasa army had deflated the fawn claims of Lepel Griffin that British rule is just and benevolence towards people. These remarks he uses very often in his work. On the contrary, even after more than thirty years of rule British Government had failed to create a strong bond with Cis-Sutlej Chiefs and with the people of their country. Though, Lepel Griffin gives hint of new policy for common people to create better connection but failure of British policy again confronted them in the shape of revolt of 1857 A.D but they succeeded to win over the chiefs into their side during the revolt.

British General put forth some rules with which Lepel Griffin agrees that these rules were necessary. Governor General rules out to abolish transit duties and abolition of police jurisdiction. But on the other hand Lepel Griffin says that abolition of police jurisdiction was not good idea because this made difficult for chiefs to collect revenue.¹⁷ According to S.N Banerjee, Raja Patiala alone had to give a huge amount of the revenue of Rs. 90, 000 under the rule of abolishment of transit duty.¹⁸

¹³ Lepel Henry Griffin, *The Rajas of Punjab*, p. 204.

¹⁴ Punjab State Gazetteers, *Phulkian States*, Vol. XVII, p. 49.

¹⁵ Colonel Mohd. Abdul Majid Khan, *A Short History of Patiala State*, p. 5.

¹⁶ To esquire from Commissioner and superintendent, Foreign Department, Political Consultation, 30 December 1848, no. 166-68. (N.A.I). See also; R.R Sethi, The Cis-Sutlej States and First Sikh War, *Journal of Punjab Historical Studies*, Vol. VI, Punjab University, Lahore 1935, pp. 144-153.

¹⁷ Lepel Henry Griffin, *The Rajas of Punjab*, Low Price Publication, Delhi, Reprint 2014, pp. 208-216. Also see; Foreign Department, Secret Consultation, 26 December 1846, no. 1280-1313. (N.A.I)

¹⁸ S.N Banerjee, *History of Patiala*, Vol. II, N.D, p. 2. See also; Letter of Thanks from Governor General to Raja of Patiala for to abolish the transit duties; Foreign Department, 31 December 1847, no. 1702, no. 1704. (N.A.I)

Lepel Griffin in his work *The Rajas of Punjab* does not discuss about the role of Patiala state in second Anglo-Sikh war.

Lepel Griffin highlights that during the interruption of 1857 A.D no other Indian ruler showed great loyalty or rendered more evident service to the British Government than the Maharaja Narinder Singh of Patiala. He was well known head of Sikh Rajas; here Griffin tells that his hesitation or disloyalty would have cost British Government with the most disastrous results. As his ability, brave character and high position would have made him the most formidable leader against our Government. But due to honorable and principled environment of gratitude as well as the loyalty provided by British Government to Maharaja due to which Maharaja without any doubts placed his whole powerful resources and energy under the absolute command of England, at that time when less sincere friends did not bother much. Importance of Maharaja Narinder Singh which was discussed by Lepel Griffin can be traced in official letters of correspondence between Punjab Government and British Government. They were well aware of the significance of Maharaja Narinder Singh to stop mutiny as they needed allies like Indian rulers because losing grasp even over a single vital leader or ruler especially alias like Narinder Singh who was very capable of leading a leaderless mutiny might have pose serious trouble to British Government. Fear of British Government that Patiala chief could change his side and may join the rebels , is well traceable in Official letters, Phulkian state Gazetteer as well as given in *The Rajas of Punjab*.¹⁹

On the other hand A.C Arora says that the chiefs of Princely states helped British Government not due to liberal attitude of British Government towards them as told by Lepel Griffin rather they sought it as a golden opportunity to win over the gratitude of British government by rendering their services to government and then in return to get concession from them for an example - Papers of Requests.²⁰ While according to Khrishan Lal, jealous rivalry among ruling houses was the actual cause of offering services to the British Government as

¹⁹ Lepel Henry Griffin, *The Rajas of Punjab*, p. 233-234. See also; Letter from Punjab Government to Indian Government, 29 March 1859, Foreign Department, Political Consultation, no. 42. (N.A.I). See also; *Phulkian State Gazetteer*, Vol. XVII, p.49.

²⁰ After rendering distinguish services during mutiny of 1857, chiefs of Cis- sutlej states demanded eight request as a favor for their services were called Papers of requests. For detail see A.C Arora, Phulkian Chiefs Papers of Requests, *The Punjab Past and Present*, Punjabi University, Patiala, April 1971, p. 234.

Nabha and Jind were also on the side of British and Maharaja Narinder Singh would not let the rewards of loyalty pass to them.²¹ Historian Ganda Singh put forward another factor that mutiny was aimed to restore the power of Mughal emperor Bhadur Shah but people of Punjab had suffered a lot in the hands of Mughals and had fought against them several times during 17th and 18th centuries, therefore they were not expected to help mutineers at all.²² So when the news reached Patiala that insurgents in Delhi and Meerut had started mutiny and the attitude of native troops of Ambala was also looked suspicious, so the Maharaja himself led as the head of all of his available troops and marched the same night to Jesomali, a village closer to Ambala and at the same time he sent his elephants, camels and other carriage to Kalka for the transportation of European soldiers to Ambala from hill station of Kussowali²³, Dagshai and Sabathu. Then he went from Jesomli to Thanesar and deployed a force of 1300 men along with guns for the protection of the district.²⁴

He was eager to fight with mutineers thus he expressed his desire repeatedly through the letters to go to Delhi. But the appeal was continuously rejected by the British Government. Lepel Griffin gives explanation through the words of chief commissioner that the Local people were confused with various rumors about the cartridges, adulteration of flour etc but when Maharaja Narinder Singh himself took the charge courageously and heartily on our side, these mischievous reports began to be discredited because Maharaja was an orthodox Hindu, whose support at such moment was as similar as Brigade of English troops to us and served more to tranquilize the people more than a hundred official disclaimers would have ever done.²⁵ But according to Raj Khalsa he was a staunch Sikh.²⁶ Here this is to be noted that in the absence of Maharaja whole Cis-Sutlej could have arise against the British Government but now he was expected to convince other Cis-Sutlej states to follow him in order to serve British Government. S.N Banerjee added

²¹ Krishna Lal, The Role of Mahraja Narinder Singh of Patiala in the Rebellion of 1857-58, *Punjab History Conference Proceeding*, Punjabi Univeersity, March 1968, p. 284.

²² Ganda Singh, *Patiala East and Punjab States Union*, Archive Department, Patiala, 1951, p. 50.

²³ Foreign Department, Political Consultation, 2 July 1858, no. 168-190, p. 123, para. I. (N.A.I). See also; Lepel Henry Griffin, *The Rajas of Punjab*, p. 233.

²⁴ Lepel Henry Griffin, *The Rajas of Punjab*, p. 233.

²⁵ Letter Commissioner Cis – Sutlej States to Chief Commissioner Punjab, 9 March 1858, Foreign Department, Political Proceedings, 2 July 1858, no. 182, para 4. (N.A.I)

²⁶ Giani Gian Singh, *Raj Khalsa*, Vol. II, p. 59.

that in geographical and strategically manner that Patiala had occupied the important position because of its connectivity to Grand trunk road which made rest parts of India get associated with Punjab and on other hand Delhi wasn't far away but without Maharaja's hostile service from Patiala would results much severe for British as communication would have been cut off between Delhi and Punjab. So the help provided by Patiala chief was much necessary and his presence was too.²⁷ But according to Salahuddin Malik, probably most significant reason behind it was that the repeated requests made by Maharaja, made British officials cautious as they suspected that opposition may persuade this distinguished chief to join rebel's side. Their doubt on Maharaja issue was not baseless because Emperor Bahadur Shah had made frequent requests to Maharaja Narinder Singh that he will be bestowed with a noble rank and lordly dignity if in return he will be doing their favor and become their vassal, so that they together could arise against the British Government and marched jointly with their armies to Delhi.²⁸ Lepel Griffin also discussed about the attempts made by Bahadur Shah to lure Maharaja on his side but instead that Maharaja gave these letters to the M.C.G Barnes.²⁹ While Barnes had once wrote a letter to Montgomery (Judicial Commissioner) about suspicious act of Patiala state when Nihal Chand Diwan of Narinder Singh released 100 fugitive mutineers.³⁰ It seems that British had taken each and every incident so seriously that they were not in favor to give any opportunity to rebels or to take any risk. Thereby, British Government confidentially took precautionary steps to intercept and vigilance over their own trusted chiefs and people, primarily leaving no chance for any leader to instigate rebels. So, why they didn't be because Muslim and Sikh community brotherhood could pose serious challenge to British Government.

Maharaja sent his army to help British in Thanesar, Karnal, Ambala, Sharanpur, Jagadari, Firozpur and Grand Trunk Road from Karnal to Phillor as a safeguard from any kind of disturbance. He sent Partap Singh with 500 horses under his command to Delhi. The Maharaja in his own territories furnished supplies, carriage and kept the roads clear for all government troops while passing through Punjab to Delhi as well as all refugee from Sirsa , Rhotak and Hissar who

²⁷ S.N. Banerjee, *A History of Patiala*, Vol. II, N.D, p. 97.

²⁸ Salahuddin Malik, The Punjab and the Indian Mutiny, *Journal of Indian History*, August 1972, p. 346.

²⁹ Lepel Henry Griffin, *The Rajas of Punjab*, p. 234.

³⁰ Letter of G.C Barnes to Bob Montgomery, 5 February 1858, cited in S.N Banrjee, *A History of Patiala*, N.D, p. 97.

came into Patiala were received with sympathy and were provided with everything they required. He also gave a loan of five lakh Rupees to British government and expressed his desire to double this amount but British Government was satisfied with the amount they received from him. The Patiala contingent employed in the British campaign during 1857A.D consisted of 8 guns, 2156 Horse, 2846 Infantry along with 156 officers. Troops were deployed in the particular mentioned cities and the loan amount was found same as mentioned in Official documents and as given In *The Rajas of Punjab* except that 970 bodyguards and 8 cannons were also being provided by Raja of Patiala.³¹

Lepel Griffin discussed about matter of Dholepur³² disturbance in detail, in which Maharaja Narinder Singh played a vital role. The combined insurgent forces of Indore and Gawalior attacked the Rana of Dholepur. Unfortunately, most of the Rana's troops and officials joined the rebels, who ravaged and looted the district; they denied chief's authority over them and even threatened his life to death until he helplessly consented to their demands. At the end insurgents left Dholepur taking with them the guns of Dholepur's chief to Agra, where they were completely defeated by the troops deployed in Agra garrison and in Delhi under the command of General Greathed on 10th October. But Dholepur still remained in a state of anarchy and the chief's life was still under threat. So North-west, Punjab authorities and Narinder Singh of Patiala sent their combine forces consisted of 2000 men to Dholepur. Although Dholepur was saved but positions of neighboring states were still deteriorated therefore British Government directed Patiala troops to remain there.³³ But here S.N Banerjee gives a different aspect about this conflict at Dholepur, according to him the motive of Patiala chief to march with his forces to save Dholepur was not that he wanted to please British Government or to suppress any rebellion instead Rana Balwant Singh appealed to Maharaja of Patiala for his help. For Maharaja it was also necessary to save Dholepur because Rana Balwant Singh was his son-in-law. So for

³¹ Lepel Henry Griffin, *The Rajas of Punjab*, p. 236. See also; Foreign Department, Political Proceedings, 2 July 1858, no. 182- 183 (N.A.I); Punjab Government Records, Part . I, Lahore, 1911, pp. 4-7, 18-19, 36-37.

³² Dholepur was a Rajput State, situated between Agra and Gwalior . Its Ruler Rana had married the daughter of Maharaja Narinder Singh of Patiala. Most of troops and officials of Rana had joined the rebels and then Patiala forces came to save Rana and Dholepur .

³³ Lepel Henry Griffin, *The Rajas of Punjab*, p. 237. See also; Foreign Department, Political Proceeding, 20 May 1859, no. 74-75.(N.A.I)

the safety of his daughter and his Son- in – law he agreed to render services and his assistance as well as he communicated with Government of Punjab and North –west provinces for the safety of his own son – in – law and daughter. British Government agreed for assistance because it would put good impact of Sikh Maharaja’s presence in the Dholepur and on the other affected areas. That’s why Patiala forces marched towards Dholepur and stayed there even after the mutineers left it for the safety of Rana and his city.³⁴

Nabha:

Lepel Griffin in *The Rajas of Punjab* explains that due to unsympathetic actions taken by British Government against Lahore led to the first Anglo- Sikh war in 1845 A.D. Lepel Griffin further acclaimed on the basis of the arrogant character of the Raja of Nabha that he would definitely support the Lahore Darbar was predefined.³⁵ Not only Nabha but many other Cis-Sutlej chiefs did not proved loyal to the British during First Anglo Sikh war because every village which lies in the region of Cis-Sutlej had some familial relation with Lahore Army thus it was inevitable and as such “The heart of the Sikh population in our protected states were in the heart of the men of their own sects and tribe and decidedly disincline to the British Government.”³⁶

According to Lepel Griffin’s statement, Raja Davinder Singh’s policies were not benevolent for the state as compare to his deceased father.³⁷ As per *Gazetteer* above statement is undeniable and true. He also tells that Raja Davinder Singh was in contact with Lahore Darbar through General Ram Singh who was sent by Jowahar Singh, at the same time he agrees that though any direct or solid proof of his treason could not have found because of the death of Major Broadfoot and due to the loss of large number of papers.³⁸

³⁴ S.N. Banerjee, *A History of Patiala*, Vol.II, N.D, p. 105.

³⁵ Lepel Henry Griffin, *The Rajas of Punjab*, pp. 450-451

³⁶ Governor General’s Minute, 17 Nov. 1846, Para 4-5, Foreign Deptt., Secret Consultation, 26 Dec. 1846, Nos. 1280-1313, p. 101. (N.A.I)

³⁷ Lepel Henry Griffin, *The Rajas of Punjab*, p. 451. See also; *District and States Gazetteers of Undivided Punjab*, Vol. VI, B.R Publishing Corporation, Delhi 1895, p. 299.

³⁸ Lepel Henry Griffin, *The Rajas of Punjab*, p. 451,

Lepel Griffin even tells that conduct of Davinder Singh was not good because when he was requested to deliver the supplies, carriages and information he didn't respond the Agents in time. For his negligence estates of Almoh and Deharu were seized from him as a signal punishment.³⁹ However, as given in the *Nabha Twarikh* when General Ram Singh of Lahore came to Nabha for his personal work than British Government started suspecting the character of the Raja and in their misperception they punished the Raja and took the lands.⁴⁰ Than after two days Major Broadfoot ordered Raja to join them with his force or he would be considered enemy of British. In spite of the fact Dr. Ganda tells that when preparations for the war were beginning Major Broadfoot asked Kedha Singh, lawyer of the Nabha to go to Lahore and spy the Lahore officials for him. But Kedha Singh refused to do so therefore Broadfoot got annoyed and started complaining about the Raja of Nabha to the British Government.⁴¹

Lepel Griffin tells that not only Raja failed to act on the call of Government but his Agent Kahna Mal too failed to render the supplies.⁴² But according to Gurmukh Singh reason behind this failure was different, as Raja had given the *diwani* to Gulab Singh Manshaia but *khatiri* cast considered it at their birth right so Munshi Sahib Singh in order to take revenge from Raja delayed the supplies with the help of Kahna Mal. Nonetheless, Noor Khan, Deedar Khan, Sooba Khan and Kahzan Singh had come with troops to help the British Government.⁴³

As give in *The Rajas of Punjab* the strict orders were being sent by Broadfoot to Raja Nabha even though he did not show any kind of interest instead remained at Nabha.⁴⁴ On the other side, Giani Gian Singh tells that Raja on the order of Broadfoot move to Malout with his troops from Nabha but somehow on the urge of Swami Jai Gopal Acharia the Raja came back to Nabha by leaving his journey in the mid.⁴⁵

³⁹ Lepel Henry Griffin, *The Rajas of Punjab*, p. 452.

⁴⁰ Bhai Gurmukh Singh, *Tawarikh Nabha*, Gurmat National Agency, Amritsar, N.D, p. 17.

⁴¹ Ganda Singh, *Patiala and East Punjab State Union*, pp. 60-61. See also: Padama Piyara Singh, *Sankhep Sikh Ithihaas*, Patiala, 1963, p. 264.

⁴² Lepel Henry Griffin, *The Rajas of Punjab*, p. 453.

⁴³ Bhai Gurmukh Singh, *Tawarikh Nabha*, p. 19.

⁴⁴ Lepel Henry Griffin, *The Rajas of Punjab*, p. 453.

⁴⁵ Giani Gian Singh, *Raj Khalsa*, Vol. II, p. 88.

On the death of Raja of Patiala the Raja Davinder Singh of Nabha visited Patiala but declined to join the British camp.⁴⁶ In the favor of Raja Davinder Singh a defensive statement is given in the *Tawarikh Nabha* that when he was summoned to join British with his troops than unfortunately the sudden death of Patiala ruler could not let him join the British on time because as a head of Phulikan Family it was his duty to attend the death ceremony and to console the family of deceased ruler. Therefore, he went to Patiala three times.⁴⁷ In the counter reply, Lepel Griffin blames that Major Broadfoot gave him order on 15th December and he might have had easily respond to the order within 48 hours because Maharaja of Patiala died on the 23rd of December thus it can clearly pre-assume that Raja of Nabha was just trying to make excuses to remain absent from the camp and was nothing else. So at the end of the war Raja was not given permission to attend the *Darbar* of the Governor General at Ludhiana and an investigation was started against his dull performance.⁴⁸ On the basis of Kali Rai's work the palace at which Darbar held was at Lahore instead of Ludhiana.⁴⁹

Lepel Griffin tells that after the investigation got completed the Government held him guilty so Davinder Singh was ordered to be removed and his eldest son, who was minor at that time was made ruler under the supervision of his step grand-mother. Three responsible officers were placed at Nabha to assist Rani Chand Kaur beside it they were also responsible for the safety and education of the young prince. 1/4th land of the Nabha was taken away like Pakhowal, Dehrau and Rori a portion worth rupees 12,200 was taken and land worth 28,776 a year was confiscated by British Government in lieu of a contingent of 100 horses, 133 foot soldiers and the remaining land worth rupees 71,224 were equally divided among Patiala and Faridkot as a reward of service in the war. Raja Davinder Singh was given a pension of Rs. 50,000 per year from the revenue of Nabha and was sent to Mathura. The primary and secondary sources notify that Davinder Singh was treated in same way as given in *The Rajas of Punjab*.⁵⁰

⁴⁶ Lepel Henry Griffin, *The Rajas of Punjab*, p. 453.

⁴⁷ Bhai Gurmukh Singh, *Tawarikh Nabha*, p. 18.

⁴⁸ Lepel Henry Griffin, *The Rajas of Punjab*, p. 457.

⁴⁹ Giani Lal Singh (trans.) Rai Kali and Tulsi Ram, *Punjab Di Sair*, Punjabi University, Patiala, 1971, p. 283.

⁵⁰ Lepel Henry Griffin, *The Rajas of Punjab*, p. 45. See also; Foreign Department, Secret Consultaion, 26 December 1846, no.1280-1313. See also; Giani Lal Singh (trans.), Rai Kali and Tulsi Ram, *Punjab Di Sair*, 1971, p. 283.

Lepel Griffin tells the condition of Raja Davinder Singh after he was shifted to Mathura where he resided till 1854 A.D. As per Griffin he didn't learn from his past and created trouble for everyone even he fell deep under the debt and supposed that Nabha would pay his expenses.⁵¹ In *Patriot Prince* it has also been given that in Mathura Davinder Singh failed to give better impression.⁵² Due to his outrageous behavior authority of north-western provinces decided to shift him to another palace, first Thanesar was suggested but after discussion authorities decided to send him to Lahore in the Kahrak Singh's palace and he was being shifted there on 8 December 1855 A.D. where he died on November 1865 A.D. He had left behind four widows. Rani Man Kaur was the mother of two sons first was Bahrapur Singh and second was Bhagwan Singh.⁵³ But according to Thakur Desraj, Raja Davinder Singh felt very displeased with the behavior of British towards him so in depression he fell ill and died. Other information about his family members and the locations of his which had been changed by British found same.⁵⁴

According to Lepel Griffin Major Mackeson installed Raja Bharpur Singh on throne on 17 January 1847 A.D as it has been told earlier a council was created and three members under Rani Desw were appointed which were Gurbaksh Singh, Fateh Singh and Behali Mal. Gurbaksh Singh was appointed on a duty to look after the Prince's education but he had banished from Nabha by his master but later on he came back to Nabha on the order of Mackeson. Munshi Shahib Singh was being charged for ill –advising the Davinder Singh at the time of Anglo –Sikh war so Mackeson fired him to perform council duties, but within a few years he become favorites of Rani Chand Kaur and labored much to overthrow the Gurbakash Singh. Gurbaskah Singh later charged with the misuse of his position and by using his power he managed to get rich by hook and crook. An investigation was directed against him and when he found guilty he had had removed from his post. Than Munshi Shaib taking benefit of the opportunity became president

Also; *District and States Gazetteers of Undivided Punjab*, Vol. IV, p. 299. Ganda Singh, *Patiala and East Punjab State Union*, p. 62. Jeet Singh Seetal (trans.) Kanhyia Lal, *Traikh – i-Punjab*, p. 105.

⁵¹ Lepel Henry Griffin, *The Rajas of Punjab*, p. 460.

⁵² Munna Lal Syngal, *The Patriot Prince*, Doaba House Ludhiana and Delhi, 1961, p. 2.

⁵³ Lepel Henry Griffin, *The Rajas of Punjab*, pp. 460-461.

⁵⁴ Lepel Henry Griffin, *The Rajas of Punjab*, pp. 460-46. Thakur Desraj, *Jaat Ithiaas*, Kranti Press, Agra, N.D, p.567.

of the council without any special references.⁵⁵ But according to *Sidhu Brara the Itihaas*, Munshi Sahib Singh was also member of the council before he had being fired.⁵⁶

Lepel Griffin depicts the active services of Raja Bharpur Singh of Nabha towards British Government during the mutiny of 1857 A.D, in his work *The Raja of Punjab*. He told that when mutiny broke out Raja was ordered to stay in readiness for service and on the 17th of May he had given the charge of important area of Ludhiana. Bharpur Singh with 350 horses, 450 foot soldiers and along with 2 guns stayed there for more than six months and on his occasional leave he would leave his brother in his absent.⁵⁷ However, as per Government records and *District and State Gazetteers* at Ludhiana there were 300 horse riders which were deployed in service and total numbers of foot soldiers were 400.⁵⁸ Though as stated by Devi Parsad, the numbers of troops deployed in Ludhiana were 800 in total.⁵⁹ Even he provided the escort of 300 men for the security of a train, to escort Commander in Chief from Philour to Delhi.⁶⁰ According to official records and Devi Parsad this train was loaded with heavy guns so Raja escorted them to Delhi under his supervision.⁶¹ Earlier, the Nushehri Battalion had been appointed for this duty but when they refused to proceed than Nabha troops were asked to perform the duty. On the arrival of mutineers in Philor, British officer with the energetic help of a detachment of Nabha troops destroyed the bridge to stop the enemy and in a combat several mutineers killed and several Nabha soldiers got injured and killed.⁶² As per the concerned official records, Nabha soldiers fought gallantry in this operation.⁶³

⁵⁵ Lepel Henry Griffin, *The Rajas of Punjab*, p. 461.

⁵⁶ Balwant Singh Historian, *Sidhu Brara Da Itihaas*, New Lal Bhag, Patiala, 1986, p. 128.

⁵⁷ Lepel Henry Griffin, *The Rajas of Punjab*, Low Price Publication, Delhi, Reprint 2014, p. 464.

⁵⁸ Statement of Service Rendered by Raja Bahrpur Singh during Late Disturbance, Foreign Department, Political Proceeding, 2 July 1858, no. 168, para. 31. (N.A.I). See also; *District and States Gazetteers of Undivided Punjab*, Vol. IV, p. 299.

⁵⁹ Harimander Singh Kohli (trans.) Devi Parsad, *Gulshan-i-Punjab*, N.A, Punjab Historical Department Library, Patiala, p. 265.

⁶⁰ Lepel Henry Griffin, *The Rajas of Punjab*, p. 464.

⁶¹ *Ibid.*, p. 265. See also; Letter From Commissioner to Superintendent, Cis-Sutlej States to Secretary to Chief Commissioner Punjab, 4 March 1858, Foreign Department, Political Proceeding, 2 July 1858, No. 167, para. 5. (N.A.I)

⁶² Lepel Henry Griffin, *The Rajas of Punjab*, p. 465.

In the opinion of Lepel Griffin, the Raja Bharpur Singh of Nabha was so anxiously wanted to march to Delhi as Raja of Jind had done but it was not allowed and said that he was very young and his life could not be put on the risk. A point should be noted to this fact that the Raja Davinder Singh of Nabha was dethroned by British because he had not helped the British Government therefore naturally Nabha State lost his status and his trust in front of British Government and when mutiny broke out, it came as a God sent chance for new chief of Nabha State to prove his loyalty. That's why Nabha chief Bharpur Singh to regain his status which had lost due to his predecessors showed much interest to help the British Government during mutiny. Even then a force comprised of 300 men was sent under the command of the Didar Singh to Delhi.⁶⁴ Accordance with *The Raja of Punjab* British Government urged for the loan of two and half lakh rupees from Raja and he gave it to them at once. But according to official document, Commissioner had first demanded three lakhs and than in his second letter he requested for two and half lakh.⁶⁵ In the addition Raja Bharpur Singh sent many new soldiers for help and arrested several mutineers and performed every service with great locality.⁶⁶

Lepel Griffin apprise in his work *The Rajas of Punjab* that after mutiny ended what kind of rewards were given to Raja Bharpur Singh of Nabha. First among them was a territorial grant which was taken from Ludhiana and Ferozepur, amounts not more than 30,000 awarded to him. Second was that his *Khillat* should be increased from seven pieces to fifteen, equal to Raja of Jind. Third, a salute of nine guns in his respect would be given during his visit to the Governor General's Darbar and in fourth it was suggested that in his visit to Governor General, he should be welcomed back by Foreign Secretary.⁶⁷ All of the four suggestions awarded to the Raja found similar except in first suggestion it has also given that the grant awarded to him would be held by

⁶³ Letter From Commissioner to Superintendent, Cis-Sutlej States to Secretary to Chief Commissioner Punjab, 4 March 1858, Foreign Department, Political Proceeding, 2 July 1858, No. 167, para. 6. (N.A.I). See also: *District and States Gazetteers of Undivided Punjab*, Vol. IV, B.R Publishing Corporation, Delhi 1895, p. 299.

⁶⁴ Lepel Henry Griffin, *The Rajas of Punjab*, p. 465. See also; Statement of Service Rendered by Raja Bahrpur Singh during Late Disturbance, Foreign Department, Political Proceeding, 2 July 1858, no. 168, para. 27. (N.A.I)

⁶⁵ Lepel Henry Griffin, *The Rajas of Punjab*, p. 465. See also; *District and States Gazetteers of Undivided Punjab*, Vol. IV, p. 299. See also; Foreign Department, Political Proceeding, 2 July 1858, no. 168, para. 5. (N.A.I)

⁶⁶ Lepel Henry Griffin, *The Rajas of Punjab*, p. 465. See also; Foreign Department, Political Proceeding, 2 July 1858, no. 168, para. 9. (N.A.I)

⁶⁷ Lepel Henry Griffin, *The Rajas of Punjab*, pp. 465-466.

him and for his male heirs forever.⁶⁸ Nevertheless, Buta Singh Sekohn tells that schemes to award the titles, honors and also determining the salute guns were as per the superiority of rulers. It was a part of tactical policy of British statesmen to win over the loyalty of the Phulkian Chiefs, highest honors were being granted to Patiala, Nabha and Jind. Despite the fact that the Bhawalpur state was largest in area as compare to the other states of the Punjab.⁶⁹

Lepel Griffin praises the British Government and says that Government bestowed upon Raja the rewards which were far more valuable than those which were originally suggested. The area of Bawal and Kanti which were confiscated from Jhajjar were given to him, worth Rs. 1, 06,000 per annum. His *khillat* increased from seven to fifteen pieces and a salute of eleven guns awarded to him.⁷⁰ As per Kanhiya Lal, Jhajjar territory was sold to him in exchange of the loan which Government had taken from him during crucial time.⁷¹ However, according to Devi Parsad cost of land acquired from Jhajjar was of 3 Lakh.⁷² It is worth to mention that in 1846 A.D it was the same British Government who had confiscated one forth territory of the Nabha State, therefore territories which were granted were fell short in front of the lose which Nabha had to suffered. Even though British Government so cunningly bestowed the grant of Jhajjar upon the Nabha and placed the Sikh rulers between the turbulent Muslim territories, on the other hand it was also very near to the borders of Rajpuana states i.e. Japiur and Alwar. Thus many times they got disturbed due to border disputes. Manifestly in this situation for their protection a strong frontier police backed by the military force was required. British authorizes put this burden upon Phulkian Chiefs knowingly.

⁶⁸ Letter From Commissioner and Superintendent Cis-Sutlej States to Secretary to Chief Commissioner, Punjab, 4 March 1858, Foreign Department Political Proceedings, 2 July 1858, no. 167, para. 10. (N.A.I)

⁶⁹ Buta Singh Sekhon, Relationship Between Paramountcy and Punjab States (1858-1947), *The Punjab Past and Present*, Punjabi University, Patiala, April 2012, p. 85.

⁷⁰ Lepel Henry Griffin, *The Rajas of Punjab*, Low Price Publication, Delhi, Reprint 2014, p. 466. See also; C.V. Aitchison, *A Collection of Treaties Engagements and Sanadas*, Vol. VIII, Central Archeological Library, New Delhi, 1960, p. 291. See also; Letter from Chief Commissioner of Punjab to Secretary to Government of India, 12 March 1858, Foreign Department Political Proceedings, 2 June 1858, no. 169, para 2, Kahrita to Governor General to Raja of Nabha, 2 June 1858, no. 190.(N.A.I). See also; Jeet Singh Seetal (trans.)Kanhya Lal, *Traikh – i-Punjab*, p. 106.

⁷¹ Jeet Singh Seetal (trans.)Kanhya Lal, *Traikh – i-Punjab*, p.106.

⁷² Harimander Singh Kohli(trans.) Devi Parsad, *Gulshan-i-Punjab*, N.D, p. 267.

In common interests with Patiala and Jind, Nabha sent an urged along with these chiefs i.e. 'Paper of requests' in 1858 A.D and in January a Darbar was held at Ambala by Lord Canning and all the Cis-Sutlej States ruler were present there, where rulers were being awarded by their valuable services to British Government which has been mentioned separately.⁷³

Lepel Griffin in his work elucidate that the Raja had given 2 and half lakh to British Government during mutiny and remainder loan of 1848 A.D was also left to pay. Thus the amount in total was 9 and half lakh. Raja of Patiala and Raja of Nabha in exchange demanded the land of Budhwanah and of Kanoudh respectively on the lease of 20 years. British Government agreed and approved the transfer.⁷⁴

According to Lepel Griffin, Raja Bharpur Singh was keen to improve his administration and when in 1859 A.D political agent's investigation found some of his minister guilty. He at once removed them from their post. Raja started this reformation under the suggestion of Patiala. Bharpur Singh's advisers tried to estrange him from Patiala state but as per his intelligence he didn't paid any attention to them. A related point is to consider is that the political agents were working for Punjab Government; their main motive was to keep a close supervision over the administration of Cis-Sutlej states.⁷⁵ According to the Pannikar's remark on the authoritative role played by Political agent or resident "The wisper of the Resident is the Thunder of State."⁷⁶

Lepel Griffin admires his ruling though he was a minor ruler but still his rule was better than Jind state. Lepel Griffin acclaims that Raja had promised to become most liberal prince of North India. Even from his personal documents his loyalty towards British Government can be seen. Therefore, Lord Elgin the viceroy of India offered him a seat in the Legislative Council and Raja accepted it with great pleasure. Unfortunately, as a will of God he was never destined to

⁷³ For detail see also C.V. Aitchison, *A Collection of Treaties Engagements and Sanadas*, Vol. VIII, p. 287. See also; *Infra*, pp. 176-182.

⁷⁴ Lepel Henry Griffin, *The Rajas of Punjab*, p. 473. See also; C.V. Aitchison, *A Collection of Treaties Engagements and Sanadas*, Vol. VIII, p. 292.

⁷⁵ Since the 1859-59 the Cis Sutlej States Patiala, Nabha , Jind, Malerkotla, Kalsia and Shimla hill states came under the Commissioner of Ambala.

⁷⁶ K.N Pannikar, *British Diplomacy In North India*, Associated Publishing House, New Delhi, p. 104.

take his seat in council because he fell sick and died on 9th November.⁷⁷ Khazan Singh and *District and State Gazetteers* affirm the death date of Raja Bahrapur Singh.⁷⁸

The character and his commitment for the superior administration under the surveillance of British Government, the remarks which have been discuss by Lepel Griffin is given in above paragraph, Giani Gian Singh advocates the statement.⁷⁹

By understanding the above paragraph it should be keep in mind that the reason behind the changed attitude of native rulers and British Government for each other by close to 19th century is primarily based on the fact that many leading chiefs had disappeared from the political stage of Indian politics and consequently in a good number of princely states fell under the minority rule at once at the same time. Thus under the surveillance of the British Government the young princes by learning from them they ruled on their states in changed attitude.⁸⁰

Jind:

One the most important matter which Lepel Griffin explains is the Jind's response during the Anglo-Sikh war. At the commencement of war attitude of Sarup Singh dissatisfied British. In Novermber 1845 A.D from him help of 150 camels was demanded so British could use them in Sirhind Divison but Raja showed no interest. So, Major Broadfoot fined him of 10,000 for his negligence. After this Raja started behaving well and his performance remained satisfactory till the end of the war. He helped British by sending grains, his contingent served with the British troops and a detachment was sent to Gumgrana under command of Hay. Later, he also sent a detachment to curb the rebellion in Kashmir. Government awarded the troops with double allowance who had served in the Kashmir expedition.⁸¹ It is mention in the official records that only few chiefs were loyal to British at the time of war one among them was Jind.⁸² According to

⁷⁷ Lepel Henry Griffin, *The Rajas of Punjab*, pp. 474-475.

⁷⁸ *District and States Gazetteers of Undivided Punjab*, Vol. VI, p. 299. See also; Khazan Singh, *History and Philosophy of Sikh Religion*, Part-I, Nehwal Kishore Press, Lahore, 1914, p. 298.

⁷⁹ Giani Gian Singh, *Raj Khalsa*, Part II, p. 95.

⁸⁰ N.D, *The British Crown and Indian States*, P.S King and Son Limited, London, 1929, p. 94.

⁸¹ Lepel Henry Griffin, *The Rajas of Punjab*, pp. 386-387

⁸² Commissioner Superintendent to Esquire, Foreign Department, Political Consultation, 30 December 1848, no. 166-168. (N.A.I).

R.R Sethi the British officer Mackeson was not happy with the performance of Cis-Sutlej chiefs and assistance which chiefs had provided could have been possible only because of British Government's repeated warnings. So he suggested the Government some alteration for more satisfactory relation with chiefs because Government cannot rely only on proclamation and engagements. So all these benefits which were bestowed upon Jind were part of British Government policy. So they could get active help from the chiefs in future.⁸³

For his devotion Governor General remitted his fine and awarded him a grant of land valued 3,000 per year. Government abolished transit duty in his territory and promised never to demand tribute in future from any successor of Jind. Raja Sarup Singh on his part agreed to engage with all his troops during an event of war, to maintain the Military road in territory, to suppress *Sati*, to stop slave dealing and to stop infanticide in his state.⁸⁴ *Punjab State Gazetteers* advocates the statement of Lepel Griffin.⁸⁵

It is given in *The Rajas of Punjab* that for his services during Anglo Sikh war Government awarded him with *Sanad* in which confirmation over his ancestral possession and assurance of renewed protection was granted.⁸⁶ It is worthy to note that by issuing the *Sanad*, most probably, it would not be unjust to say that British Government had precisely got 'two strings at one bow' tactically. It was a clear act of British Paramountcy. Though Raja Sarup Singh of Jind was seeking his own safety and protection, he wanted assurance and security for his land and property from British Government in future because Government had autonomously applied rule at various occasion over Jind by considering themselves as Lord Paramount power. On the contrary, British by issuing mere a *sanad* of assurance to Jind got much more important right in exchange from Jind. As per agreement if any enemy would approach to Cis-Sutlej side with the purpose of conquering it, Raja would join the British with his army to expel the enemy. Second, British put another burden on him because as per agreement Raja was told that he would

⁸³ For detail of Mackeson's suggestion see; R.R Sethi, Cis-Sutej States and First Sikh War, *Journal of The Punjab University Historical Society*, Vol. VI, Part II, December 1935, p. 147-148. See also; Punjab State Gazetteers, *Phulkian States*, Vol. XVII, p. 216.

⁸⁴ Lepel Henry Griffin, *The Rajas of Punjab*, p. 388.

⁸⁵ Punjab State Gazetteers, *Phulkian States*, Vol. XVII, p. 216.

⁸⁶ Lepel Henry Griffin, *The Rajas of Punjab*, p. 388. See also; Punjab State Gazetteers, *Phulkian States*, Vol. XVII, p. 216.

build and repair military roads in his territory for the passage of British army from Amabla to Ferozpur even the width of road was to be decided by British engineer. British Government had experienced that in future if some disturbance occurred they would need allies like chiefs of Cis-Sutlej States and military roads for safe transportation and passage of military in difficult time. This pre -planning helped them in near future when in 1857A.D munity happened. At that time protected chiefs stood along them as pillars of British power in Punjab.⁸⁷

According to Lepel Griffin during second Sikh war Raja Sarup Singh offered to join English army against Lahore but Government declined his services because it was not required however he was warmly thanked for his loyalty.⁸⁸ *Punjab State Gazetteers* gives same response.⁸⁹ However as per official documents British Government gets the help of Phulkian chiefs to some extent in the shape of carriage and supplies.⁹⁰

Lepel Griffin narrates the role of Raja Sarup Singh in munity in his book *The Rajas of Punjab*. When the news of munity reached him he, at once marched to Karnal on 18th May 1857 A.D where he took the charge of safety of the cantonment. However he had merely 800 men in his troop but they did well in securing the station. Raja sent a detachment to Bhagpat (area near Delhi) for the protection of the bridge so that Meerat forces could join Sir H.Benard by crossing Jamuna. Raja's troops marched in advance to restore order in Panipat.⁹¹ As per official records he didn't go direct to Karnal as at first he went to Thanesar than halted at Ghabdhan finally on the request of British Government he went to Karnal.⁹² Major C.H Buck vouches the arrival of Raja Jind on 18th of May in Karnal.⁹³

On 7th July Raja Sarup Singh joined British at Alipur and took part in the battle of Badli Serai. Commander-in-chief sent captured guns as mark of honor for their performance in battle.

⁸⁷ To see the agreement see- C.V. Aitchison, *A Collection of Treaties Engagements and Sanadas*, Vol. VIII, p. 62.

⁸⁸ Lepel Henry Griffin, *The Rajas of Punjab*, p. 389.

⁸⁹ Punjab State Gazetteers, *Phulkian States*, Vol.XVII, p. 216.

⁹⁰ Foreign Department, Secret Consultation, 30 June 1849, No. 40-49.(N.A.I)

⁹¹ Lepel Henry Griffin, *The Rajas of Punjab*, p. 391. See also; Somerset Playne, *Indian State; A Biographical, Historical and Administrative Survey*, London, 1921, p. 412. See also; Behari Lal Dingra, *Jind State, A Brief Historical and Administrative Sketch*, Times of India Press, Bombay, N.D, p. 2.

⁹² Foreign Department, Political Prog., 2 July 1858, nos. 171-172.(N.A.I)

⁹³ Major C.H Buck, *The Annals of Karnal*, Government Printing, Lahore 1914, p. 10.

Raja was again sent to Bhagpat on 21st to repair the bridge of boats which had been destroyed by insurgents. It took three days to rebuild it but mutineers again succeeded in destroying it and compel Raja to fall back. Raja then went back to Jind. Mutineers had instigated the Jind people for revolt but Sarup Singh somehow managed to control the situation. Only Raja Sarup Singh of Jind's troops had got a chance to serve in Delhi. His forces took prominent part under the command of Khan Singh in Delhi assault. Meantime, Rohtak's administration was temporarily made over to Raja Sarup Singh during most disturbed period.⁹⁴ Somerset Playne, *Mutiny Records*, Walter Lopper and Foreign Department sources give the same details.⁹⁵ Krishan Singh Betab also mentions the same that Commander-in-chief had sent canons as present.⁹⁶

After the end of mutiny in Delhi he came back to Sufidon. He appointed 25 of his men in Larsowali and in Delhi. He also sent 200 men with General Vancortlandt to Hansi and 110 men with Khan Singh commander to Jhajjar. 250 were stationed at Hansi and 20 men of Jind troops were deployed in Ghoana.⁹⁷ From official records and *Punjab State Gazetteers* and *Mutiny Records* assistance given by Raja to British can be seen.⁹⁸

Lepel Griffin tells that General Wilson in praise of Jind wrote in his dispatch of 22nd September that "Prominently to notice the admirable services performed by Raja and his troops, who are said not only to have discharged harassing duties in constant escort of convoys, but to have aided the General on more than one occasion in the field; and, finally to have participated in the capture and assault of Delhi."⁹⁹ But in *Mutiny Records* Wilson's statement is given different. He has said that "I am mainly indebted for the valuable aid of Patiala and Jind contingents, my

⁹⁴ Lepel Henry Griffin, *The Rajas of Punjab*, p. 391.

⁹⁵ Foreign Department, Political Prog. 2 July 1858, nos. 171-172. See also; *Mutiny Records Correspondence*, Part I, Punjab Government Press, Lahore 1911, pp. 152, 172. See also; N.D., *Memoranda of Information Regarding Certain Native Chiefs*, N.D., p.2. See also; Somerset Playne, *Indian State; A Biographical, Historical and Administrative Survey*, p. 412. See also; Walter Lopper Lawrence, *Ruling Princes and Chiefs of India*, Reprint 2005, Lahore, p. 269.

⁹⁶ Krishan Betab, *Ithihaas Riyast Jeend*, Sunami Gate, Sangrur, 2007, p.73.

⁹⁷ Lepel Henry Griffin, *The Rajas of Punjab*, p. 392.

⁹⁸ Foreign Department, Political Progs., 2 July 1858, nos. 171-172.(N.A.I). See also; Punjab State Gazetteers, *Phulkian States*, Vol. XVII., p. 216. See also; *Mutiny Records Correspondence*, Part II, Punjab Government Press, Lahore 1911, p. 136.

⁹⁹ Lepel Henry Griffin, *The Rajas of Punjab*, p. 393.

mean of which my communication with our rear has kept open and safe escort of numerous convoys of stores and ammunition to camp has been effected.”¹⁰⁰

Raja Sarup Singh of Jind received rewards for his participation with British Government to stop the mutiny. First, he was to be given an estate worth Rs.50,000 per year near his territory but later on a portion of Jhajjar was assign to him. But again Government had to change its decision because granted land was far away from Jind which would have been difficult for Raja to manage. Finally, Dardri was made over to Jind. This territory situated nearly 20 miles to south of Jind and between the estates of Jhajjar and Loharu, it worth Rs.1,03,000 per annum. Thirteen villages of Kularan were also given to Raja Sarup Singh of Jind worth Rs. 13,813. He also got the house of rebel Sahazada Mirza Abu Bakr which was situated in Delhi, valued Rs. 60000 in total. His salute was raised from 11 guns to 15 guns and an honorary title “Farzand Dilband RaSikh-ul-itikad Raja Sarup Singh Bhadur vali Jhind” was also conferred upon him.¹⁰¹ From Government’s official records grants discuss by Lepel Griffin which were bestowed upon Jind by British after 1857 A.D seems common.¹⁰² Metclaf and *Punjab State Gazetteers* confirm the transfer of Dardri to Jind.¹⁰³ But according to *Punjab State Gazetteers* value of Dadri area was Rs. 1,38,0000.¹⁰⁴ Somerset Playne advocates the grant to 13 villages of Kularan.¹⁰⁵ A.S per C.U Atchison total numbers of Kularan village were 14.¹⁰⁶ According to Krishan Singh Betab, instead of getting house of Mirza Abu Bakar Raja Jind on the suggestion of General Khan Singh requested to get Gurudwara Sheesh Ganjh in exchange and the request was also got approved by

¹⁰⁰ *Mutiny Records Correspondence*, Part II, p. 172.

¹⁰¹ Lepel Henry Griffin, *The Rajas of Punjab*, p. 393-394.

¹⁰² Government of India to Chief Commissioner of Punjab, 2 June 1858, Foreign Department, Part –A, no. 189. (N.A.I). See also; Government of India to Chief Commissioner of Punjab, 2 June 1858, Foreign Department, Part – A, no.187. (N.A.I). See also; Chief Commissioner of Punjab to Government of India, 13 April 1858, Foreign Department, Political Progs. 2 July 1858, no 169. (N.A.I). See also; Colonel G.B Malleeson, *An Historical Sketch of Native States of India*, Longman Green, 1875, p. 338.

¹⁰³ Charles Theophilus Metcalfe, *Two Narratives of Mutiny*, Archibald Constable, London, 1891, p. 72. See also; Punjab State Gazetteers, *Phulkian States*, Vol. XVII., p. 216.

¹⁰⁴ Punjab State Gazetteers, *Phulkian States*, Vol. XVII.,p. 216.

¹⁰⁵ Somerset Playne, *Indian State; A Biographical, Historical and Administrative Survey*, p. 412.

¹⁰⁶ C.V. Aitchison, *A Collection of Treaties Engagements and Sanadas*, Vol. VIII, p. 267.

British.¹⁰⁷ Information of raising guns salute in his honor is traceable in *Indian Princes and Crown*.¹⁰⁸ However title given in *A Collection of Treaties and Sandas* is Farzand Dilband RaSikh-ul-itikad-i-Daulat-i-Inglasia.¹⁰⁹ But according to Rai Kali title given to Raja was Raja Shaib Mushfak Mehrbaan Mukhlsaan Raj Bhadur Walli-i-Jind Slaamat.¹¹⁰

Kapurthala:

In *The Rajas of Punjab* Lepel Griffin discuss the Raja Nihal Singh's role in First Anglo-Sikh war. Lepel Griffin tells that chief was bound by treaty of 25th April 1809A.D by article 4 and article 6 to furnish supplies to British troops within Cis-Sutlej territories but Raja Nihal Singh failed to do so. Officers deployed during war blamed Nihal Singh for his misconduct in their letters which are given in *The Rajas of Punjab*. Allegations are noted below:

First, Colonel Mackeson reported that even after sending repeated requests Ahluwalia chief failed to supply grains and Captain Mills wrote in his letter that Raja Nihal Singh didn't show interest in sending any kind of supply until two battles and a very few was send by him after the final defeat of Sikh army.

Second, Major Broadfoot in his feedback told that repeated letters with strict warning to join British Government in difficult time had sent but Raja Nihal Singh neither joined nor supplied grains.

Third, John Lawrence reported in his letter that Ahluwalia chief had not delivered any information until the British authorities himself convey the message. So delayed report would become useless which were sent by Ahuluwalia agents.

Fourth, in this charge British Government revealed that Kapurthalla troops fought against the British Government at Aliwal under the command of Haider Ali and also at Buddowal. Raja Nihal Singh in his defense said that he was unable to stop his troops because his troops had confined him in his fort that's why he was not able to help the British Government. However,

¹⁰⁷ Krishan Betab, *Ithihaas Riyast Jeend*, Sunami Gate, Sangrur, 2007, p. 75.

¹⁰⁸ N.D, *Indian Princes and Crown*, Bennet and Coleman, Bombay 1912, p. 129.

¹⁰⁹ *A Collection of Treaties Engagements and Sanadas*, Vol.VIII, p. 263.

¹¹⁰ Giani Lal Singh (trans.) Rai Kali and Tulsi Ram, *Punjab Di Sair*, p. 266.

British Government was not satisfied with his excuse. Major Lawrence replied that he deliberately didn't join British because he feared the rage of Sikh and of his fate if Sikh would have won and he was well aware of that the British would forgive him, that's the reason he served us with only his empty words.¹¹¹

According to Giani Gian Singh Raja Nihal Singh in his defense said that when his own army came to know that he was about to help British than army rebelled against him and confiscated him even killed his *wazir*. He also said that if he would have tried to escape to help British authority than they would might have killed him. Even he asserted that he daily used to send 5-6 letters to the British Government and had even sent one lakh 40 maund grain to British troops. But Government denied all of his statement. Giani Gian Singh point out that at that time British Government's policy was to reduce every Sikh chief's powers that's the reason Nihal Singh's strong evidences in his defense were being got denied and consider him guilty. Same methods were being applied upon Nabha and Jind too.¹¹²

As given in Kanhiya Lal and *Kapurthalla and Its Past and Present* that during first Anglo Sikh war, rebellious soldiers of Nihal Singh made it quite difficult for him to respond to the British call. The rebel forces besieged him and bombarded the palace. Insurgents killed his minister Molvi Gulam Mohi-ud-din who was believed to have suggested his master to abide firmly to his engagements with British authorities.¹¹³ It is to be added that Lahore Darbar was virtually regarded as suzerain by the Kapurthalla and it may be said that Kapurthalla had been in subordinate alliance with Lahore Darbar at least throughout the reign of Maharaja Ranjit Singh, There had been a great attachment between the people and soldiers of Kapurthalla state and those of Lahore Darbar. Therefore probabilities of Kapurthalla forces would help the Lahore Darbar

¹¹¹ Lepel Henry Griffin, *The Rajas of Punjab*, pp. 543- 547. See also; Punjab District Gazetteers, Vol. XIV-A, *Jallandar District and Kapurthalla State*, p. 6. See also; Foreign Department Political Proceeding, 2 July 1858 nos. 166-194; Letter from Commissioner and Superintendent Trans-Sutlej to Chief Commissioner Punjab, 30 January, 1858, para 8, no. 192. (N.A.I) See also; Syad Muhhamad Latif, *History of Punjab*, Eurasia Publishing House, New Delhi, 1964, pp. 320-321.

¹¹² Giani Gian Singh, *Raj Khalsa*, Vol. II, pp. 168-169, See also; Jeet Singh Seetal (trans.)Kanhya Lal, *Traikh – i- Punjab*, p. 96.

¹¹³ N.D, *Kapurthala State- Its Past and Present*, N.D, Kapurthala, 1928, p. 11. See also; Jeet Singh Seetal (trans.)Kanhya Lal, *Traikh – i-Punjab*, p. 96.

were higher. As the matter of fact, condition of Nihal Singh had been peculiar one, his territories lies in both sides, in the Trans – Sutlej and in Cis-Sutlej even his chiefs were ally of Lahore Darbar, on the other hand he was bound to serve British authorities. So what did he could have done?

In May 1857A.D when mutiny broke out in Bengal, Raja Randhir Singh took the earliest opportunity to prove his loyalty towards the British Government.¹¹⁴ While according to A.C Arora in the revolt of 1857 A.D Sikh Chiefs found a good chance to render substantial services to British Government so as to win over their gratitude and to procure some solid territorial and some other concession from them.¹¹⁵

Lepel Griffin tells that Raja Randhir Singh was vassal of crown and was bound to render all possible aid to Government in the time of difficulties but military services could not be demanded from him as he was already paying annually a tribute of Rs.1,32,000 in commutation. But according to A.c Arora, Sohan Singh Seetal, Kapurthala Gazetteer and Ganda Singh annual *nazzarna* of Rs.1,31,000 was fixed for the commutation of military service.¹¹⁶ According to Twareakh Khalsa the total amount was Rs.1,30,000¹¹⁷. On the other hand according to Muhhamad Latif total amount was Rs.1,23,000.¹¹⁸ When first intimation broke out at Delhi and Meerut, Raja marched into Jalandhar accompanied by his brother Bikram Singh and his chief advisors, he also offered his service for Delhi but his presence was necessary in Jalandhar, as Raja's troops guard the civil station, jail and treasury.¹¹⁹ But according to Commissioner of Trans-Sutlej, Jalandhar Doab was on the essential road by which Delhi army drew its supplies and reinforcement from the Punjab so any disturbance in Jalandhar could have seriously affected

¹¹⁴ Lepel Henry Griffin, *The Rajas of Punjab*, p. 576.

¹¹⁵ A.C Arora, *British Policy Towards Punjab States 1858-1905*, p. 4.

¹¹⁶ *District Gazetteer of Kapurthala*, p. 6, Also see; Ganda Singh, *Patiala and East Punjab States Union*, p. 75. Also; Sohan Singh Seetal, *Sikh Misla Te Sardar Gahrane*, p. 123. Also; A.C Arora, *British Policy Towards Punjab States 1858-1905*, p. 26.

¹¹⁷ Giani Gian Singh, *Tawarikh Raj Khalsa*, Vol. III, S.G.P.C, Amirtsar, p. 650.

¹¹⁸ Syad Muhhamad Latif, *History of Punjab*, p. 320.

¹¹⁹ Lepel Henry Griffin, *The Rajas of Punjab*, p. 576.

the British army operation at Delhi. Even interruption in postal and telegraphic communication might have been a serious issue. That's why Raja's presence was compulsory in Jalandhar.¹²⁰

According to Lepel Griffin when mutiny broke out at Sialkot, a request was made to Raja to secure the Hoshiarpur. Raja Randhir Singh went there with 200 infantry, 100 cavalry and two light guns and he remained there till November.¹²¹ In official documents it is also written that about hundred of men of Raja's troops were remained there after the withdrawal of the British forces, they were deployed to escort the families of British officers from Jalandhar to Lahore.¹²²

The number of Kapurthala troops employed in 1857 A.D by Raja Randhir Singh from May to November consisted 1200 infantry, 200 cavalry, 5 guns and for this force Government sanctioned gratitude equivalent to Rs. 12000, which was paid as a monthly salary to each soldier.¹²³

Lepel Griffin in *The Rajas of Punjab* praises Raja Randhir Singh of Kapurthala's services during 1857 A.D. He said that Government was not much powerful in Cis-Sutlej states but Raja's conduct saved Jalandhar Doab. This could happen only because of reliable force of Raja Randhir Singh when at crucial time other lukewarm friends left Government.¹²⁴

But here Lepel Griffin didn't discuss about the actual statement of Chief Commissioner and preceding words of praise which were actually said by Government of India as an explanation to Chief Commissioner. In his report Chief Commissioner admitted that Raja Randhir Singh provided valuable services during 1857 A.D mutiny but services rendered by him

¹²⁰ Commissioner and Superintendent Trans-Sutlej to Judicial Commissioner Punjab, 5 January 1858. Punjab Government Records, *Mutiny Reports*, Vol. VIII, Part I, Lahore 1911, pp. 142-147.

¹²¹ Lepel Henry Griffin, *The Rajas of Punjab*, p. 576. See also; Giani Gian Singh, *Tawarikh Raj Khalsa*, Vol. III, p. 650.

¹²² From Commissioner to Superintendent Trans-Sutlej States to Chief Commissioner Punjab, 30 January 1858, Foreign Department, Political Proceeding, 2 July 1858, No. 192, para 15-16. (N.A.I)

¹²³ Lepel Henry Griffin, *The Rajas of Punjab*, p. 577. See also; From Secretary to Chief Commissioner of Punjab to Secretary to Government of India, 8th April 1858, Foreign Department, Political Proceedings, no. 191, para 4. (N.A.I) See also; N.D, *Kapurthala State- Its Past and Present*, N.D, Kapurthala, 1928, p. 12.

¹²⁴ Lepel Henry Griffin, *The Rajas of Punjab*, p. 577. See also; Giani Gian Singh, *Tawarikh Raj Khalsa*, Vol. III, p. 651.

had been presented in overrated manner in the Commissioner's report.¹²⁵ He stated that, it would not be correct to attribute the safety of the Civil Treasury of Jalandhar in the presence of Raja because the cash had been deposited in the cantonment, he further refuse to admit that the success of operation of Delhi depend upon the preservation of order in the Jalandhar Doab because the line from Lahore to Ferozpur and from Lahore to Ludhiana was also open to British Government.¹²⁶

Not only this, Raja Randhir Singh of Kapurthala also offered his services in Oudh or Awadh along with his brother Bikram Singh for restoration of peace and order. It has been recorded that the Kapurthala contingent met enemy in the field six times and captured nine guns. British officers of Awadh highly appreciate the help rendered by Raja and his troops. At the end of March 1859 A.D Raja's force was released from service and came back to Punjab.¹²⁷

For his services Government of India rewarded him with affectionately manner according to Lepel Griffin. Tribute of 1857 A.D was remitted and annual tribute for future was reduced to Rs.25000 per year also *khillat* of Rs.15000 granted to him and Rs.5000 to his brother.¹²⁸ But as per *Tawareakh Khalsa*, amount of 10,000 was granted as *khilatt* to his brother.¹²⁹ Lepel Griffin tells that the salute of 11 guns was assigned to him and honorary title of Farazand-Dilband-RaSikh-Ul-Itikad was given to him for his services.¹³⁰ As mentioned in *Kapurthala State and its*

¹²⁵ Report of Commissioner from Jalandhar : 'On the Night of the Mutiny no attempt was made to release the convicts from the Jail, to Rob the treasury or to plunder the property , private and public must be attributed to the Rajah of Ahluwalia Rajah and his troops, who supplied all the guards in civil lines' . For Detail See Mutiny Records, Part I, pp. 142-147.

¹²⁶ From Chief Commissioner to Government of India, 8 April 1858, Foreign Department, Political Proceedings, 2 July 1858, no. 191, para 2. (N.A.I)

¹²⁷ Lepel Henry Griffin, *The Rajas of Punjab*, Low Price Publication, Delhi, Reprint 2014, pp. 578-579. See also; Giani Gian Singh, *Tawarikh Raj Khalsa*, Vol. III, p. 652. See also; A.C Arora, *British Policy Towards Punjab States 1858-1905*, p. 27. See also; Anju Arora, *British Paramountcy and Internal Administration (1858-1948)*, National Book Organization, New Delhi, 2001, p. 42.

¹²⁸ Lepel Henry Griffin, *The Rajas of Punjab*, Low Price Publication, Delhi, Reprint 2014, pp. 578. See also; Giani Gian Singh, *Tawarikh Raj Khalsa*, Vol. III, p. 652. See also; Jeet Singh Seetal (trans.) Kanhyia Lal, *Traikh – i- Punjab*, Punjabi University, Patiala, 1968, p. 97.

¹²⁹ Giani Gian Singh, *Twareakh Raj Khalsa*, Vol. III, p. 652.

¹³⁰ Lepel Henry Griffin, *The Rajas of Punjab*, pp. 578.

Past and Present the title was Farazand-i-Dilband-RaSikh–Ul-Itiqad Daulat-i-Inglisiah instead of Farazand-Dilband-RaSikh–Ul-Itikad.¹³¹ On the contrary, Anju Arora tells that Daulat-i-Inglisiah was later added as per the recommendation of the Punjab Government.¹³² Title of Bhadur was given to Bikram Singh according to Lepel Griffin and Bhagat Singh confirms it.¹³³ But according to *Soorbir Khalsa* and Sohan Singh Seetal title Bhadur was given to Raja Randhir Singh.¹³⁴ Just the opposite; Fuzund Dilbund Rasekool Itheqad Raja Rajegan Raja Runder Singh Bhadur title have been used in C.V Aitchison official treaties collection.¹³⁵

Raja Randhir Singh was also rewarded with a grant of *istimari* tenure of two estates of Boundi and Bithouli worth rupees 1 lakh per year and estate of Akaona was given to his brother Bikram Singh worth Rs. 45000 per year. In *The Rajas of Punjab* it has been told in brief that lately this property matter became court issue in author's time. Later on, Akaona was transferred to the present Raja Randhir Singh of Kapurthala at that time.¹³⁶ As per given in *Kapurthala Gazetteer* and *Tawareakh Khalsa* this property was won by Raja in 1869 A.D under the arbitrary orders of Chief Commissioner Sir Henry David of Awadh. Bikram Singh instead of Akoana was given land in Lakhmirpur and in Bareilly, worth of rupees 5 lakh by Kapurthala.¹³⁷ While in the times of Lepel Griffin, Akoana's income was 3 Lakh from which 1 Lakh 32 thousand was being taken by Government in shape of tax.¹³⁸

Lepel Griffin affirmed in his writing that garden of Naraingarh situated in Ambala which had been confiscated during First-Anglo Sikh war was also given back to Raja Randhir Singh and a *sanad* was granted on 15th April 1859 A.D, in which along with possession a term was

¹³¹ N.D, *Kapurthala State- Its Past and Present* by an official, N.D, Kapurthala, 1928, p. 12.

¹³² Anju Arora, *British Paramountcy and Internal Administration (1858-1948)*, p. 50.

¹³³ Lepel Henry Griffin, *The Rajas of Punjab*, p. 578. See also; Bhagat Singh, *History of Sikh Misals*, Publication Bureau, Punjabi University, Patiala, 2009, p. 86.

¹³⁴ Bishan Singh Giani, *Panth Parkash Soorbir Khalsa*, Master Sunder G.A.V Khalsa College, Amritsar, p. 86. See also; Sohan Singh Seetal, *Sikh Misl Te Sardar Gahrane*, Lahore Book Shop, Ludhiana, p. 123.

¹³⁵ C.V. Aitchison, *A Collection of Treaties Engagements and Sanadas*, Vol. VIII, Central Archeological Library, New Delhi, 1960, p. 362.

¹³⁶ Lepel Henry Griffin, *The Rajas of Punjab*, pp. 580.

¹³⁷ *District Gazetteer of Kapurthala*, 1907, p. 7 Also see; Giani Gian Singh, *Raj Khalsa*, Vol. II, p.177.

¹³⁸ Giani Gian Singh, *Raj Khalsa*, Vol. II, p. 177.

being added that in the time of either difficulty or in any danger Raja shall render political and military services to Government.¹³⁹

It has been defined earlier that till mutiny of 1857 A.D Kapurthala was not bound to render any military services but the policy of Government was being changed after Queen's Proclamation of 1858 A.D. In spite of this, even after 1857 A.D this term was added to the duties of Kapurthala. The exact motive of this term can only be traced from the remarks of Canning's Dispatch. Which have been discussed in Anju Arora's work and in '*The Panjab Past and Present*.' Canning said that British Government instead of focusing on extending their territories they must focused on strengthening their rule within the present limits because they didn't have sufficient European force, no adequate British staff and financial condition were also feeble in current situation to manage any further extension. He further acclaimed by giving Malcom's remarks that "If we would keep on turning all India into Districts, our rule may last only for fifty years but if we would manage to keep number of Native states without political powers but as our loyal instruments, we would exist in India for long."¹⁴⁰ It is to be noted that estates which were given to Raja Randhir Singh of Kapurthala, were given without conferring political powers to him.

Lepel Griffin assured that the most privileged award to Raja was 'Right of Adoption' by Lord Canning.¹⁴¹ While according to C.V Aitchsion's *A Collection of Treaties, sanad* was allotted not only especially to Kapurthalla but to several other Princes of India too.¹⁴²

In the words of Lepel Griffin, Raja Randhir Singh had an ambition of ruling over the estates of Bari Doab, which was being resumed by British Government after the death of his

¹³⁹ Lepel Henry Griffin, *The Rajas of Punjab*, Low Price Publication, Delhi, Reprint 2014, pp. 580. See also; C.V. Aitchsion, *A Collection of Treaties Engagements and Sanadas*, Vol. VIII, p. 362.

¹⁴⁰ Anju Arora, *British Paramountcy and Internal Administration (1858-1948)*, p. 43-44. See also; Buta Singh Sekhon, *Relations between Paramountcy and Punjab States (1858-1947)*, *The Punjab and Present*, Punjabi University, Patiala, October 2003, p. 86.

¹⁴¹ Lepel Henry Griffin, *The Rajas of Punjab*, p. 581.

¹⁴² C.V. Aitchsion, *A Collection of Treaties Engagements and Sanadas*, Vol. VIII, p. 362. See also; A.C Arora, *British Policy Towards Punjab States 1858-1905*, p. 35. See also; Anju Arora, *British Paramountcy and Internal Administration (1858-1948)*, p. 50.

father Raja Nihal Singh, were restored to him for an annual tribute of Rs.25,000 per year.¹⁴³ But without conferring any civil and political powers to Raja. Eventually Raja became unsatisfied¹⁴⁴ due to the Government's refusal to restore these powers; in the same manner as it has been discussed earlier in the policy of Lord Canning.

In an another affair of title grants, Lepel Griffin describes, that on the appeal of Oudh Chief Commissioner, Government of India presents the Raja with title of Raja-i-Rajghan. But this title was to be used only in Oudh not in Punjab in order to place him higher than any other ordinary *Taluqadars*.¹⁴⁵ But as stated in Anju Arora's book, Chief Commissioner proposed that due to civilized life of Raja, his excellent command on English, European history and on politics, he might be vested with the title of Knight Commander of Bath. But Government refused by saying that it might cause embarrassment to Chiefs of Punjab attaining equal ranks.¹⁴⁶

On 17th October 1864 A.D Raja got another high ranked as award from British Government in the presence of independent chiefs of India at Lahore darbar; 'Star of India' was the award which was presented by Governor General Lord Lawrence.¹⁴⁷ This ceremony which Lepel Griffin affirms can be confirmed from several documents.¹⁴⁸

In the Darbar, Viceroy in his speech as given in *The Rajas of Punjab* declared that this award of 'Star of India' bestowed only to the chiefs of highest rank. But here this should be noted that Kapurthala state has always been treated as inferior state in the context of Phulkian states. For an example, some important concessions were given to Phulkian states for their *Paper of Requests 1858 A.D.*¹⁴⁹ Kapurthala was exempted from the power of life and death sentences. Likewise Kapurthala was given 'Right of Adoption' on the failure of the heir apparent much

¹⁴³ Lepel Henry Griffin, *The Rajas of Punjab*, p. 583.

¹⁴⁴ Foreign Department, Political Proceedings, 3 February 1860, no. 84-87. (N.A.I)

¹⁴⁵ Lepel Henry Griffin, *The Rajas of Punjab*, p. 583.

¹⁴⁶ Anju Arora, *British Paramountcy and Internal Administration (1858-1948)*, p. 48.

¹⁴⁷ Lepel Henry Griffin, *The Rajas of Punjab*, p. 585.

¹⁴⁸ Sohan Singh Seetal, *Sikh Misl Te Sardar Gahrane*, Lahore Book Shop, Ludhiana, p. 123. See also; N.D, *Kapurthala State- Its Past and Present*, N.D, Kapurthala, 1928, p. 13. See also; Bishan Singh Giani, *Panth Parkash Soorbir Khalsa*, p. 89. See also; Syad Muhammad Latif, *History of Punjab*, p. 321.

¹⁴⁹ Foreign Department, Political Consultation, 27 May 1859, no. 85-87.(N.A.I)

later as compare to the other Phulkian chiefs, and there are number of other incidents when Kapurthala state was considered inferior.¹⁵⁰

During the last period of Raja Randhir Singh, Lepel Griffin describes that Raja's earnest wish was to visit England. Therefore he left for England in 1870 A.D. But he died at Aden during his journey to England due to liver infection. So his body was conveyed to Bombay and ceremonies of cremation were performed by his son Kharak Singh.¹⁵¹

In the coronation speech of Kharak Singh in *The Rajas of Punjab* is given that installation took place on 12 May 1870 A.D after the death of his father. Col. Coxe and subjects of Kapurthala and Oudh, presented the Raja with the amount of rupees worth 1, 25000 in total.¹⁵² But according to *Raj Khalsa* amount was Rs. 1,20000 Lakh in total.¹⁵³ Kharak Singh proposed that with this money a College and a Hospital would be built under the name of his deceased father and amount of 2 lakh rupees would be deposited in the Government security in form of Promissory notes and Interest attained per annum 10,000 would be used in maintenance. Bhagat Singh, Bishan Singh confirms this.¹⁵⁴ But according to *Raj Khalsa* the interest gained from Promissory notes was 19,000 instead of 10,000 as given in *The Rajas of Punjab*.¹⁵⁵

In 1857 A.D when mutiny broke, during instability of law and order Maharaja of Patiala showed great allegiance, even Jind and Nabha also presented distinguished service towards British Government. These services which Lepel Griffin wrote are confirmed by R.C Majumdar and by A.C

¹⁵⁰ For details of these Incidents see, Anjua Arora, *British Paramountcy and Internal Administration (1858-1948)*, pp. 51-54.

¹⁵¹ Lepel Henry Griffin, *The Rajas of Punjab*, p. 588. Giani Gian Singh, *Tawarikh Raj Khalsa*, Vol.III, p. 65. See also; Sohan Singh Seetal, *Sikh Misla Te Sardar Gahrane*, p. 123. See also; *District Gazetteer of Kapurthala*, 1904, p.7.

¹⁵² Lepel Henry Griffin, *The Rajas of Punjab*, p. 594. See also; Bhagat Singh, *History of Sikh Misals*, Publication Bureau, Punjabi University, Patiala, 2009, p. 87.

¹⁵³ Giani Gian Singh, *Raj Khalsa*, Vol.III, p. 179.

¹⁵⁴ Lepel Henry Griffin, *The Rajas of Punjab*, p. 596. See also; Bishan Singh Giani, *Panth Parkash Soorbir Khalsa*, p. 86. See also; Bhagat Singh, *History of Sikh Misals*, Publication Bureau, Punjabi University, Patiala, 2009, p. 87. See also; Giani Gian Singh, p. 658.

¹⁵⁵ Giani Gian Singh, *Raj Khalsa*, Vol. II, p. 179.

Arora.¹⁵⁶ So, Cis-Sutlej demanded rewards for their services in shape of their eight requests incorporated in “Phulkian Chief’s Papers of Requests” or were called *Wajib-Ul-Arz*¹⁵⁷.

Their first demand was for the allowance of power to impose capital punishment which was taken away from them in 1847 A.D. Under British influence, no permission of severe punishments was allowed to them and they weren’t allowed to execute extreme sentences without consent of Political Agent or Commissioner. Chiefs regarded this as limiting their powers. So they start sending fewer applications to British Agent for the approval of punishment from 1847 A.D to 1857 A.D because approval was being made important for them to be taken from British Agent, by this they tried to dodge these rules by sending lesser application. Only two applications from Jind and one from Faridkot were made. The three Phulkian Chiefs demanded power of life and death sentence that must be again resorted to them. Agent sent this request to commissioner for removing the restriction which was imposed on punishment. According to Lepel Griffin, Chief Commissioner accepted this request and told that this request was superior for all chiefs more than anything else and so this power was resorted to them again¹⁵⁸.

But here A.C Arora gives reason that Agent had recommended the removal of this restriction because he had observed that he had not empowered to hear these cases because neither any criminal was ever brought to him nor any witness. Only a short and plotted idea was being brought towards him and thus he was being compelled to reward death sentence to the person. He told in his letters to chief commissioner that nothing could ever stop the Princely Chiefs to award death sentence to any person if they want. They gave punishment in secret ways and had never referred a single case to him .He said that he got only 2 cases from Jind, but not a single case from Raja of Patiala .He further added that the situation was very irrelevant to him and it was very complex to maintain law and order. He said that rulers presented cases in so arranged manners before him that he could not deny but to give his consent for what they were being expected to do. He also added that he suffered most from Patiala. He said that during the late disturbance in revolt, he had authorized them with power

¹⁵⁶ R.C Majumdar, *The Sepoy Mutiny and Revolt of 1857*, K.L Mukhopadhyaya, Calcutta, 1963, p. 278. See also; A. C Arora, *Patiala Riyast vich British Sarvuchta da Vikas 1809 -1938*, Punjabi University, Patiala, 1999, p. 71.

¹⁵⁷ *Wajib – ul-Arz* to Governor General, Feb 5 .1858, File no. H- 514, N.S, Case no. 135, Punjab State Archives, Patiala.

¹⁵⁸ Lepel Henry Griffin, *The Rajas of Punjab*, p. 246.

of execution for precarious criminals without his consent, and he saw no possible point in withholding these powers for him in future. Lastly, he further added that Raja of Jind had told him that he would hardly care to accept the grant of Dadri unless this power was given to him. Thus Government of India accepted proposal.¹⁵⁹ But here S.N. Banerjee gives a statement which is slightly different from the power of punishment which was transferred to the chiefs during mutiny, that Agent felt without this power it would become difficult for chiefs to control the situation in their respective states, so he empowered them to execute heinous criminals without his consent but he was not able to withhold the power in future.¹⁶⁰

Their second request was that in case of minor ruler's succession until the time of his maturity, to run the state administration successfully a Council of Regency should be formed, and condition was that Council of Regency should be created among the three houses of Phulkian families, even members of this Council Regency should only be selected by British Agent and by two other Phulkian Chiefs. In this Council, strangers and relative of minor should not be included and selected members must be the old and trustworthy servants of the state.¹⁶¹

But according to S.N Banerjee a stranger could be added with the permission of two Council Chiefs, and if anyone found guilty or create disturbance in Council than the new successor would be chosen by same procedure.¹⁶² While A.C Arora gives further detail that why these distinguish demands were being made. According to him three things were implied were as follow:- First- two surviving Chiefs have had vital hand along with the authority of Commissioner in choosing member for Regency. It is remarkable to note that Phulkian Chiefs although in general were very jealous of one another, but surprisingly joined hand together in dealing with British, in the matters of their common interests. That's why they preferred to keep the decision about the choice of the members of Regency of Council in their own family house instead of leaving to outsiders. Second was that, the members of Regency would be selected among the old, experience and trustworthy members only, who would run administration devotedly and smoothly .Idea of discrimination of one might incite jealousy and intrigues from others. Third was that, the most significant outsiders and relatives

¹⁵⁹ A.C Arora, Phulkian Chiefs Papers of Requests, *The Punjab Past and Present*, p. 237.

¹⁶⁰ S.N, Banerjee, *A History of Patiala*, Vol.II, p. 71.

¹⁶¹ Lepel Henry Griffin, *The Rajas of Punjab*, p. 246.

¹⁶² S.N, Banerjee, *A History of Patiala*, Vol.II, p. 71.

of the underage ruler were not be included in Council .The exclusion of strangers was proposed to certainly to remove the apprehensions of Phulikan Chiefs, on the other hand the British could add their own candidate in Council which might would have been very suitable virtually for most powers of the state.¹⁶³

On other hand commissioner's remarks which are not given in *The Rajas of Punjab* on this fourth request were "It was very intelligent demand. He said it was good to handover states into experienced hands .In this council it will be a big mistake to nominate our own members"¹⁶⁴

As stated in *The Rajas of Punjab*, third and fourth requests made by the Phulkian Chiefs were the most important for them i.e. right of adoption. In case of failure of male heir among the members of the Phulkian families or in case of death of Phulkian Chief without male inheritor or without having adopted descendant than the two of the lasting Chiefs must be given power to select a successor from Baba Phul's family. Here Lepel Griffin states that this wasn't prevailed in Sikh traditions or in Cis- Sutlej and Trans-Sutlej states to adopt and carrying with it all the right of successions to private property and to enjoyed by son of the deceased, had never been acknowledged as conferring any right of succession to chief ship. In Punjab proper, the Maharaja at Lahore and south of the Sutlej, the British Government claimant as paramount powers, the right of inheriting all estates to which there was no male heirs, among them whom had adopted son had no place.¹⁶⁵

Lepel Griffin agreed with situations of Chiefs by saying that Chiefs were in fear of losing their territories after death without successor. They were scared because their most loved portion would become an escheat of British Government, which has been threatening them from upcoming future in which at any times their territory could be absorbed. There are number of examples of these cases that had fallen to Government from time to time, it's very first example was connected with the country in the north of Delhi which was very vast, and Chief ship of this portions had been wrapped up in British empire on the basis of failure of male heir. He himself agrees with his

¹⁶³ A.C Arora, Phulkian Chiefs Papers of Requests, *The Punjab Past and Present*, p. 235.

¹⁶⁴ Chief Commissioner to Indian Government, Foreign Department, F.C. No. 84, 16 June 1858, para 3. (N.A.I)

¹⁶⁵ Lepel Henry Griffin, *The Rajas of Punjab*, p. 247.

Government's policy, which clearly states that it was their keen desire to apply these unjust policies over the Princes of India.¹⁶⁶

Lepel Griffin said that cause of inheritor issue was mainly because of their addiction to intoxicated things; this seems to be true because many of the princely Chiefs died due to over drinking or bad habits, which has also been discussed by Lepel Griffin in *The Rajas of Punjab*. Lepel Griffin further discuss that 1857 A.D revolt had taught many things so government thought to give up the idea of taking over any future escheats.¹⁶⁷ But in spite of this, Tupper and A.C Arora both says that policy of British Government was not clear, especially towards Phulkian states the policy of government was more confusing. In early years widows enjoyed the right of succession of their deceased husband¹⁶⁸ but British rule declared the succession should always remain with the male dominant even Griffin agrees that Government in 1857 A.D excluded the female from succession. However the custom of *chadar dalna or karewa*, example; the brother of dead marrying his widow to become heir, was petty common among Phulkian families. But Nabha, Jind and Patiala stopped using this custom altogether.¹⁶⁹ According to Griffin, British Government was not willing to allow this request because of their policies, which had been prevailed since long time and was working successfully but here he didn't clearly mentions about which policy he is talking about. Probably it might be Policy of Lapse about which he was talking about. It became clear from correspondence between Punjab Government and India Government and from Lee Warner and W.W Hunter's statements that British Government was not in favor of this grant because they could lose the right of the lapse policy.¹⁷⁰ On other hand Warner's remarks was that the Court of Director's policy was clear that concession of adoption was optional but rule shouldn't be given.¹⁷¹

Phulikan Chief's fifth request was that women must not be selected for the Council of Regency or no participation in affairs of states and any kind of complaint lodged by women of their family must not be heard by British Government. On this request Griffin writes that Government

¹⁶⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 248.

¹⁶⁷ Lepel Henry Griffin, *The Rajas of Punjab*, p. 249.

¹⁶⁸ Charles Lewis Tupper, *Our Indian Protectorate*, Longman Green, London, 1891, p. 106.

¹⁶⁹ Lepel Henry Griffin, *The Law of Inheritance to Sikh Chief Ship*, Punjab Printing, Lahore 1869, pp. 18-19.

¹⁷⁰ Letter of Indian Government to Punjab Government, Foreign Department, F. C, 20 May 1858, no. 85, para 5-6.
(N.A.I)

¹⁷¹ William Lee Warner, *The Life of Dalhousie*, Savielle and Corenburgh Press, London, 1972, p. 129.

agreed to exclusion of women participation in Council. But according to him Government was not bound to surrender the right of interference when the matter was related with the women protection. These recommendations are found same in the letters of Government that British commissioner consider it as a wise request that women should not be included in Regency but in case of humanity basis Government might have to interfere¹⁷².

Their sixth request as given in *The Rajas of Punjab* was that British Government should promise that they would not make any interference on the behalf of relative's connection, or dependants of the family. Griffin tells here that Government could not bond itself with such promises because its interference never had been, nor would be great. Confirmation can be seen in official letter where Governor General and council agreed with this thought.¹⁷³

Seventh request which Lepel Griffin explains was more confusing for British Government than for Chiefs of Punjab. Chiefs demanded a *Sanad* guaranteeing them their hereditary ownership under the hand seal of Queen of England. Here one thing should be noted that Griffin left the commissioner's recommendation's remark, which commissioner send it for its approval from Government because he believed that Chiefs will definitely praise this reward and their trust would be doubled in British Government, so it would be very wise for us to accept this proposal,¹⁷⁴ to this senior official were not willing but Griffin says that they found this demand unnecessary and no need of *Sanad* from Queen was required. But he didn't mention the exact reason to describe it as unimportant.¹⁷⁵ But exact reason lies behind with British policy if they would have accepted Punjab Chief's request than other minor Chiefs of India like Holkar, Sindhia would also forward to get their right as equal status as to the Punjab Chiefs . So situation would become more complex to approve this request. Which are expressed by officials of British Government in their letters and also confirmed by S.N Banerjee and A.C Arora, So British were well acquainted with compatibility of

¹⁷² Letter from Commissioner Cis-Sutlej Sates to Chief Commissioner Punjab, May 20 1858 ,Foreign Department, F.C, no. 85, para 7. (N.A.I)

¹⁷³ Letter from Indian Government to Punjab Government, 20 May, 1859, Foreign Department, F.C, no. 87, para 6. (N.A.I)

¹⁷⁴ Letter Commissioner Cis-Sutlej States to Chief Commissioner of Punjab, 20 May 1858, Foreign Department, F.C, No. 85, para 9. (N.A.I)

¹⁷⁵ Lepel Henry Griffin, *The Rajas of Punjab*, 253.

this request so they decided to decline it, and they suggested that an answer should be given to Phulikan Chiefs that their areas and their authority are secured under Queen's representatives.¹⁷⁶

There eighth and final request was that, no claims against their subjects should be heard in the civil courts which were situated in the British occupied territory. The rule at that time was that, no claims could be entertained in the British courts unless the cause of action arose in the British territory or the defendant has possessed property in that area. However, Chief Commissioner was not in favor of changing existing system as it as we found it in Lepel Griffin's book. So demand was rejected as it is told.¹⁷⁷

Even though not all the demands of Phulkian Chiefs were approved, and only those were fulfilled which were seemed suitable to the British Government .Viceroy awarded *Sandas* of adoption on 5th may 1860 A.D in open Durbar and all the promises which were made there, are written in *The Rajas of Punjab* and it can also be traced in the collection of treaties by C.V Atichson. In this Open Darbar which was held at Ambala ,Viceroy made them to believe that they could trust British Government in every aspect whether it was related to their territory , their ancestral land or their integrity as well as chiefs were given assurance that their dignity, pride, status would be remain same as it was earlier. British government promised that it would always be ready to help them and they could serve and rule in their territories without panic because they were being protected by Queen's representatives under the will of Majesty. However, in favor Rajas have to serve Great Britain with loyalty and full devotion, and protected chiefs would have to cooperate with British at time of intrusion by an enemy and that they would maintain law and order in their territories. Even chiefs were also expected that they would try to eradicate inhuman rituals and try to ease the problems of people of their own land. These promises which were made on 5th may1860 are

¹⁷⁶ A. C Arora, *Patiala Riyast vich British Sravuchta da Vikas*, 1809 -1938 ,Punjabi University Patiala, 1999, p. 71. See also; From Commissioner to Cis-Sutlej states to Secretary to the Chief Commissioner, Punjab no. 149, Foreign Department, F.C, 27 May 1859, no. 85. (N.A.I)

¹⁷⁷ From Secretary to Chief Commissioner to Secretary to Government of India, Foreign Department, F.C, 27 May 1859, no. 87. (N.A.I)

traceable in same manner as mentioned above. These are given in clause shape, total ten in numbers.¹⁷⁸

Faridkot:

Lepel Griffin reveals that intention of Pahar Singh behind helping the British in war of 1845 A.D against Lahore Darbar was to get Kotkapura.¹⁷⁹ So, when many chiefs were indifferent or hostile than he helped the British by helping them in arranging supplies and carriages. He did excellent service in Firozshar battle and remained loyal. For this British awarded him with grant of half territory which was seized from Nabha, worth Rs. 35,612 and what he wished for, was restored to him i.e. Kotkapura.¹⁸⁰ His services during Anglo-Sikh war can be trace in official documents.¹⁸¹ According to I. Banerjee, British Government awarded the chief with title 'Raja' for his distinguish services.¹⁸²

¹⁷⁸ Lepel Henry Griffin , *The Rajas of Punjab*, p. 254-257. See also; C. V Atchison, *A Collection of Treaties Engagements and Sandas*, Vol –III, p.161-65.

¹⁷⁹ Kotakapura was under Lahore. It was only six to seven miles from the south of Faridkot and was ancestral property of Faridkot.

¹⁸⁰ Lepel Henry Griffin, *The Rajas of Punjab*, p. 619.

¹⁸¹ Foreign Department, Secret , 25 August 1849, no. 77, no. 78 (N.A.I) Also See: Shah Muhhamad's poem(He was a contemporary poet)

ਪਹਾੜਾ ਸਿੰਘ ਸੀ ਯਾਰ ਫਿਰੰਗੀਆ ਦਾ

ਸਿੰਘਾ ਨਾਲ ਸੀ ਉਸ ਦੀ ਗੈਰਮਾਨੀ|

ਓ ਤਾ ਭਜ ਕੇ ਨਾਵ ਨੂ ਜਾਇ ਮਿਲਿਆ,

ਗਲ ਜਾਇ ਦੱਸੀ ਸਾਰੀ ਭੇਤ ਵਾਲੀ |

ਉਥੇ ਹੋ ਗਿਆ ਹਰਨ ਹੈ ਖਾਲਸਾ ਜੀ,

ਚੌਦਾ ਹਥਾ ਦੀ ਮਾਰ ਕੇ ਮਿਰਗ-ਛਾਲੀ|

Also see: The resumed territory of Nabha was confiscated in 1846 A.D and was equally divided between Faridkot and Patiala. Foreign Department, Secret, 26 August 1856, Nos. 1280-1313.

¹⁸² I. Banerjee, Bengal Past and Present, *The Cis-Sutlej States in The Crisis of First Anglo-Sikh War*, Vol. LXXIV, Serial no. 138-139, 1955, p. 79.

It has been given in *The Rajas of Punjab* that Raja Pahar Singh died on April 1849 A.D and was succeeded by his son Wazir Singh.¹⁸³ Source *The City of Faridkot* advocates the statement.¹⁸⁴

Lepel Griffin in his work discusses the services of Wazir Singh during mutiny of 1857 A.D. Wazir Singh seized several mutineers and gave them over to British authorities. He worked under the command of Deputy of Ferozpur and guarded the ferries.¹⁸⁵ Similar content can be seen in *Punjab State Gazetteers, Memoranda of Information of Chiefs*.¹⁸⁶

One of his body of troops under the General Van Cortlandt attacked rebel Sham Das. For this gallantry services he was awarded with a title of “Burar Bans Raja Shaib Bhadur” along with a *khillat* of eleven pieces and a salute of 11 guns. On March 11, 1862 A.D he was also awarded with the right of adoption.¹⁸⁷ Exact same information is given in *Punjab State Gazetteers, Memoranda of Information of Chiefs, A Historical Sketch of Native States*.¹⁸⁸

¹⁸³ Lepel Henry Griffin, *The Rajas of Punjab*, p. 620.

¹⁸⁴ Fauja Singh and R.C Rabra, *City of Faridkot Past and Present*, Punjabi University, Patiala, 1997, p. 23.

¹⁸⁵ Lepel Henry Griffin, *The Rajas of Punjab*, p. 620.

¹⁸⁶ Punjab State Gazetteers, Faridkot State, p. 48. See also: N.D, *Memoranda of Information Regarding Certain Native Chiefs*, N.D, p. 2.

¹⁸⁷ Lepel Henry Griffin, *The Rajas of Punjab*, pp. 620-621.

¹⁸⁸ Punjab State Gazetteers, Faridkot State, p. 49. See also: N.D, *Memoranda of Information Regarding Certain Native Chiefs*, N.D, p.3. Also see: Colonel G.B Malleson, *An Historical Sketch of The Native States of India*, Longman Green, London, 1875, p. 341.

Conclusion

At the dawn of the 19th century the Marathas held complete control over the imperial capital Delhi and the areas around it. The English were gradually moving forward in this direction. A clash between the two became almost predictable. On the other hand, Zaman Shah, Durrani ruler of Kabul, was contemplating to recover the Punjab and Delhi. He had already made more than one attempt, had crossed the Attock but was called back to Kabul for reasons of trouble in home politics. All these circumstances had increased the strategic and political significance of the Cis- Sutlej area or the land between the Jamuna and Sutlej, which was precisely called Sir-i-Hind or Tabr-i-Hind viz the axe on head of India.

The occupants of the area were generally the Phulikan and some of the Manjha Sikhs, who has conquered it from the Afghan *faujdar*, Zain Khan, in 1764 A.D and had subsequently, laid the foundation of their several principalities, out of which four major states were Patiala, Nabha, Jind and Kaithal. There were hundreds of minor too. Besides there were also three Muslim states i.e. Raikot, Malerkotla and Kunjpura in the area, and the states of Kapurthala, these territories mainly lay in Jalandhar Doab, also possessed about 250 villages in the Cis-Sutlej region.

After a constant struggle of about twenty years against the Mughals and the Afghans, these Sikh states had gained an independent status during the 18th century.

It was quite difficult to trace the boundaries or to determine the individual revenue and the forces of each of these states, as they were always changing, but collectively its area could be said to have extended from the Jamna in the west, to the Sutlej in the north, to the Shiwalik hills in north-east, and to the confines of the Haryana tract in the south and southeast.

The population of this tract consisted mainly of Jats, Gujars, Dogras, a large number of whom had accepted Sikhism. Here, Hindu and Muslim both lived together. The foremost profession of the people was agriculture. Huge taxes were levied by the chiefs on the commodities, which ever passed through their respective area. For some decades past most anarchic situations had prevailed in this area, hence every village and town was fortified for self defense.

The prominent rulers of the states at the time were Raja Shaib Singh of Patiala, Bhai Lal Singh of Kaithal, Raja Bhag Singh of Jind, Raja Jaswant Singh of Nabha and Raja Fateh Singh of Kapurthala.

The Cis-Sutlej chiefs were supreme in their own states and allowed the remnants of the Mughal provincial administrative system, which had survived the distress of the 18th century, to carry on the function in their respective states. There were no confined law and justice was forceful and ready. There were neither regular prison nor was capital punishment ever resorted to. The common form of penalty were fine, extra duty, mutilation, stocks and fancy punishment such as blacking of the face of the culprit or stamping and branding of his forehead and exiling him from his native town. The system of trial by ordeal was not unknown and the theory of punishment was rather retributive.

These states followed distinguish course of history from that of the Manjha Sikhs in the Trans-Sutlej area, though the growing power of Maharaja Ranjit Singh towards the close of the 18th century proved to be a severe threat to their independence. Their attitude towards the English, as was exposed by the mission of the Yusuf Ali Khan, was that of responsive cooperation. The Mughals emperor having lost all his former powers and prestige, except the enjoyment of nominal sovereignty over the territories between the Sutlej and Chambal, the chiefs of these states acknowledged and paid him homage only when it suited them. But the Sikhs, as a political body had no unity among themselves due to which they suffered greatly at the hands of their opponents. It was only an exceptional occasion that the major and the some of the minor Cis-Sutlej Sikhs chiefs did pool their resources and took a united stand against a common rival.

However, their efforts for independence were hardly ended when they were called upon to embark in a fresh struggle which continued throughout the first decade of the 19th century. During this struggle the chiefs had to face the plot and aggressive designs of several powers against their own possession and privileged, to fight which they had to mobilize all their diplomatic skill, besides their own resources.

Best source to get information about these chiefs is *The Rajas of Punjab* which was written by Lepel Henry Griffin. It got published in 1870 A.D. The main merit of Lepel Griffin's work is that only he gives comprehensive and exhaustive account of all aspects of the rule of

Native chiefs. Therefore, many historians have used it as the prime source to get knowledge about the Cis-Sutlej states of Punjab during these particular years. As a matter of fact, Griffin's two fold objective was to justify the British imperialistic policy and of ensuring the loyalty of Sikh chiefs towards the British Paramount.

So to derive more authentic information from this source, need to analyze, it is considered necessary. Therefore, the topic of the present thesis is Lepel Henry Griffin's *The Rajas of Punjab: A Historical Analysis*: the entire academic exercise involved to historically analyze the Lepel Griffin's work in the Cis-Sutlej states with the help of primary and secondary sources. There can be seen abundant research on the relations of Maharaja Ranjit Singh with British Government. However, relations of Cis-Sutlej states with British Government from year 1803 to 1870 have not been explored in depth yet. Only detail has been provided in Lepel Henry Griffin's work *The Rajas of Punjab* other sources only shares the brief information of Cis-Sutlej. So, approach has been made in study to analyze the account of Lepel Henry Griffin. The study assures to present the reader with authentic analysis of Lepel Henry Griffin's work *The Rajas of Punjab*. The study is divided into six chapters. A number of outcomes came into light through study which is given below.

First chapter of the study contains the work of British, which is based on their interest in writing Sikh history. For convenience, chapter can be divided into four parts. First part of the study traces the British interest in the study of Sikhs from the genesis of the European Historiography. Origin of European Historiography was a factor which created senses and curiosity among thinkers. On the other hand, Industrial revolution ignited its throttle to extreme, even thrust of exploring and trade changed the atmosphere. This transformation lessened the distance of far-flung corners. Thus, East Indian Company which had landed on the shores of Indian waters as a Trader Company; it not only became a creator of British rule but also gave way to western thinkers. Thus, 19th century saw revolutionary changes in writing of history. However, it shouldn't be supposed that there was no such writing trend prior to British but their methods, approach and technique of collecting data were different. Second part deals with the scrutiny of the life and works of different writers who wrote before Lepel Henry Griffin. Work of Louis Polier, James Brown, George Foster, John Malcolm, H.T Princep, and J.D Cunningham

has been recorded. Work of third part is an overview of the details of Lepel Henry Griffin's life. Fourth part deals with the Lepel Henry Griffin's work.

Second Chapter of the present study takes up as Relationship between British Government and Cis-Sutlej states, very first thing can be notice that Lepel Griffin never blames his own Government at any point he can be seen supporting his Government but sometimes in same matter, in very next pages he seems to reveal the truth in direct or indirect manner. But he seems to be under some pressure and cannot able to share his thoughts openly. Most probably this pressure was of none other than might of his own Government upon him.

Lepel Griffin does not offer detail account of entrance and meeting of Jaswant Rao Holkar with Cis-Sutlej chiefs whereas a historical source shares his intentions and meetings with chiefs of Cis-Sutlej states.

In the agreement of 1809 A.D it has been clearly mentioned that British would not interfere in the personal matters of the Princely state but David Ochterlony did the opposite and breaks the rules of policy. When Raja Patiala was willing to give administration into his step mother Rani Kehm Kaur's hand than Ochterlony by forcing him, made him to change his decision to give administration into Rani Aas Kaur's hand. But Lepel Griffin doesn't condemn this offensive step of Ochterlony. He doesn't give any explanation, on the contrary says that British Government was not wanted to interfere because situation of every princely state was same and therefore more state would ask for interference. So Government ordered Ochterlony to limit his interferences. But it has been clearly mentioned in the clause of 1809 A.D policy that no interference is allowed. On the other hand Lepel Griffin leaves untouched the explanation of David Ochterlony about his interference. There are other sources which manifest that Ochterlony in his defensive reply to Government said that it was us who saved the Cis-Sutlej chiefs from wrath of Maharaja Ranjit Singh therefore in return of substantial benefit a demand of the body of horse when required could be derived. David Ochterlony further remarks that "I hereby presume to think that, we are entitled to assume such a control as will ensure to us a slight return not merely for security and protection but for actual existence as a Government." It can be assume that mismanagement was just an excuse because in actual when Raja failed to furnish supply of horsemen than Ochterlony decided to give the administration of the Patiala to his trusted one and Rani Aas Kaur's relations were not good with Raja Sahib Singh and Rani Aas Kaur had also

expressed her desire to obey the orders according to British Government therefore she was perfect for Ochterlony. About the enhancement of supplies of cavalry got increased after Rani Aas Kaur got administration as mentioned by Lepel Griffin. Quite the opposite he admires Rani Aas Kaur by stating that due to her efforts, condition of mismanaged state got improved. Indirectly he was trying to prove the orders to be just, which were forcefully implement upon Patiala by Ochterlony. As it has been mentioned earlier, Lepel Griffin writes about Rani Aas Kaur to be corrupt when she was head of *Toshkahna*. She put the limits over expenditure of Raja and accumulated enormous wealth for herself. Later this became matter of dispute between her and his husband and after death of Raja Sahib Singh with his own son.

Even after Government's instructions Ochterlony didn't stop to interfere and his continuously interference made condition of Patiala state from bad to worst. Without any doubt it can be said that due to Ochterlony Patiala state became a stage of conspiracy between rivalries and Patiala state divided into two sects. But Lepel Griffin not at any single time pin points Ochterlony, instead put whole blame over Raja Sahib Singh of Patiala. However, at the end of this matter in brief he himself shares that interference was of failure.

Unfortunately, in this scuffle Raja Sahib Singh died. Therefore opposite party expressed doubt over sudden death of Raja. However Lepel Griffin by taking the Rani Aas Kaur's side writes that Rani could not do this because she could lose her seat. It should be noted that on the death of other Cis-Sutlej chiefs, Lepel Griffin says that sudden death of a chief could not be consider normal. Even after these misshappenings British had ordered inquires to find real cause of death but after death of Patiala's Raja nothing is mentioned about such type of inquiry.

After death of Raja of Patiala his own son Karam Singh became chief though the charge was in the hand of his mother Aas Kaur and minister Misar Naudha. Raja Karam Singh wanted to grasp all powers but after assuming all powers in his hand he again gave post of chief minister to Misar Naudha. Lepel Griffin assuredly says that after the death of Sahib Singh Government had stopped to interfere but from British Officer Captain Birch's diary it comes out that British Government had daunted Raja for to make Missr Naudha his chief minister. Quite the reverse, Lepel Griffin tries to show that Raja was very close to Misar Naudha that during his installation over throne by saying "He made a special request to agent of British Government in an open Darbar to bestow a valuable Khillat upon Missar Naudha as a sign of satisfaction." Other two

points are also worthy to note; Firstly in *The Rajas of Punjab* no similar example of such distinguish incident during the installation of other Cis-Sutlej chiefs has not been given nor any sign of special regard for any other expect chiefs. Secondly, Lepel Griffin says that he was very close to his mother than others.

When dispute occurs between son and mother over *Toshkhana* than Government starts to interfere. However, Lepel Griffin again and again gives statement about interference that this was last time and from now on British Government decided not to interfere. However in reality this inference remained in continuity. Missar Naudha was also a symbol of active interference of British Government.

As per given in *The Rajas of Punjab* Jaswant Singh of Nabha was given a separate proclamation letter of 3 May 1809 A.D from Governor General for his personal assurance. Most conceivable research attributed to it that these treaties were not of much important for British Government but was very beneficial for chiefs because of this they were getting exemption from tribute and got secured all their previous authority and right. That's the reason they were eager to sign a treaty of assurance which was much important for them from every perspective.

Lepel Griffin discusses the matter of Bhriog of Kapurthala state. According to him on the complaint of Ochterlony the Raja Fateh Singh confiscated the Brhiog. While, from inspection of Captain Brich's dairy it reveals that Raja Fateh Singh was intimidate by British General and was told that if he would not punish the Maha Singh than British would deprive him off from his supremacy over Bhriog. Lepel Griffin tells that after seizure of Bhriog by Fateh Singh, Ochterlony ordered Fateh Singh to withdraw his troops and to reinstate Bhriog to Maha Singh. But Fateh Singh denied obeying David Ochterlony. But from official letter it finds out that Fateh Singh forward a letter through his *Vakil* in which he explained that on the request of Ochetrkony he had punished Maha Singh without any delay and conduct of punishment was made without reference. Maha Singh's mother urged him to excuse them from British but he retained it. From Raja Fateh Singh's letter to Governor General it seems unobjectionably cleared that Government's action to reinstall Maha Singh made Raja Fateh Singh tempestuous. Because he had have spend a lot of money on Bhriog encroachment. That's why he refused to set free Bhriog. But Lepel Griffin doesn't refer these valid points of Fateh Singh. From which it could be observe that British Government acted in self willed manner and issued inappropriate orders.

Lepel Griffin further documents that when Raja Fateh Singh didn't changed his decision than Government directly warned him that if he would not restored the estate than British force would be sent to dispose off his encroachment. When this matter turn out to be more serious than Local Government forward it to Indian Government. Government of India changed the decision of Local Government and allowed Raja Fateh Singh to use his supremacy over Bhirog by any measures, which he might sees fit to employ. It is to be noted that Government changed its decision only when it noticed that Raja Fateh Singh got enraged by their conduct, so they immediately took action because they didn't want to break off their relations with Raja Fateh Singh which they were secretly building from many years. But on the opposite Lepel Griffin says that Fateh Singh was not in their direct contact until the matter of Bhirog.

According to Lepel Henry Griffin, Raja Bhag Singh was first among the other Cis-Sutlej chiefs, who made an alliance with British Government as well as other chiefs also wanted to do so. However, several historical documents suggests that both parties were seeking benefits from each other because from the British Government's side they wanted to secure help from Sikh chiefs again Martahas or to at least get assurance of neutrality from them. While on the other hand Raja of Jind like other Phulkian Chiefs wanted to overthrow the Perron, their former benefactor and wanted to attain some additional benefits in the form of escheats from British.

In the work of Lepel Griffin it has given that Raja of Jind joined the General Lake in his pursuit of Jaswant Rao Holkar in 1805 A.D. British Government deployed him as an envoy to his nephew Maharaja Ranjit Singh to stop him to help the Holkar against British. Lepel Griffin assuredly says that this mission was conducted by Bhag Singh to please the General Lake so he could be able to exert considerable influence with his nephew over British. While outcome of the study reveals that not only Bhag Singh wanted to attain benefits but the British Government was also seeking to create a connection with Maharaja Ranjit Singh which they had tried in 1800 A.D in order to create a front against Shah Zaman. But Maharaja Ranjit Singh had not showed any interest in British at that time. So most probably Raja Bhag Singh was person of their interest to persuade the Maharaja. Most likely Lake granted the lands to Bhag Singh to clear the way for their long waited policy in which they wanted to create a buffer zone. In beginning the policy of British was to create a close connection with these states in order to frustrate any attempt of invading army from the western side of Indus.

Lepel Griffin shares an important meeting's conversation which was held between Raja Bhag Singh and Otcherlony. In which Raja Bhag Singh told David Ochterlony that all of the Sikh chiefs are eagerly waiting to welcome the British Government. Though few chiefs like Sardar Jodh Singh Kalsia are under the heavy obligation and they cannot come forward at once and declare friendship with British yet. As per research, It seems true that Sardar Jodh Singh wanted to join British but circumstances were not favorable for him due to his close connection with Ranjit Singh therefore Ocherlony told Bhag Singh that Jodh Singh should not be need to break the connection with Maharaja Ranjit Singh at present but he needed written assurance from him that in event of the hostilities he would join the British. Whereas historical sources suggest that Lepel Griffin does not share the policy of British Government, which was continuously in touch with David Ochterlony while he was heading towards Punjab. By obeying the orders of British Government, Ochterlony was trying to lure every small and important chief to his side so they could use them if a war occurs between Maharaja Ranjit Singh and British.

As per *The Rajas of Punjab* David Ochterlony told Raja Bhag Singh that Raja has to return the land which he had occupied from the friend of the British. It had been taken from Rani Daya Kaur. Here Lepel Griffin didn't mentioned a point which can be presume from the *The Ludhiana Agency Records* that Raja Bhag was agreed to give up land because he was seeking for British Protection but when David Ochterlony asked him to return all the grants which he had gained from last expedition he questioned him about that what British Government has decided about his other grants when he agreed to return the land to Rani Daya Kaur.

On this David Ochterlony replied that he had not received orders about it yet, though in official documents he agrees that he didn't wish to give any answer because of fear of deceiving one party or encouraging other. From the above statement of David Ochterlony it can be clearly judged that Ocherlony knew the answer but at that time they needed the Raja Bhag Singh the most because he was the main key between chiefs and British connection and question which David Ochterlony was trying to hide was most probably related with Ludhiana because Ocherlony had kept an eye on Ludhiana fort for British cantonment which Bhag Singh had received from Maharaja. For which David Ochterlony had already wrote to British Government without the consent of Bhag Singh and even it did happen. Whereas Bhag Singh did get nothing for his lose. He had to pay heavy price for the British Protection.

As given in *The Rajas of Punjab* Bhag Singh requested for Karnal in exchange of Ludhiana but Government said that Karnal had already conferred on Muhhamad Khan and the conditions of Karnal State were not normal as it required strong measures. Government also rejected the proposal to restore the Ludhiana to Rai Alyas, former owner of Ludhiana. Government at first agreed to compensate Raja Bhag Singh for his loss but later they decided that British Cantonment at Ludhiana was only intended to be for short term and it would be revert to chief so no compensation required. This is to be noted that Lepel Griffin in his first statement says that Ludhiana was chosen to build permanent cantonment than on very next page he writes that cantonment was to be built for short term. He further tells that British military station at Ludhiana has not lifted yet. It can be understood that he was well aware of intentions of his Government but he doesn't condemn the blustering behavior of Government but gives a hint for reader by telling that the cantonment about which his Government was issuing statement in year 1809 A.D that it would be a built only for short term, was still existing in Lepel Griffin's times and by examining the *Ludhiana Agency* it founds that Government didn't want to left Ludhiana ever, even they didn't gave Karnal in exchange of the Ludhiana for any purpose. Government instructed the David Ochterlony that they need Bhag Singh in Ludhiana because he would at all times provide them supplies and secure the good will of District and if they would transfer the chief of Karnal to Ludhiana and Ludhiana chief to Karnal than they would have to suffer a lot. It can be comprehend that British Government was thinking of his own benefits. In fact Ochterlony was well aware of his Government's attitude so he had himself sent an application in the favor of Bhag Singh in which he mentioned that Bhag Singh was most trusted person of Maharaja Ranjit Singh even though he helped British Government much and now British Government must do justice with him but Government did the opposite.

Lepel Griffin boasts that British Government's protection saved the Cis-Sutlej chiefs from injustice. However, in reality British were playing them fool and using them as puppet. They had nothing to do with chiefs; their own benefits were above them all. They didn't care for the loss or benefits of chiefs. As Raja Bhag Singh of Jind in his stupidity not only lost the territory of Ludhiana but also lost the true friendship of Maharaja Ranjhit Singh. He had chosen the side of British to save his territory from Maharaja Ranjit Singh but he lost it immediately without any gain in return by seeking the British Protection, though he played crucial role

between British and Sikh Chiefs friendship. But intentions of British were clear they want to secure their own border.

Lepel Griffin has discussed the succession matter of primogeniture in Jind State. Bhag Singh due to his unstable health decided to choose a successor before his death so he wished that his younger son Prince Partap should be appointed his successor while government was in favor of rule of primogeniture. Therefore Government rejected the succession of Kanwar Partap Singh and authorized elder son to throne of Chief ship. By analyzing the matter as given in *The Rajas of Punjab* the fact can't be denied that British Government had intervened in the cases of Patiala, Nabha and Jind authoritatively for assertion of the primogeniture but historical sources contain ample evidences of controversy and disagreement about this very important point for example British Government didn't apply this rule in case of princely state of Bhawalpur when in 1850 A.D Nawab nominated his third son to succession. It can be easily comprehend by comparing the facts that British were always keep on seeking the chance to interfere in the Princely states' succession matters because as per their secret policy they wanted only those rulers to rule over princely states who would work under their command.

In matter of Jind British Government didn't limit their interference as Lepel Griffin has stated in the context of Patiala state despite British Government crossed its limits and established a Regent. David Ochterlony was specially sent to Jind to supervise these new arrangements. Rani Sobrahi was made regent. British Government did the same as it was done in Patiala state. But even on this second interference of the British Government, Lepel Griffin remains silent again. Moreover, in this case if British Government was directly involved so instead of questioning the British Government he put the whole blame over Partap Singh, younger son of Raja Bhag Singh. As a result of these steps of British Government, Jind had to suffer a lot as it had turned from peaceful state to ground of conspiracy and murders.

Lepel Griffin votes in favor of Metcalf because many British had condemned the diplomacy of Metcalf. Metcalf had been blamed by several authors that Maharaja was gaining his strength by taking possession over the Cis-Sutlej territories and Metcalf did nothing and was travelling with Maharaja mere as a spectator and let the Maharaja to take over the Faridkot. Lepel Griffin justifies that although British didn't want to permit the Maharaja to carry on his conquest but at that time French invasion apprehension didn't let it to do so and after removal of

danger Government changed his policy suddenly. It can be clearly understood that British were not like the other powers such as Marathas or Mughals. They have nothing to do with chiefs. They did not want to make Maharaja angry at that time because they needed the Maharaja to create a buffer zone against French invasion. At that time Maharaja was strong candidate for them and British let the chiefs suffer until their priorities would not got changed.

When British Government demanded the restitution of all states on the left side of Sutlej which were achieved during 1808 A.D and 1809 A.D at that time Maharaja put forward his claim over Faridkot but Lepel Griffin denied the firm claims of Maharaja which have been traced from various sources which have directly and indirectly pointed that Faridkot state had accepted authority of Maharaja Ranjit Singh willingly. So as Griffin has said earlier about apprehension of French invasion so on the basis of that term in can be understand that when fear of invasion fade away British changed their policy at once and curb the activities of Maharaja. But on the contrary Lepel Griffin instead of accepting this put the blame on Maharaja Ranjit Singh that he was forwarding invalid reasons.

Lepel Griffin with sharing the information of next phase of Faridkot matter says that Mokham Chand was not willing to give up Faridkot he told Maharaja that British were intending to occupy the city. However, Lepel Griffin denies his claim and says that Government had no intention to garrisoning the town but it was determined that it should be returned to its real owners. Nevertheless on the basis of research it finds out that British wanted to establish two cantonments in *Doaba*, one in Faridkot and second in Jalandhar. As it has been discuss in Jind's history that cantonment was made permanent by cheating on the Bhag Singh of Jind so it can probably said that British had made intentions of establishing the cantonment in Cis-Sutlej area in order to establish their authority over Cis-Sutlej states but when situation got tensed than Metcalf had to make a treaty with Maharaja and had to leave the idea of building a cantonment in Faridkot.

The subject of third chapter comprises the study of Relationship between Lahore Darbar and Cis-Sutlej States, very first, can be notice that although Lepel Griffin discuss various topics related to Princely states in his work but when it is being compared with other sources than the result never comes out to be similar. This dissimilarity can be seen a lot. Evidently, Persian sources belonged to Maharaja Ranjit Singh's time conveys a different story apart for the Lepel

Griffin's work. However, through cross analyzing the Persian and other contemporary sources it also comes out that these sources don't share any mutual understanding about any incident. The difference can be clearly seen from the facts about which they talked.

First example of this can be seen from the quarrel between the Rani Aas Kaur and Raja Sahib Singh of Patiala. The information which Lepel Griffin shares about their family rupture does not match with other sources and even these sources also shares different-2 perspective. There are lots of examples of such types in entire work of Lepel Griffin when his statement does not corroborate with other sources. However on some general matters, information can be seen identical to other primary sources.

When in 1808 A.D Cis-Sutlej Chiefs got scared after continuous expedition of Maharaja Ranjit Singh to south, than they went to Mr. Seton for protection but returned after getting no affirm assurance than Lepel Griffin instead of telling truth in a straight way he shares the matter from a different angle to cover up the truth and tries to blame the Maharaja. He says that Maharaja attempted to bring chiefs to his side by pressurizing them while they were seeking British protection. On the contrary, truth was that at that time British Government was worried about danger of French invasion. So to deal with this upcoming danger they needed the support of Kabul and Lahore. However, it doesn't mean that the British didn't want to bring Cis-Sutlej chiefs to their side but at that time they needed the Maharaja Ranjit Singh the most. So when group of chiefs went to seek protection from British than Mr. Seton didn't give sufficient answer. It should be noted the purpose of Metcalf's mission was also same. Even Lepel Griffin himself talks about the necessity of Anglo-Sikh alliance during French Invasion. When French threat got ended thus need of Maharaja not much required and when they got news that chiefs has decided to be with Maharaja they immediately took action to bring Cis-Sutlej chiefs under their protection.

Lepel Griffin further denotes that chiefs of Cis-Sutlej were not willing to meet Maharaja Ranjit Singh and on the other hand he himself says that chiefs went to meet Maharaja in hope to firm the friendly alliance. Another fact is that the Lepel Griffin keeps on emphasizing that though Patiala Raja went to meet Maharaja but secretly he was in their side but actual situation found different because when Government came to knew that chiefs are going to change side by meeting Maharaja in Lahore than Government wrote a letter to Patiala chief about which Lepel

Griffin himself agrees that protection was given to Patiala through this letter, prior to the meeting, by Delhi Residency without waiting the distinct order from Calcutta Residency. Another fascinating fact which is also traceable from Lepel Griffin's own work is that when Maharaja put forward some conditions for Anglo-Sikh alliance to Metcalf, Envoy of Delhi than Metcalf said that he has no authority to make promise without referring the propositions to Calcutta for the decision of Governor General. So most plausible research can be attributed to this is that the British were against Maharaja and Cis-Sutlej chief's alliance therefore they broke their protocol and without getting the permission of Home Government they acted swiftly. Moreover, after conferring protection when Ocherlony was heading to Punjab than he was strictly told not to trust Cis-Sutlej's chiefs in a blindfold manner because they were not trustworthy as they could change at any moment but Lepel Griffin doesn't discuss these crucial facts.

Lepel Griffin doesn't unfold the fact that what British Government could get from awarding protection to these minor chiefs and for what purpose this was being awarded because British Government had not demanded any escheats or money in exchange.

Lepel Griffin compares the Maharaja's rule with his own Government's and says that his Government's rule was not only better than Maharaja's instead it was better than all previous empires who had once ruled over India. While as per research, for princely state's chiefs rule of Maharaja was similar to sudden death after severe illness and of British rule alike gradually death by fever.

Major disagreement is evident over matter of Doladhi from the perspective of other historical sources when are being compared with Griffin's work.

In the context of *The Rajas of Punjab* there is lot of examples of its difference with other contemporary British historian on a same issue. For instance, in case of Morwan, Lepel Griffin says that no evidence was found to prove the innocent Raja of Nabha guilty, that he had looted the treasury. While J.D Cunningham says that Raja of Nabha was proven guilty. In very next example, Lahore Government put blame over British Government for conferring the Morwan to Nabha without any proper investigation. As obvious it could observe Lepel Griffin in support of

his Government held this blame invalid. Nevertheless, Broadfoot and J.D Cunningham consider it to be valid. There are lot of examples of these types can be seen in *The Rajas of Punjab*.

No matter which ever state is being discussed by Lepel Griffin, divergence will be found through comparing with other sources for example; Holkar's visit in Punjab. Nevertheless Lepel Griffin gives more authentic information about Fateh Singh's character. This could possible due to that he was the Superintendant of Kapurthala state in 1875 A.D. So it was equitable that he was very familiar with Kapurthala but apart from it he also says that he knew every chief of Cis-Sutlej states very closely. But apart from Kapurthala he lacks proper vividness in the context of other Princely states. Character explanation given by Lepel Griffin about Fateh Singh of Kapurthala cannot be denied and found similar in other sources as well.

However, Lepel Griffin leaves untouched an important point about Kapurthala state, that when British and Fateh Singh came close to each other. The beginning of their relations starts with secret meeting when Lake himself approaches Raja Fateh Singh. Lake and his fellow soldiers welcomed Fateh Singh into their camp by taking off their cap as a welcome gesture and try to impress him. British took special care to humor Fateh Singh and even Lord Lake proposed to have separate arrangements with him. But Fateh Singh tactfully evaded this agreement. The British General then offered Sonipat and Panipat to Fateh Singh as a mark of his appreciation if he plays a role in setting a friendly settlement with Maharaja Ranjit Singh. But Fateh Singh refused to accept this proposal and regarded it as bribe. Than Fateh Singh added that he would get these territories some other day since their friendship will going to be last forever.

When on 27 December of 1827 A.D after having some discord with Maharaja Ranjit Singh, Fateh Singh crossed Sutlej leaving behind his state. Than Lepel Griffin gives a very correct statement about Raja Fateh Singh that fear of Fateh Singh was result of his over thinking and exaggeration. Because Fateh Singh was one of the few, whom Maharaja had any sincere feeling of regards. These facts are corroborated by most of chronicles.

When for the installation of new successor of Kapurthala state after Fateh Singh's death, got disturbed due to the quarrel between brothers for throne. Lepel Griffin blames Maharaja Ranjit Singh to intensify the dissensions between brothers. A large number of sources agree with Lepel Griffin.

After death of Raja Sher Singh, Lahore state would have been left without rightful successor. Then Lepel Griffin says as a claimant of successor, Nihal Singh of Kapurthala should have come to front to claim the throne. But he was of timid disposition and unexcited person; therefore he didn't show any interest in Lahore politics. While the available historical sources suggest that when Nihal Singh came to know that British were also showing interest in Lahore politics than he thought that it would be wise to remain outside. Because he didn't want to put in risk his own state by confronting such a big power like British.

Lepel Griffin offers full fledged details of the Nihal Singh's Kapurthala succession and about the obstacles, which he faced from Maharaja Ranjit Singh and his brother. Many historical sources approve Lepel Griffin's approach.

Lepel Griffin further documents that Nihal Singh's brother hatched a conspiracy against him and tried to kill him. Lepel Griffin again blames Maharaja Ranjit Singh that he played double game in this matter, he expressed sympathy with Nihal Singh and at the same time he directed him to give Amar Singh a separate maintenance of 30,000 a year instead of 1 lakh which Amar Singh had demanded. Maharaja did this because Amar Singh as a bribe had promised him to pay *nazarana*. Even though Amar Singh was encouraged by him to extort territory of worth one lakh from his brother so Amar Singh did it accordingly and even captured Nihal Singh and didn't released him until he agreed to pay district of Sultanpur for his maintenance.

However, historical source contains different approach to this incident. According to them Nihal Singh went to Lahore Darbar after being attacked and told Maharaja that on the instigation of Lakha and others, Amar Singh had attacked Sardar Nihal Singh than Maharaja asked for proper investigation and both were being brought in front of him in his Darbar. When Maharaja asked for the reason behind misconduct of Amar Singh than Amar Singh replied that he was starving and was being got distracted quite on the account of the lack of means of the livelihood. Maharaja on hearing his reply said that he should have referred the matter to him first before to take any step, than Maharaja ordered punishment for his conduct. It is also to be noted that Captain Wade had also sent a letter in which he had requested to punish Amar for his crime. But on the Nihal Singh's request Maharaja pardoned him because Nihal Singh said that Amar Singh is like son to him and was astray from path by wicked persons and advocated for

maintenance for livelihood. Therefore Amar Singh was granted maintenance for livelihood on the consent of his own brother. There is no valid explanation from Lepel Griffin for this omission is noted.

Lepel Griffin further inscribes the dealing of Maharaja with Malerkotla. In which Phulkian chiefs became security when Malerkotla fails to pay ransom of 1 lakh rupees and chief of Jind got some land in favor from Malerokotla. But somehow Maharaja changed his decision after some negotiations and freed the chiefs from paying the debt of Malerkotla. Here Lepel Griffin completely fails to reveal the actual scenario of this whole incident. In actual Diwan Mokham Chand and other officials of Lahore was planning take over the Malerkotla along with Ambala and gradually to take the possession over Patiala so their boundary could reach to Jamuna. When Bhag Singh of Jind got intimation he discusses it with Bhai Lal Singh and Chanan Singh. They decide that it would be unwise to let the Maharaja to take over the Malerkotla under his charge permanently because in future he would create difficulties for them and therefore they placed bid over Malerkotla and offered Maharaja Ranjit Singh 1 lakh and 25 thousand in exchange of Malerkotla.

Fourth chapter of the present study deals with the British Paramountcy in Cis-Sutlej states. In this chapter, it has been seen that Lepel Griffin tries to hide negative points of its Government and in act of British Paramountcy over these states, Lepel consider it to be a legitimate right of British Government. Even British Government had inappropriately brought several territories under them but Lepel Griffin found it unobjectionable First matter in this is related with Patiala, Lepel Griffin shares the information about Haryana and Bhatiana dispute between British Government and Raja of Patiala. In this lengthy case Lepel Griffin blames Patiala for attempting to control British possession in Abohar. However, research reveals that Edward Gardiner, British officer, first started to colonize the land without discussing the boundaries with Patiala. Lepel Griffin proclaims that Patiala had no proof to acclaim his right over these districts. But through research, evidence in the favor of Patiala is being procured which advocates the authority of Patiala over these states, which are not discussed by Lepel Griffin. According to documents two different treaties were made with British officer, first were with Perron and second were with Lake to get authority over these states. Later, British Government deliberately declared these documents to be forged. Despite it, Charles Metcalf and

William Fraser pressurize him to accept all the terms according to their wish. But Lepel Griffin shows no interest to share these important points. On the contrary, Lepel Griffin vindicates the Ross Bell who was being installed to set up the boundaries. Lepel Griffin to support his own point puts finger upon his own Home Government when Home Government doesn't agree with the Local Government's methods. He states that "Home Government naturally knew less than of Indian Government of the character of Sikh Chiefs." Despite knowing it, that Home Government's order considered as final order in every case. Even when Home Government on the basis of the enquiry and evidences issued its decision than Lepel Griffin as expected, once again put blame over Raja of Patiala. While in the praise of Mr. Ross Bell he says that the investigation carried out by such an experienced person should not be challenged. It should be noted that Government ordered to reopen the case after getting disappointed from Mr. Ross's report. Lepel Griffin further claims that British had taken over far less territory than its lawful right while opposing the Patiala Raja he expresses that "Raja had obtained so much when he had right to nothing." But it isn't true because other historical sources put forwards that Patiala Raja was forced to accept the unacceptable proposal and even on his recurring requests no attention was being paid and deprived him from his legal right. It can be judged that indirectly Lepel Griffin was in favor of coercion.

In the case of Mahrajanian Sikhs Lepel Griffin shares the dispute of Phulkian chiefs for supremacy. Through analyze it has been discovered that Nabha also claimed for supremacy and David Ochterlony supported his claim. But Captain Burges, who was investigator officer of this case, was in favor of Patiala. Lepel Griffin doesn't share about this partially. This case was very similar to Doldahi case in which investigator officer Coolbrooke was in support of Patiala and had given decision in favor Patiala but due to the interference of Home Government, Local Government had to change its decision. Nabha keep on requesting British Government that he has the sufficient proof but Government neglected his requests completely.

Then British Government decided to make over the village for term of one year to Patiala along with some conditions. But Patiala Chief got dissatisfied with the decision. Therefore British Government in August 1833 A.D took the village under their own direct control. Lepel Griffin does not reveal these conditions. Through research it comes out that these terms which were applied were not easy to accept especially the third one in which it has been

given that Patiala Raja would not demand any Revenue or Land tax from Mahrajkan. In reply Patiala Raja had also expressed his view by saying that Mahrajkan were dependant of Patiala and even they had paid 4000 tribute in 1788 A.D. So without attaining any benefit why would Patiala bear the expenses of an unmanaged village without getting anything in exchange and especially that village which had been remained under his ancestors? So it can be said that without getting any benefit from the territory in shape of tax or gifts not only Patiala even no other ruler would accept the proposal. By comparing the facts it can be understood that in actual British Government's policy has come into a change. Before they seemed to support a creation of a safe zone and during this time period they seemed to support imperialistic thought as it can be seen in the case of succession matter of Jind and same in this case. Although British wanted to take over the village but at first they weren't ready to take over the village it was far away from their territory and needed much attention to manage the wild people of Mahrajkan. So they planned that village should be given to Patiala for trail if Raja failed to do so than they would take over the village. So it was quite clear from the intentions of British Government that sooner or later British Government was going to take over the village. So as it was expected it happened and British took the possession of village. Instead of pointing out his own Local Government Lepel Griffin by praising British Government tries to proof that under the rule of British Government immediate change in behavior was noticed in Mahrajkan people and further shares that anarchy had prevailed in their reign. It can be observed that Lepel Griffin is indirectly telling that Phulkian chiefs were anarchist ruler. Lepel Griffin in his account tries to show that his Government's rule was just and liberal who seems to be his major purpose that to highlight his Government's achievements through his work. But it does not seem true because as per research study, under the rule of British for three years matter of Mahrajkan village's administrative reforms remained untouched. Therefore several important members of Mahrajkan community had to go to Ambala to meet Clerk. Clerk than elected some head men who were to look after their matters of dispute. But this process got failed and people requested the Government to establish a Thana so that their matter could solve without delay. But Government was not willing to put burden upon them of expenditure therefore Government refused to make a Thana in Mahrajkan. Again Lepel Griffin leaves the negative points of British Government untouched.

On the other hand sources consensually suggest that Mahrajkan had well organized administrative structure did exist to pre-British Interference. However Lepel Griffin tries to

change the angle of the Mahrajikian case in an attempt to polish the image of British Government and neglects the actual fact deliberately.

A very important question arose, as per the interpretation of the *sanad* of 5 May 1860 A.D. As per the first clause of agreement Raja of Patiala, Nabha and Jind and their heirs were granted full sovereignty over their ancestral and acquired domains. About this *sanad* Lepel Griffin gives a fascinating statement in which he openly claimed that “The term full sovereignty was a loose rendering”. He explicitly state that “If a full sovereignty” meant a power such as this, the right of Government, as a paramount would altogether disappear. Full Sovereignty,” as far as *sandas* are concerned is a conventional term.

By setting aside the *Dastar-Ul-Amal* or the rule of practice of Late Raja Narinder Singh, council of Regency was made and when I didn’t work properly and had to dissolved than Lepel Griffin hold official of Patiala responsible for the dissolvent however other sources manifest that there was no doubt that there was great fraction in the council but Lepel Griffin does not uncurtailed that the real culprit behind this fraction was British agent Major General R.G Taylor. He openly and actively interferes in the state matters. Therefore, due to interference of British Agent the Council of Regency in three phulkian states had to be resolved by British Government.

As narrated by Lepel Griffin Raja Bharpur Singh died naturally and was not poisoned while other sources do not agree with Lepel Griffin.

As given in *The Rajas of Punjab* a new chief was installed after the death of Raja Bharpur Singh of Nabha by British Government. New chief Bhagwan Singh of Nabha was selected on the basis of the *sandas* of 1860A.D and 1862A.D chose by the British authority with the consultation of the chiefs of Patiala and Jind. However, on the basis of research it may be discerned easily that this procedure applied was an exceptional case because this type of concession was not provided to the other princely states except to the two other Phulkian states. That if a ruler died without choosing a successful heir than British Government had the right to appoint the rightful heir. Actually this provision was the product of the clever statesmen of British Government because at one hand they assured the perpetuity of the princes of their houses and on the other hand it benefited the British Government as they could show their right as a paramount power over the Native states. Even on the other hand they get economical

benefits too. As per the rule, *nazrana* of $1/3^{rd}$ of the value of one year's income of the state was being demanded on the failure of the adoption.

Lepel Griffin shares the matter of rebellion of Balinawali and Dadri. Lepel Griffin blames others for these rebellions. However, by thoroughly reinvestigating the cases it finds out that these rebellions were a result of defected revenue policy of British Government. Secondly, historical sources show disagreement with Lepel Griffin's work in these particular matters.

In the matter of dispute for throne of Kapurtahala among Ragbhir Singh and his two younger brothers, British Government denied hearing the claims of younger brothers on the basis of rule of primogeniture. Lepel Griffin supports the action of British Government. But it has also been given in Lepel Griffin's work that prior to 1858 A.D Government was in support of younger brothers and was in favor of division of the state. By thoroughly analyzing this confusion, it reveals out that reason behind this sudden change was Queen's Proclamation. This proclamation was in favor of Princely chiefs. But tussle among brothers went long. The actual cause behind this tussle was British official like John Lawrence and R.G Taylor. Nevertheless, Lepel Griffin never discloses their role in his work.

The fifth chapter of present study deals with the succession and dispute matters of Cis-Sutlej states. Lepel Griffin in his account inscribes the succession dispute of Raja Karam Singh with younger brother Ajit Singh. He justly provides the information of whole incident and all other sources validates his statements.

Lepel Griffin next in his work shares the matter of dispute between the father and the son. The case was of Raja Jaswant Singh of Nabha and his son Kanwar Singh. In his work Lepel Griffin supports the Kanwar Ranjit Singh. However a lot of evidences after thorough examination seem to support Raja of Nabha. These lengthy evidences have been discussed in the thesis in detail.

Lepel Griffin in his work discusses the lapse of Kaithal. When chief of Kaithal died without having any heir apparent and Government was about to gain control over Kaithal than Nabha, Patiala and Jind tried to obstruct the Government and tried to get succession for the nearest claimants. But Government was determined to get the escheat and to claim their right. But inwardly Phulkian chiefs believed that sooner or later their estates would also lapse to

paramount power. Only in this matter Lepel Griffin shares the true intentions of his Government and thinking of Cis-Sutlej chiefs. But one point should be noted that to share the history of Kaithal was not part of Lepel Griffin's work. Lepel Griffin could not talk openly against its Government but here he describes the intentions of his Government very boldly. This is quite odd.

In the matter of succession after sudden death of Raja Fateh Singh of Jind without male-heir Lepel Griffin himself agrees that first intention of British Government was to annex the whole state of Jind but then numerous claimants rose up to claim their right over the Jind chief ship. Through inspection of other materials it comes out that British Government changed its intention to take over the Jind by noticing some facts that remoteness of estate, their poverty, scattered position could create problems. Thus these facts changed their mind so they preferred the tribute collection scheme. In 1831 A.D political agent under the instruction of William Bentick suggested the chiefs of Cis-Sutlej states that if they would start giving 1/3rd of their income as tax to British Government instead of annexing the Jind. On the contrary this demand was totally unjust because as per the agreement of 1809 A.D these states were exempted from to giving any kind of tax. Therefore chiefs denied obeying the orders. Than British Government decided to gave only those land to late Raja Sangat Singh's relative Sarup Singh of Jind which were once under their common ancestor Gajpat Singh and the land which were occupied or won by Sangat Singh were being annexed by British It is important to consider that if British Government was in favor of implementing this law as per treaty of 1809 A.D then it was automatically and logically a condition in which Article 3 (The Chief shall remain in the exercise of same rights and authority within their own possession , which they were enjoyed before they were taken under British Protection) could have been justly applied. But Government instead of it used his paramount power and overruled his own policy for his own benefits which Lepel Griffin cunningly tried to hide. In the official records Sarup Singh's request to British Government justifies the above statement. A fact also came into light that Captain Wade had suggested Indian Government that Government should taken the benefit from the lapse of Jind state by putting the Ludhiana tenure at better footing. Study also reveals that they were not only looking to captured Ludhiana by attaining benefit for this opportunity instead Clerk had also suggested that Government should not approve the claim of Maharaja Ranjit Singh as they had done before in many cases. By examining the facts it can be assume that British were after the

Ludhiana which they had got from Bhag Singh by hook and crook and lapse of Jind state gave them golden chance to fulfill their desire to occupy the Ludhiana without any resistance. However, first priority of British official were also to usurp all the state but constant appeal of Phulkian chiefs and Maharaja Ranjit Singh as on the other side of Sutlej didn't let them to do so.

British Government was indulge at such level in the Cis-Sutlej's politics chief couldn't even issue will freely. Same happened in Nihal Singh's case. British Government compelled him to leave power to his elder son Randhir Singh instead of his younger son, which was the favorite of Raja. On the contrary, John Lawrence was in favor of disintegration of Kapurthalla state. But Lepel Griffin does not discuss these important factors in his work.

Dispute among chiefs for the territories was very common and as per the *sanad* of 22 August 1811 A.D British Government got power to solve their cases and to provide justice. Naturally every chief of Malwa state individually came under the jurisdiction of British Government while before it control over them was limited. Number of these dispute matters has been shared by Lepel Griffin in his work and he claims that British Government provided justice in every single case to the victim. However, the outcomes of the research shows differences because as per the analyze British Government's policy got changed in forties to fifties. Government attempted to reverse its previous policy in order to bring more and more territory under their rule. By baseless argumentation the agents of British Government tried to wriggle out the previous commitments. In some cases they succeeded in their motives and in some cases they reached to compromise. Same policy was adopted in matter of Khumanun village. But Lepel Griffin fails to share two face policy of British Government in his work.

Lepel Griffin explains the long unsolved matter of Sunti and Nabha. Through analytical study of *The Rajas of Punjab* can be said that this case present a typical example of British Government's policy. It was a clear demonstration of the fact that British authorities considered it their ultimate right as Paramount power to interfere as a supreme authority on the behalf of the feudatories of a state even in the violation of the existing engagements with that particular state, and impose their decision upon a chief much against his wish. It should be noted that British had created a mistake by adding a clause VII in *sanad* of granted to Phulkian chiefs. This made them wiser in the respect of dealing with other states. For example when Maharaja of Kashmir demanded a similar assurance as was given to Phulikan chiefs. Then British

Government of India denied fulfilling his request on the ground that such stipulations had been found in the practice not to work well and had resulted, notably in the case of Sonthi Sikhs and Nabha in misunderstanding and objectionable complications.

By thoroughly examining and analyzing the numerous dispute matters as given in the *The Rajas of Punjab* with the other primary and secondary sources the purpose of British can be comprehend which Lepel Griffin does not wanted to reveal to readers is that the authoritative intervention of the British Government for settling disputes between the chiefs and their feudatories even in the breaching the existing *sandas* or terms, tended to promote the interests of the Paramount power. Through entertaining the representations freely from the feudatories against their chiefs, the British Government brought the Native Chiefs under its firm grip and ensured their persistent loyalty. On the other hand, for the Chiefs being painfully conscious of the fact they could not afford to displease the paramount power. Thus under the circumstances they could only send petitions or counter – representations to Local Government or to Home Government. Thus British power took full advantages from the disputes and playing off one against others they cleverly pushed forward their imperial interests.

Lepel Griffin describes next about the Sujuarah village's revolt in his work. Suujuarah village was situated on the boundary of Rohtak which rose in revolt when a Telishdar, who had been sent by Jind to measure the cultivated area for settlement. This settlement model was adopted from English system of revenue. Villagers killed the Tesildar in contradiction. On hearing this Raja marched against insurgents with his forces As it has been mentioned before as Lepel Griffin's prime motive was to glorify the image of his Government, therefore he says that on the advice of Government Raja issued an order to grant free pardon to all of them except leaders if they would go back to their homes quietly. Idea to issuing Proclamation worked effectively thus majority of insurgents went back and revolt got normalized without any loss of single life. While comparing with other sources the major disagreement with Griffin is evidently appears. First of all the other sources shares that name of villages was Lajuana not Suujuarah and secondly they collectively states that fearsome battle took place between resident of the Laujuana and Raja, and due to this a lot of men got injured from both parties even some sources also register that the several number of people were also got killed. In addition some sources also claims that when situation got out of control than heavy artillery was being offered by British.

Thus with the help of canons they settled the matter by scaring the people and destroying more than half of the village. This wasn't happened first time when people got annoyed by unjust policy of British Government for example rebellion of Balanwali was also a result of faulty revenue policy of British Government.

In last chapter 'Cis-Sutlej States Services in War' role of these petty states has been analyzed as given in *The Rajas of the Punjab*. Lepel Griffin blames Cis-Sutlej chiefs that British Government was not satisfied with their performance during first Anglo-Sikh war. It has also been discussed that how and why people of Cis-Sutlej opposed British Government. But prime points which can trace through analyze are that though common people were been living under the British rule since 1809 A.D but they opposed the British at the time of war. That's why Anglo Sikh war forced British to implement precautionary measures for future. Here question arise that why? Even Lepel Griffin keeps on saying that British rule was just and benevolence towards people. These remarks he uses very often in his work but through analyze it reveals that people's sympathy were with Khalsa army and it deflated the fawn claims of Lepel Griffin because even after more than thirty years of rule British Government had failed to create a strong bond with Cis-Sutlej Chiefs and people of their respective countries. Lepel Griffin in his work further says that services provided by Cis-Sutlej chiefs in First Anglo Sikh as compare to 1857 A.D revolt were not satisfactory. However research reveals that chiefs could not be fully blame if they may had wanted to help British they couldn't because their own state army's sympathy was more with Lahore than British because many of their relatives were in Lahore army. Though Lepel Griffin gives hint of new policy for common people to create better connection but failure of British policy again confronted them in the shape of revolt of 1857 A.D but fortunately they succeeded to win over the chiefs into their side by the time of revolt of 1857 A.D.

Lepel Griffin shares that Patiala chief for his services and loyalty during Anglo Sikh war received award from British Government but along with these rewards he requested for the right of his former possession thus by receiving *sanad* he secured his and his successor's right over his hereditary states. But when attempt was being made to understand that why Patiala especially requested for the right of former possession when it was already under his control it comes out that policy of British Government in pre thirty years had seized number of territories by applying several tactics over Cis-Sutlej Chiefs. Jind and Kythal are the example of it.

Therefore it is not a matter of surprise that British policy should not have caused some alarms in mind of chief of Patiala and led him to request for the confirmation of his possession.

As per *The Rajas of Punjab* during interruption of 1857 no other Indian ruler showed great loyalty or rendered more evident service to the British Government than the Maharaja Narinder Singh of Patiala. He was well known head of Sikh Rajas; here Griffin tells that his hesitation or disloyalty would have cost British Government with the most disastrous results but due to honorable and principled environment of gratitude as well as the loyalty provided by British Government, to Maharaja due to which Maharaja without any doubt placed his whole powerful resources and energy under the absolute command of England. But in actual chiefs of Princely states helped British Government not due to liberal attitude of British Government towards them as told by Lepel Griffin rather they sought it as a golden opportunity to win over the gratitude of British government by rendering their services and then in return get concession from them for an example – ‘Paper of Requests’.

According to Lepel Griffin, Patiala chief without waiting the orders of British officials he saved the chief of Dholepur from rebels and thus he provided the help to British and proved his loyalty towards them. However the matter was not the same as Lepel Griffin has depicted. In actual, motive of Patiala chief was to march with his forces to save Dholepur was not that he wanted to please British Government or to suppress any rebellion but Rana Balwant Singh appealed to Maharaja of Patiala for his help. For Maharaja it was also necessary to save Dholepur because Rana Balwant Singh was his son-in-law. So for the safety of his daughter and his son-in-law he agreed to render services and his assistance as well as he communicated with Government of Punjab and North –west provinces related it. British Government agreed for assistance because they thought it would put good impact of Sikh Maharaja’s presence in the Dholepur and on the other affected areas. That’s why Patiala forces marched towards Dholepur and stayed there even after the mutineers left it for the safety of Rana and his city.

By analyzing the attitude of Cis-Sutlej chiefs by comparing the early nineteen and late nineteen as given in *The Rajas of Punjab* it can be observed that chief of late 19th century were much attached and loyal with British Government. The reason behind the changed attitude of native rulers and British Government for each other by close to 19th century is primarily based on the fact that many leading chiefs had disappeared from the political stage of Indian politics and

consequently in a good number of Princely states fell under the minority rule at once at the same time. Thus under the surveillance of the British Government the young princes by learning from them, they ruled on their states in changed attitude and in changed behavior. It should also be kept in mind that British had also took the responsibility of the education of minor under their authority and therefore they were imparted western study. It can be understood that western education was that powerful tool which changed the attitude of the new chiefs towards British Government.

By analyzing *The Rajas of Punjab* it can be pointed out that among all these princely states Jind state had to suffer a lot. First incident of Ludhiana cantonment than of succession matter of Jind and after that under the name of an award for serving the British in 1846 A.D an illusion was made to entangle the Raja of Jind though Raja of Jind was seeking his own safety and protection, he wanted assurance and security for his land and his property from British Government for future because Government had applied rule at various occasions over Jind by arbitrary and by considering them as Lord Paramount. On the contrary a *sanad* was being issued, by issuing mere a *sanad* of assurance to Jind the British Government got much important right in exchange from Jind. As per agreement if any enemy would approach to this side with the purpose of conquering this country, Raja will join the British with his army to expel the enemy. Second, British put another burden upon him, as per agreement Raja was told that he would build and repair military roads in his territory for the passage of British army from Amabla to Ferozpur even the width of road was to be decided by British engineers. British Government had experienced that in future if some disturbance occurred they would need allies like chiefs of Cis-Sutlej States and military roads for safe transportation and passage of military in difficult times. This pre-planning helped them in near future when in 1857 A.D mutiny happened. At that time protected chiefs stood along them as pillars of British power in Punjab.

Lepel Griffin affirms claims of describing British Government as the most excellent rule as compared to previous ruler especially Maharaja Ranjit Singh. His claims got deflated when Anglo Sikh war began not only the people from the Trans and Cis-Sutlej opposed British Government but also Cis-Sutlej chiefs were not on their side.

Lepel Griffin justly advocates the law of Primogeniture which his Government followed if a matter of succession arises among these principalities. On the other hand, he himself had said

that there were no particular rules of succession in Cis-Sutej states. British arbitrarily imposed this law upon them being a supreme power. However, this law made situation worsen. It deprived off the Rajas from issuing Will by which they used to select their predecessor before their death. This law also became reason for the rupture in states. Due to this law inefficient ruler might also get throne, without any efforts. These inefficient rulers were always being used by British Government as their puppet. Moreover this fact can't denied that British Government had intervened in the cases of Patiala, Nabha, Jind authoritatively for assertion of primogeniture but it didn't apply it as a rule in the case of Bhawalpur when in 1850 A.D Nawab nominated his third son to the succession. Policy of the British Government was not clear towards princely states of Punjab therefore chiefs had to send a paper of requests in 1860 A.D to procure their rights for future.

Though Lepel Henry Griffin had been remained superintendent of Kapurthala state but he didn't write a single word why or for what reason Kapurthala was treated inferior than other states. For an example some important concessions were given to Phulkian states for their *Paper of Requests 1858 A.D.* Kapurthala was exempted from the power of life and death sentences. Likewise Kapurthala was given 'Right of Adoption' on the failure of the heir apparent much later as comparative to Phulkian chiefs and there are number of other incidents when Kapurthala state was taken with inferiority.

Lepel Griffin has no doubt and has not ignored even minute detail. He not only depends upon the British official records but also collected the information on the basis of personal interviews. His account constitutes a complete history of the Sikh Chiefship of the region from their remote origin upto 1870 A.D.

As a high official he had an easy access to all the documents and could easily provide valuable information though Lepel Griffin's work all said and done is predominantly motivated. He seeks to justify the British policy and sings glories of British Imperialism. He writes in his prefatory note to *The Rajas of Punjab* that:

..... the policy of the British Government , so far as the Sikh States are concerned,

Has been uniformly liberal, enlightened and just; that in no single instance has it

abused its strength to oppress its weaker neighbours, but that, on the contrary
it had taken less than its undoubted right and has decided
disputed questions with a generosity and disinterestedness
which will be looked for in vain in the administration
of any country.

He also remarks that Government of India has had one policy and one alone, whether Punjab or Oude or Bengal was concerned. In other words Lepel Griffin believes that the British career of conquests in India was absolutely clean and unblemished. He ignores the unscrupulous means which the British authorities had adopted for example in the annexation of Sindh, Satara, Jhansi, Nagpur, Oudh and Punjab etc. Even Lepel Griffin was not right in holding that the British policy in respect of Cis-Sutlej states was uniformly liberal and generous. He himself contradicts this remark when he gives number of examples about the absorption of some territories of the Sikh Chiefship by the British in an unjust manner during the period of East India Company. After the Anglo Sikh war British Government absorbed many petty Cis-Sutlej Sikh states which were considered guilty of having supported the enemies of the British and it not only confiscated portion of territories of Kapurthala and Nabha states for their supposed disloyal conduct to the British but also dethroned Raja Davinder Singh of Nabha.

To sum up, it may be concluded that nineteenth century was not only important to the Sikhs but also to the British. Top most powers of India had vanished from the map. Subsequently British opportunist emerged as supreme power in India. Simultaneous, change in western political conditions happened to be the reason to intersect the British with chiefs of Punjab. This journey of British and Cis-Sutlej which started in 1803 had have to go through several political hurdles like Anglo Sikh wars, Revolt of 1857, internal and external complications. Fortunately, Lepel Griffin took the initiative to correspondingly inscribe this journey from historical perspective. The author claims that “No chapter of Indian History has ever been written so unreservedly or with so much detail as the present volume. Even relation of Princely states with British till 1947 remained intact and played an important part in Indian politics and history. So on, it attracts more attention of the thinker belonging to various classes.

Undoubtedly, *The Rajas of Punjab* historically momentous for several reasons though his main concern was to provide justification to the British rule in Punjab and basis for the reservation of the British Empire in India. Lepel Griffin's work leaves no doubt that like other conservatives thinkers he also believes in the policy of Divide and Rule. Like them he suggests that loyalty of aristocracy and army were the only dependable pillars of permanence of British rule in India. All the same, it has to be admitted that he was the one of those few administrative historians who left us a rich heritage of historical literature on the period which is though not very remote is yet obscure in history.

PRIMARY SOURCES

I. PROCEEDINGS OF THE GOVERNMENT OF INDIA IN THE FOREIGN DEPARTMENT, (NATIONAL ARCHIVE OF INDIA, NEW DELHI)

- Foreign Department ,Political Consultation
- Foreign Department, Political Proceedings
- Foreign Department ,Political - A
- Foreign Department, Foreign Consultations
- Foreign Department , Secret Proceedings
- Foreign Department, Political Progs.
- Foreign Department ,Political A, C
- Foreign Department ,Secret, I
- Political Dispatch
- Letters from the Proceedings of the Government of India
- Viceroy and Governor General of India

II. RECORDS OF PUNJAB STATES IN PUNJAB STATE ARCHIVES, PATIALA

- Patiala and Nabha State Records
- Annual Reports on the Administration of Punjab and its Dependencies
- Kapurthala its Past And Present, Allahabad 1921
- Aitchison, C.U, A collection of treaties, Engagements and Sandas, Vol. I, Vol-II, Vol. VIII Calcutta, 1931.

III. GOVERNMENT GAZETTEERS

- Imperial Gazetteer of India
- Punjab State Gazetteer
 - a) Kapurthala State
 - b) Faridkot State
 - c) Phulkian State
 - d) Nabha State
 - e) Jind State

- Punjab District Gazetteers
- Imperial Gazetteers
- Gazetteers of Undivided Punjab

IV. JOURNALS

- Punjab Past and Present, Biannual, Published by the Punjabi University, Patiala for the year 1968, 1971-72, 1974, 1990 and 2012.
- Punjab History Conference Proceedings, Published by Punjabi University, Patiala for year 1970 to 1976, 1979 and 2003
- Journal of The Punjab University Historical Society
- Bengal Past and Present, 1955

V. ENCYCLOPEDIA:

The Encyclopedia of Sikhism

- VI.** Collection of the Letters of Ochterlony to Metcalf, Ganda Singh Collection, Punjabi University, Patiala.

VII. Books

- Amarvant (trans.) Raja Ram Tota, *Guldaste-i-Punjab*, Vol. I, Department of Punjab Historical Studies, Punjabi University, Patiala, N.D.
- Allen, W.H *History of Punjab; Rise Progress and Present Condition of Sect and Nation of Sikh People*, Vol. I, Leaden Hall Street, London, 1846.
- N.D, *An Historical Interpretation of George Rusell Clerk*, National Archive, N.D, India, N.D,
- Dhingra, Behari Lal *Jind State: A Brief Historical and Administration Sketch*, Bombay (N.D).
- Buckland, C.E (ed.) *Dictionary of Indian Biography*, Oxford University Press, London, 1946.
- Clunes Lieutenant John, *An Historical Sketches of Princes of India*, Smith and Elder Co., London, N.D.

- Cunningham, Joseph Davey *The History of the Sikhs*, Ahlemarle Street, London, 1863.
- Dow, Alexandar *The History of Hindostan*, , J.Walker, London, 1812.
- Forster, George A *Journey from Bengal to England*, Vol. I, R. Faulder, London 1788.
- G. Birch, Captain *Selection From Notebook Kept By Captain G. Birch 1818-1821*, Superintendent, Government Printing Punjab, Lahore.
- Gregor W.L M, *The History of The Sikhs*, Vol. I, Laden Hall Street, London, 1846.
- Griffin Lepel Henry, *The Rajas Of Punjab*, Low Price Publications, New Delhi, Reprint, 2014.
- „ *Law of Inheritance to Sikh Chiefship*, Punjab Printing Company, Lahore, 1869.
- „ Maharaja Ranjit Singh, Claredon Press, Oxford, 1905.
- Griffin, Massey, *Chiefs and Families of the Note In Punjab* Vol . I. II, Government Printing, Lahore, 1940.
- Harimander Singh Kohli (trans.) Devi Parsad, *Gulshan-i-Punjab*, N.D, Punjab Historical Department Library, Patiala.
- Joginder Kaur (ed.) *Ram Sukh Rao's Fateh Singh Parbhakar*, Punjab State Archives, Patiala, 1980.
- Kaye, John William, *The Life and Correspondence Of John Malcolm*, Smith, Elder and Co., London, 1856.
- N.D, *Kapurthala State- Its Past and Present*, N.D, Kapurthala, 1928.
- Khan Muhhamad Sayed Hasan, *Tarikh-i-Patiala*, Safir-Hind Press, Amritsar, 1878, Amritsar, 1878.
- Khan Colonel Mohd. Abdul Majid, *A Short History of Patiala State*, Rajinder Press, Patiala, May 1910.
- Major C.H Buck, *The Annals of Karnal*, Government Printing, Lahore, 1914.
- Malleson, Colonel G. B C.S.I, *An Historical Sketch of Native States of India*, Longman Green, London, 1875.

- Mal, Bhakt (trans.) *Khalsanama*, Punjab Historical Studies, Punjabi University, Patiala.
- Macauliffe, *The Sikh Religion*, Vol. VI, Oxford, London, 1909.
- Metcalfe Charles Theophilus, *Two Narratives of Mutiny*, Archibald Constable, London, 1891.
- Mill, James *The History of British India*, Vol. I, Wertheimer and Co., London, 1817.
- Malcolm, Lieutenant John *Sketch of The Sikhs*, Asiatic Society, London, 1812.
- Mufti-Ali-Ud-Din (trans.), *Ibartnama*, Vol. II & Vol. III, Department of Punjab Historical Studies, Punjabi University, Patiala.
- *Mutiny Records Correspondence*, Part I & II, Punjab Government Press, Lahore 1911.
- N.D, *Memoranda of Information Regarding Certain Native Chiefs*, N. D.
- Princep Henery, *Origin of the Sikh Power in Punjab and Political life of Maharaja Ranjit Singh with an account of Religious Laws and customs of the Sikhs*, G.H Huntman, Military Orphan Press, Calcutta, 1834.
- *Press List of Old Records In the Punjab Secretariat 1809-1840*, Punjab Government, Lahore, 1911.
- *Press List of Records of The N.W.F Agency*, 1840-1845, Punjab Government Lahore, 1911.
- Rai Khuswant, (trans.) *Tarikh –i- Sikhan*, Vol. I, Punjab Historical Department, Punjabi University, Patiala.
- *Records of Ludhiana Agency 1809-1815*, Punjab Government Press, Lahore, 1911.
- Singh Giani Lal (trans.) Rai Kali and Tulsi Ram, *Punjab Di Sair*, Punjabi University, Patiala, 1971.
- Shah Bute (trans.) *Tarikh-i-Punjab*, Vol. I, Vol. II & Vol. III, Punjab Historical Studies, Punjabi University, Patiala.
- Smith George, *The Dictionary of National Biography*, Elder and Co., London, 1922.

- Suri V.S (trans.) Sohan Lal Suri, *Udmat-ut-Twarikh*, Daftar-II, Daftar – III, Daftar – IV & Daftar V, Guru Nanak Dev University, Amritsar, 1985.
- Tupper C.L, *Our Indian Protectorate*, Longman Green and Co., London, 1893.
- Warner William Lee, *The Life of Dalhousie*, Savielle and Corenburgh Press, London, 1972.

SECONDARY SOURCES:

ENGLISH BOOKS:

- Ali, B. Seikh, *History its Theory and Methods*, Luxmi Publication, Madras, 1988.
- Arora Anju, *British Paramountcy and Internal Administration (1858-1948)*, National Book Organization, New Delhi, 2001.
- Bhagat Singh, *History of Sikh Misals*, Punjabi Publication Bureau, Punjabi University, Patiala, 2009.
- Bishan Singh Giani, *Panth Parkash Soorbir Khalsa*, Master Sunder G.A.V Khalsa College, Amritsar, N.D.
- Bal S.S, *British Policy Towards Punjab*, New Age Publisher, Calcutta, 1971.
- Banerjee S. N, *History of Patiala*, Vol. I & II, N.D.
- Bakshi, S. R, *British Diplomacy and Administration in India*, Munshiram Manoharlal, New Delhi, 1971.
- Bhargava Krishan Dyal (ed.) *Brown's Correspondence*, Delhi, 1960.
- Barton, *Sir William The Princes of India*, Nisbet and Company, London, 1934.
- Bikramjit Hasrat, *Anglo-Sikh Relations, 1799-1849*, Hoshiarpur, 1968.
- Bhai Gurmukh Singh, *Tawarikh Nabha*, Gurmat National Agency, Amritsar, N.D.
- Cave Brown, *The Punjab and Delhi in 1857*, William Blackwood and Sons., London, 1861.
- Chopra G. L, *The Punjab as Sovereign State*, Al-Bruni, Lahore, 1928.
- Darshan Singh, *Western Image of Sikh Religion*, National Book Organization, New Delhi, 1999.

- Dhillon Kulbir Singh, *British Impact on the Punjab States*, Shree Publisher, Delhi, 2007.
- Der Dussen W.J Wan, *History Is A Science; The Philosophy Of R.G Collingwood*, Martinus Publishers, London, 1981.
- Desraj Thakur, *Jaar Ithiaas*, Kranti Press, Agra, N.D.
- Dua J.C, *British Historiography in 18th Century Punjab*, Radha Publication, Delhi, 2002.
- Fauja Singh, *The City of Faridkot*, Punjabi University, Patiala 1997.
- Fauja Singh (ed.), *Historian Historiography of the Sikhs*, Oriental Publishers, New Delhi, 1978.
- Farooqi Bashir Ahmed, *British Relation with the Cis-Sutlej States 1809-1823*, PUP, Language Department, 1971.
- Ganda Singh, *Patiala and East Punjab States Union*, Patiala State Archives, Patiala, 1954.
- „ *Baba Ala Singh of Patiala*, (N.D).
- „ *Early European Accounts of Sikhs and the History of Origin and the Progress of Sikhs*, Today & Tomorrow's Printers & Publishers New Delhi, 1974.
- Gill M.K, *Secular Sovereign Maharaja Ranjit Singh*, M.P Parkashan, Delhi, 2002.
- Gupta Partul (ed.), Antoine Louis Henri Polier, *Shah Alam II and His Court*, Calcutta, 1947.
- Gupta, H.R, *History of the Sikhs*, Vol. IV, Mushiram Manohar Lal Publishers, New Delhi, 2007.
- Grewal, J.S *Historical Writings on The Sikhs (1784-2011)*, Manohar Publisher, New Delhi, 2012.
- H.B Singh, *Ankhila Jarnail Akali Phoola Singh*, Sundar Printers, Delhi, 1988.
- Harbans Singh, *Heritage of the Sikhs*, Manohar Publisher, New Delhi, 1964.
- Jindal Rajeev, *The Princely States of Jind Revisted*, N.D.
- Khurana G., *British Historiography on the Sikh Power in Punjab*, Allied Publisher, New Delhi, 1985.

- Kaye John William, *A History Of The Sepoy War In India*, Longman and Green, London, 1876.
- Kahzan Singh, *History and Philosophy of the Sikh Religion*, Part - I, Newal Krishan Press, Lahore, 1914.
- Khan Abdul Majid, *A Short History of Patiala State*, Rajindar Press, Patiala, 1910.
- Lawrance Looper Walter, *Ruling Princes and Chiefs of India*, Sang-e-Meel, Publication, Lahore, Reprint 2005.
- Latif S.M, *History of the Punjab*, Calcutta Central Company, Calcutta, 1891.
- Lee Warner Sir William, *The Life of the Marquis of Dalhousie*, Macmillan and Company, London, 1904.
- Malik Salahuddin, The Punjab and the Indian Mutiny, *Journal of Indian History*, August 1972.
- Mittal Satish Chandra, *Haryana: A Historical Perspective*, Atlantic Publishers, Haryana, 1986.
- Mjaumdar R.C, *The Sepoy Mutiny and Revolt of 1857*, K. L Mukhopadhyay, Calcutta, 1963.
- Nandy, Ashish, *History and Theory Journal*, Vol. 34, no. 2, Theme issue 34, Welesen University, U.S.A.
- Playne Somerset, *Indian State; A Biographical, Historical and Administrative Survey*, London, 1921.
- Pannikar K.N, *British Diplomacy in North India*, Associated Publishing, New Delhi, 1968.
- Ramusack Barbara, *The Indian Princes and Their States*, London, 2004
- S.G.P.C, *Truth About Nabha*, Amritsar, 1924.
- Sodhi Ravinder Singh, *The Shahi Country of Nabha*, S.C.P Publication, Nabha, 2012.
- Syngal Munnalal, *The Patriotic Prince*, Doaba House, Ludhiana , 1961
- Sethi R.R, *Lahore Darbar*, G.L Chopra, Keeper of Records of the Punjab Government, Delhi 1950.

- „ *The Mighty and Shrewd Maharaja*, S. Chand, Delhi, 1960.
- Seetal S.S, *The Sikh Misals and the Punjab States*, Lahore Book Shop, Ludhiana, 1981.
- „ *Rise of Sikh Power in Punjab*, Ludhiana ,(N.D)
- *The British Crown and Indian States*, P.S King and Son Limited, London, 1929.
- Jeet Singh Seetal (ed.), *Kanhya Lal, Tarikh-i-Punjab*, Vol. III, Publication Bureau, Punjab University, Patiala.
- Sir Leslie Stephen and Sir Sidney Lee (ed.) *Dictionary of National Biography*, Vol. V, Oxford, London, 1921-22.

(II) PUNJABI BOOKS:

- Atar Singh, *Sidhu Brar ate Khandan Phul*, Moga, 1934.
- Betab Krishan, *IthiasReaasat Jihnd*, Sangrur, 2007.
- Giani Gian Singh, *Twarikh Guru Khalsa*, Part III, 1999.
- Padama Piyara Singh, *Sankhep Sikh Ithihaas*, Patiala, 1963.
- Ras Nihal , *Nirbhai Jathedar Akali Phoola Singh*, Amritsar, 2010.
- Walia Jagjiwan, *Patiala Seher*, Patiala, 1936.

Appendix I

Princely States of Punjab

Phulkian States

PATIALA: The Patiala state was the largest of all the Punjab States in the point of population and revenue, though it was second to population of Bahawalpur in area. It had a total area of 5,412 square miles with the population of 1,596,692 and revenue of Rs. 57, 11, 549 in 1901. The territories of the Patiala State were scattered and consisted of three portions. The main portion comprised the plain portion of the State west of Jamuna valley and south of Sutlej. It was surrounded by the Districts of Ferozepur, Ludhiana, Ambala, Karnal, Hissar. The second portion lay in the Shiwalik Hills and the third portion consisted of Narnual *ilaqa* in the extreme south-east on the borders of the Jaipur and Alwar States. Founded by Baba Ala Singh (died 1765). Patiala became 'the most powerful State between Jamuna and the Sutlej' during the time of his grandson and successor, Amar Singh. In 1809, this premier State came under the protection of the British Government along with other Cis-Sutlej Chiefships.

JIND: One of the three Phulkian States, Jind had an area of 1259 square miles; in 1901 its population was 282,003 and the revenue amounted to Rs 14,90, 461. The state comprised three distinct tracts corresponding to its three *thesils* of Sangrur, Jind and Dadri. The *thesil* of Sangrur was interspersed among the territories of the Patiala and Nabha States. The Jind *thesil* lay to the south-east of the Sangrur and was almost entirely surrounded by the British Districts of Karnal, Delhi and Rohtak; while on the south of it, and separated by the Rohtak District; lay the territory of the Dadri *thesil*. The founder of the ruling dynasty of Jind was Gajpat Singh (Died 1789). It was during the time of Raja Bhag Singh that the State came under the British protection.

NABHA: Having an area of 928 square miles with the population of 297, 949 and revenue of Rs. 12, 21, 313 in 1901, the Nabha State was second in population and the smallest in

the area and the revenue of three Phulkian States. It consisted of two distinct tracts; the first constituted the *nizamat* of Almoh and Phul, and second the *nizamat* of Bawal. The former comprised of twelve separate pieces of territory, scattered among the territories of the other two Phulkian States of Patiala and Jind and contiguous with the British Districts of Ferozpur, Ludhiana and the States of Malerkotla on the north and the State of Faridkot on the west. The second lay in the extreme south-east of the Punjab. The founder of the Nabha state as a separate entity was Hamir Singh (Died 1783). It was during the time of his son and successor, Raja Jaswant Singh that the State came under the British Protection in 1809.

OTHER STATES

KAPURTHALA: Of the Sikh States in the Punjab, the Kapurthala State was next in the importance to the Phulkian States of Patiala, Jind and Nabha. It had an area of 652 square miles, and according to the statistics of 1901, its total population was 314,351 and revenue about 13,00,00; besides, the State derived an income of Rs. 8,00,000 from Oudh estates extending over an area of 700 square miles of which the Kapurthala Chief held *taluqadari* rights. The main part of the state stretched from the borders of Hoshiarpur Districts on the north to the Sutlej on the south and from the borders of Julundur Districts on the east to the Beas on the west. The State actually consisted of three detached portion of territory, the principal of which was an irregular strip on the eastern strip on the eastern bank of the Beas, varying in the breadth from 7 to 20 miles. The other portion consisted of the Phagwara *thesil* between Jullundur and Phillaur and the *parganas* of Bhunga in the west of Hoshiarpur. The state also owned some territory in Cis-Sutlej States area and a few villages in the Districts of Lahore and Amritsar. Jassa Singh Ahluwalia (d.1783) was the real founder of Kapurthala State. But it was Sardar Fateh Singh who along with Ranjit Singh concluded Treaty of Unity and friendship with the British in 1806. In 1809, the British Government guaranteed protection for his ancestral Cis-Sutlej estates.

FARIDKOT: Situated in the south of the Ferozepore District, the Faridkot state had an area of 642 square miles, with the population of 124, 912 and revenue of Rs. 4,25,000 in 1901. It contained two towns, Faridkot and Kotkapura and 167 villages. The ruling family of Faridkot belonged to the Brar clan of the Jats and was descended from the same stock as the Phulkian houses, having a common ancestor in Brar, more remote by twelve generation than the

celebrated Phul, The founder of the Faridkot state was Sardar Hamir Singh (Died 1792). In 1808, Maharaja Ranjit Singh forced him to relinquish it along with other Cis-Sutlej possession and brought the State under their protection.

APPENDIX II

Proclamation to Cis-Sutlej Chiefs

3 May 1809

It is clearer than the sun, and better proved than the existence of yesterday, that the detachment of British troops to this side of the Sutlej was entirely in acquiescence with the application and earnest treaty of the Chiefs, and originated solely through friendly considerations in the British to preserve the Chiefs in their possessions and independence. A Treaty having been concluded on the 25th April 1809 between Mr. Metcalfe on the part of the British Government and Maharaja Ranjit Singh agreeably to the orders of the Right Honourable the Governor-General in Council, I have the pleasure of publishing for the satisfaction of the Chiefs of the country of Malwa and Sirhind, the pleasure and resolutions of Government contained in the seven following Articles:

Article 1. The country of the Chiefs of Malwa and Sirhind having entered under the protection of the British Government, in future it shall be secured from the authority and control of Maharaja Ranjit Singh, conformably to the terms of the Treaty.

Article 2. The country of the Chiefs thus taken under protection shall be exempted from all pecuniary tribute to the British Government.

Article 3. The Chiefs shall remain in the exercise of the same rights and authority within their own possessions, which they enjoyed before they were taken under the British protection.

Article 4. Whenever a British force, for purposes connected with the general welfare, shall be judged necessary to march through the country of the said Chiefs, every Chief shall, within his own possessions, assist and furnish the British force, to the full of his power, with supplies of grain and other necessaries which may be demanded.

Article 5. Should an enemy approach from any quarter for the purpose of conquering this country, friendship and mutual interest require that the Chiefs join the British army with their forces, and exerting themselves in expelling the enemy, act under discipline and obedience.

Article 6. Any European articles brought by merchants from the eastern districts, for the use of the army, shall be allowed to pass by the thanadars and *sirdars* of the several districts belonging to the Chiefs without molestation or the demand of duty.

Article 7. All horses purchased for the use of the cavalry regiments, whether in Sirhind or elsewhere, the bringers of which being furnished with sealed *rahdarees* from the Resident at Delhi or Officer Commanding of Sirhind, the several Chiefs shall allow such horses to pass without molestation or the demand of duty.

APPENDIX III

PROCLAMATION addressed to the SIKH SIRDARS, etc., 22 August 1811.

On the 3rd of May 1809 an Ittalah-nameh, comprised of seven Articles, was issued by the orders of the British Government, purporting that the country of the Sirdars of Sirhind and Malwa, having come under their protection, Rajah Ranjeet Singh, agreeably to Treaty, had no concern with the possession of the above Sirdars; that the British Government had no intention of claiming peshcush or nuzzrunah, and that they should continue in the full control and enjoyment of their respective possessions. The publication of the above Ittalah-nameh was intended to afford every confidence to the Sirdars that they had no intention of control and those having possession should remain in full and quiet enjoyment thereof.

Whereas several zemindars and other subjects of the Chiefs of this country have preferred complaints to the officers of the British Government, who, baring in view the tenor of the above Ittalah-nameh, have not attended, and will not in future pay attention to them; for instance, on June 15th Dellawer Ali Khan, Of Samana complained to the Resident of Delhi against the officers of Rajah Saheb Singh, for jewels and other property said to have been seized by them, who, in reply, observed that the cusba of Samna, being in the omaldery, of Raja Sahib Singh, this complaint should be made to him " and also on the 12th July 1811, Dusswonda Singh and Goormook Singh complained to Colonel Ochterlony, Agent to Governor General, against Sardar Churrut Singh for their share in property and in reply, it was written on the back of the urzee, that since during the period of three years no claim was preferred against Churrut Singh by any of his brothers, nor even the name of any co-partner mentioned, and since it was advertised in the ittalahnameh delivered to the Sirdars, that every Chief should remain in the quiet and full possession of his domains, their petition could not be attended to " The insertion of these answers to complaints is intended as examples, and also that it may be impressed on the minds of every zamindar and other 'objects that the attainment of justice is to be expected from their respective Chiefs only, that they may not, in the smallest degree, swerve from the observance of

subordination. It is therefore highly incumbent upon the Rajahs and other Sirdars on this side of the River that they explain this to their respective subjects and court their confidence that it may be clear to them that complaints to the officers of the British Government will be of no avail, and that they consider their respective Sirdars as the source of justice, and that of their free will and accord they observe uniform obedience.

And whereas, according to the first proclamation, it is not the intention of the British Government to interfere in the possessions of the Sirdars of this country, it is nevertheless, for the purpose of ameliorating the condition of the community, particularly to give general information, that several Sirdars have, since the incursion of Rajah Runjeet Singh, wrested the estates of others, and deprived them of their Lawful possession, and that in the restoration they have used delays until detachments from the British Army have enforced restitution, as in the case of the Ranee of Jeera, the Sikhs of Cholian, the talooks of Karowley and Chehloundy, and village of Cheeba ; and the reason of such delays and evasions can only be attributed to the temporary enjoyment of the revenues, and subjecting the owners to irremediable losses. It is therefore by order of the British Government, hereby proclaimed, that if any of the Sirdars or others have forcibly taken possession of the estates of others, or otherwise injured the lawful owners, it is necessary that, before the occurrence of any complaint, the proprietor should be satisfied, and by no means to defer the restoration of the property ; in which, however, should delays be made, and the interference of the British authority became requisite, the revenues of the estate, from the date of the ejection of the lawful proprietor, together with whatever other losses the inhabitants of that place may sustain from the march of troops, shall, without scruple, be demanded from the offending party ; and for disobedience of the present orders, a penalty according to the circumstances of the case and the offender shall be levied, agreeably to the decision of the British Government.

Loodiana, 22 August 1811.

(Sd.) D. Ochterlony

Agent to Governor General

APPENDIX IV

Sanad granted to the Maharaja of Patiala, 5 May, 1860

Whereas since the day of the rise of the sun of the everlasting British Empire and supremacy in this country of India, the acts of loyalty and devotion to Government of Farzand-i-Khas-i-Daulat-i-Inglisia. Mansur-i-Zaman, Amir-ul-Umara, Maharaja Dhiraj, Rajesar Sr. Maharaja Rajagan Narindar Singh Mahindar Bahadur and ancestors and predecessors of the said Maharaja on occasions of war and battle. etc., have become fully conspicuous ; accordingly as a reward for these good services and aid and assistance with troops and supplies, etc., they have always been distinguished and exalted by the powerful British Government by being granted territory and titles and raised in degrees of honour and dignity. Particularly in the year 1857 A.D. during the days of the insurrection and mutiny of wretched persons the Maharaja Sahib Mahinder Bahadur rendered and displayed worthy and conspicuous services which surpassed his previous achievements. Therefore, in recognition of such approved services, the powerful British Government, by way of Royal favour and kindness, has conferred on the Maharaja Sahib Mahindar Bahadur, some territory and additional title for gene-ration after generation and descendant after descendant. The Maharaja Sahib Bahadur has applied for a renewal of the sand regarding his ancestral territory as well as that granted to him previously and flow b the powerful Government In view of this, His Excellency the Viceroy and Governor-General is pleased to approve of the grant of the present Iona by way of treaty with the conditions entered below as a memorable document.

Clause I. According to the list annexed to this *Sanad*, the Maharaja Sahib Bahadur and his successors will, in the present and future time, exercise sovereignty, with peace of mind and in perfect security, in accordance with ancient custom, over his ancestral possessions and the dominions bestowed on him by the British Government and consider the territory granted to him by the British Government in recognition of his good services as his ancestral territory with all powers and rights, internal and external. All powers, great and small, administrative and criminal and in respect of the produce of revenue, etc., will, as heretofore, remain permanently vested in the power and control of the Maharaja Sahib Bahadur and his successors generation after generation and descendant after descendant, in present and in future for ever and in perpetuity;

and (his) brothers. Zaildars, Chaharumians (persons entitled to a fourth share), feudatories, Jagirdars and dependants will according to old custom obey the orders and commands of the Maharaja and his successors.

Clause II. The powerful British Government will not demand or exact anything on account of *nazzarana*, land revenue, administrative or criminal cesses, compensation on account of troops, etc., or on any other plea whatever, in the present or future, from the Maharaja Sahib Mahindar Bahadur, his successors, dependants, brothers, Zaildars, Jagirdars Chaharumians or feudatories except as provided in Clause III.

Clause III. As an additional royal favor and having regard to the loyalty and devotion of the Maharaja Sahib Mahindar Bahadur the powerful Government desires that this territory should always remain under the sovereignty of his family. Therefore the power of adoption is granted for ever to the said Maharaja Sahib and his successors so that in case there is no lineal descendant, they may, for the purpose of perpetuating the line of Chiefship, adopt a successor, according to their own choice from among the descendants of the Phulkian family. The powerful Government cordially accepts and agrees to this. The powerful Government also grants permission that in case—may God forbid—the Maharaja on the masnad should suddenly die, without leaving a lineal descendant or an adopted successor, the Rasa Sahib of Jalandhar and the Raja Sahib of Nabha, in concert with the Commissioner Sahib Bhadur, may select a successor from among the Phulkian family and place him on the masnad. In that case, '*nazzarana*' to the extent of one-third of the income of the State for one year will be paid into the treasury of the British Government by the Patiala State.

Clause IV. In the year 1847, an agreement regarding the infliction of capital Punishment after reference to the commissioner Sahib Bhadur and the prevention of female infanticide, Sati and salevery ,etc, and absolute power by all means regarding the infliction of capital punishment etc. In his territory, according to old custom is granted to the Maharaja Sahib Mahindar Bahadur and his successors. Similarly with regard to punishing subjects of the powerful British Government, committing crime and apprehended in the territory of the Patiala State, the Maharaja Sahib Mahindar Bahadur and his successor's are granted power in accordance with the provisions of the dispatch No. 3, dated 1 June 1836, from the hon'ble Court of Directors at the capital, London. The Maharaja Sahib Bahadur will exert himself by every possible means in promoting the

welfare of people and the happiness of his subjects and redressing the grievances of the oppressed and injured in the proper way. He will prevent in his territory female infanticide, sati and slavery, which are opposed to the principles of justice and equity towards the people, in accordance with the provisions of the former sanad. In the event of any person at any time committing the above mentioned prohibited crimes without the know-ledge of the officials of the Maharaja Sahib Bahadur, the latter will inflict deterrent punishment on him.

Clause V. The Maharaja Sahib and his successors will never fail in their faithful and devoted obedience to the Empress, Queen of England, and her successors.

Clause VI. If at any time any hostile troops with mischievous intention should appear in his neighbourhood from any side or direction, the Maharaja Sahib Bahadur will along with his existing force sincerely and loyally co-operate with the English in repelling them in accordance with past practice. He will exert himself, to the utmost of his resources, in providing supplies, grains, etc., and transport according to the requisitions of British officers.

Clause VII. Complaints against the Maharaja Sahib from his subjects, Muafidars, Jagirdars, dependants, brothers and servants, etc., will on no account be listened to by the powerful British Government.

Clause VIII. With regard to internal management and the affairs of brothers, household and relatives, the rules and arrangements made by the Maharaja Sahib Bahadur will always be respected and not interfered with by the powerful British Government.

Clause IX. On the occasion of the construction and repairs of roads in his territory the Maharaja Sahib Bahadur will in accordance with the written communication of the Commissioner Sahib Bahadur, arrange from his own territory, through kardars and officials of Parganas according to former custom, for the materials required on payment, and at the time of the construction of a rail-road or other roads, the Maharaja Sahib Bahadur will concede, free of charge, land that comes under the roads in the same way as he has done for the Imperial road.

Clause X. The Maharaja Sahib Bahadur will always pursue the course of obedience and loyalty to the powerful Government who will likewise continue to uphold his honour, respect, rank and dignity in the manner it is done at present. [Then the list of the territories, ancestral as well as those acquired from the British Government, and or the feudatories of the Maharaja was given.] **Note :** Similar *Sanads* were granted to the Rajas of Jind and Nabha on the same date.

APPENDIX V

Sunnud granted to Rajah Wuzeer Singh of Fureed Kote,

Dated 21 April 1863.

Since the establishment of British supremacy in India Rajah Wuzeer Singh and his ancestors have given proofs of loyalty to the British Government and have received rewards in the accession of fresh honours, dignity and territory. More recently the present chief Fureed Kote evinced his adherence to the cause of the British Government during the mutiny of 1857-58 in consideration of which service the British Government has, out of royal grace and condescension, remitted the service of ten sowars hitherto furnished by the Rajah; has added to the forms under which he is officially addressed; has increased the Khillut to which he is entitled, and raised the number of guns which he is to be saluted to the number of eleven ; and has graciously acceded to the Rajah's desire to receive a Sunnud or Grant under the hand and seal of the Viceroy, confirming and guaranteeing to the Rajah and his heirs forever the possession of his ancient *hereditary territory, as well as the territory acquired by the Rajah from the British Government by grant or exchange under the following provisions:—

Clause 1.— The hereditary domain now in the possession of the Rajah, and the country acquired by the Rajah by grant and exchange, according to the annexed list, are hereby confirmed and guaranteed to the Rajah and his male heirs lawfully begotten, forever, together with all the powers and authority, civil, criminal and fiscal, at present exercised by the Rajah.

Clause 2.— With the exception of the unredeemed revenue-free holdings in Ilaka Kotkupoora noted below, one British Government will never demand from the Rajah or any of his successors or from any of his feudatory relatives, or dependants, any tribute or account of revenue services or any other plea.

	Rs.
Revenue free holdings in Ilaka Kotkupoora, which have lapsed or are resumable hereafter	4,2338
Deduct yearly amount of compensation granted to the Rajah For the abolition of customs in his territory.	2,000
Balance..	2,238

Clause 3- The Rajah has in consideration of the compensation granted by the British Government, relinquished for himself and his successors for ever all right to levy excise or transit duties which have been abolished throughout the territory of Fureed Kote.

Clause 4.—The British Government desiring to see the house of Fureed Kote perpetuated, has conferred upon the Rajah and his successors forever, whenever male heirs lawfully begotten may fail, the right of adopting a successor in accordance with the customs of his race.

Clause 5.—With regard to British subjects committing crime and apprehensions bended in his territory, the Rajah and his successors will exercise the powers provided for in the dispatch of the Honorable Court of Directors to the Government, N o. 3, dated 1 June 1836.

The Rajah and his successors will exert themselves to execute justice and promote the happiness and welfare of their people. They will, in accordance with the terms of a previous engagement, prohibit "suttee," slavery, and female feticide throughout their territory, and punish with exemplary rigor those who are found guilty of these crimes.

Clause 6.--The Rajah and his successors will never fail in their devotion and loyalty to the Sovereign of Great Britain.

Clause, 7.---1.1 at any time any force hostile to the British Government should appear in this direction, the Rajah will co-operate with the British Government and oppose the enemy. He will exert himself to the utmost of his resources in providing carriage and supplies according to requisitions be may receive from the offices of the British Government.

Clause 8.-- The Rajah and his successors will always furnish at current rates, through the agency of his own officers, the necessary materials required for the construction of railroads, railway stations and Imperial roads and bridges. He will also freely give the land required for the construction of railroads and Imperial lines of road.

Clause 9.-- The Rajah and his successors will always pursue the same course of fidelity to the British Government, and the Government will always be ready to uphold the honour and dignity of the Rajah and his house.

SCHEDULE of the TERRITORIES belonging to the RAJAH of FUREED KOTE

Ancestral Possessions.

Pergunnah Furred Kote.

“ Deep Singwalla

Acquired Possessions.

Villages of Pergunnah Kote Kupoorra, given to the Rajah in exchange for Pergunnah Sultan Khanwalla.

Villages of Kote Kupoorra and Bhughtah granted by the British Government, excepting the village of Sibbian, included in British territory under the orders of the Chief Commissioner of the Punjab, No. 345, dated 4th May :858.

Feudatories and Tributaries.

Nloura Mamosana, Pergunnah Fureed Kote.

LEPEL HENRY GRIFFIN'S *THE RAJAS OF PUNJAB*: A HISTORICAL ANALYSIS

**A
THESIS**

Submitted to the
Faculty of Social Sciences
PUNJABI UNIVERSITY, PATIALA
In Partial Fulfillment of the Requirement
for the Degree of
**DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY
IN
HISTORY**

Supervisor

Balraj Singh

Dr. Balraj Singh

Assistant Professor

Department of History

Punjabi University, Patiala

Researcher

Pushpinder Singh

Pushpinder Singh



(Established Under Punjab Act No.35 of 1961)

**DEPARTMENT OF HISTORY
PUNJABI UNIVERSITY, PATIALA
NOVEMBER, 2021**

Conclusion

At the dawn of the 19th century the Marathas held complete control over the imperial capital Delhi and the areas around it. The English were gradually moving forward in this direction. A clash between the two became almost predictable. On the other hand, Zaman Shah, Durrani ruler of Kabul, was contemplating to recover the Punjab and Delhi. He had already made more than one attempt, had crossed the Attock but was called back to Kabul for reasons of trouble in home politics. All these circumstances had increased the strategic and political significance of the Cis- Sutlej area or the land between the Jamuna and Sutlej, which was precisely called Sir-i-Hind or Tabr-i-Hind viz the axe on head of India.

The occupants of the area were generally the Phulikan and some of the Manjha Sikhs, who has conquered it from the Afghan *faujdar*, Zain Khan, in 1764 A.D and had subsequently, laid the foundation of their several principalities, out of which four major states were Patiala, Nabha, Jind and Kaithal. There were hundreds of minor too. Besides there were also three Muslim states i.e. Raikot, Malerkotla and Kunjpura in the area, and the states of Kapurthala, these territories mainly lay in Jalandhar Doab, also possessed about 250 villages in the Cis-Sutlej region.

After a constant struggle of about twenty years against the Mughals and the Afghans, these Sikh states had gained an independent status during the 18th century.

It was quite difficult to trace the boundaries or to determine the individual revenue and the forces of each of these states, as they were always changing, but collectively its area could be said to have extended from the Jamna in the west, to the Sutlej in the north, to the Shiwalik hills in north-east, and to the confines of the Haryana tract in the south and southeast.

The population of this tract consisted mainly of Jats, Gujars, Dogras, a large number of whom had accepted Sikhism. Here, Hindu and Muslim both lived together. The foremost profession of the people was agriculture. Huge taxes were levied by the chiefs on the commodities, which ever passed through their respective area. For some decades past most anarchic situations had prevailed in this area, hence every village and town was fortified for self defense.

The prominent rulers of the states at the time were Raja Shaib Singh of Patiala, Bhai Lal Singh of Kaithal, Raja Bhag Singh of Jind, Raja Jaswant Singh of Nabha and Raja Fateh Singh of Kapurthala.

The Cis-Sutlej chiefs were supreme in their own states and allowed the remnants of the Mughal provincial administrative system, which had survived the distress of the 18th century, to carry on the function in their respective states. There were no confined law and justice was forceful and ready. There were neither regular prison nor was capital punishment ever resorted to. The common form of penalty were fine, extra duty, mutilation, stocks and fancy punishment such as blacking of the face of the culprit or stamping and branding of his forehead and exiling him from his native town. The system of trial by ordeal was not unknown and the theory of punishment was rather retributive.

These states followed distinguish course of history from that of the Manjha Sikhs in the Trans-Sutlej area, though the growing power of Maharaja Ranjit Singh towards the close of the 18th century proved to be a severe threat to their independence. Their attitude towards the English, as was exposed by the mission of the Yusuf Ali Khan, was that of responsive cooperation. The Mughals emperor having lost all his former powers and prestige, except the enjoyment of nominal sovereignty over the territories between the Sutlej and Chambal, the chiefs of these states acknowledged and paid him homage only when it suited them. But the Sikhs, as a political body had no unity among themselves due to which they suffered greatly at the hands of their opponents. It was only an exceptional occasion that the major and the some of the minor Cis-Sutlej Sikhs chiefs did pool their resources and took a united stand against a common rival.

However, their efforts for independence were hardly ended when they were called upon to embark in a fresh struggle which continued throughout the first decade of the 19th century. During this struggle the chiefs had to face the plot and aggressive designs of several powers against their own possession and privileged, to fight which they had to mobilize all their diplomatic skill, besides their own resources.

Best source to get information about these chiefs is *The Rajas of Punjab* which was written by Lepel Henry Griffin. It got published in 1870 A.D. The main merit of Lepel Griffin's work is that only he gives comprehensive and exhaustive account of all aspects of the rule of

Native chiefs. Therefore, many historians have used it as the prime source to get knowledge about the Cis-Sutlej states of Punjab during these particular years. As a matter of fact, Griffin's two fold objective was to justify the British imperialistic policy and of ensuring the loyalty of Sikh chiefs towards the British Paramount.

So to derive more authentic information from this source, need to analyze, it is considered necessary. Therefore, the topic of the present thesis is Lepel Henry Griffin's *The Rajas of Punjab: A Historical Analysis*: the entire academic exercise involved to historically analyze the Lepel Griffin's work in the Cis-Sutlej states with the help of primary and secondary sources. There can be seen abundant research on the relations of Maharaja Ranjit Singh with British Government. However, relations of Cis-Sutlej states with British Government from year 1803 to 1870 have not been explored in depth yet. Only detail has been provided in Lepel Henry Griffin's work *The Rajas of Punjab* other sources only shares the brief information of Cis-Sutlej. So, approach has been made in study to analyze the account of Lepel Henry Griffin. The study assures to present the reader with authentic analysis of Lepel Henry Griffin's work *The Rajas of Punjab*. The study is divided into six chapters. A number of outcomes came into light through study which is given below.

First chapter of the study contains the work of British, which is based on their interest in writing Sikh history. For convenience, chapter can be divided into four parts. First part of the study traces the British interest in the study of Sikhs from the genesis of the European Historiography. Origin of European Historiography was a factor which created senses and curiosity among thinkers. On the other hand, Industrial revolution ignited its throttle to extreme, even thrust of exploring and trade changed the atmosphere. This transformation lessened the distance of far-flung corners. Thus, East Indian Company which had landed on the shores of Indian waters as a Trader Company; it not only became a creator of British rule but also gave way to western thinkers. Thus, 19th century saw revolutionary changes in writing of history. However, it shouldn't be supposed that there was no such writing trend prior to British but their methods, approach and technique of collecting data were different. Second part deals with the scrutiny of the life and works of different writers who wrote before Lepel Henry Griffin. Work of Louis Polier, James Brown, George Foster, John Malcolm, H.T Princep, and J.D Cunningham

has been recorded. Work of third part is an overview of the details of Lepel Henry Griffin's life. Fourth part deals with the Lepel Henry Griffin's work.

Second Chapter of the present study takes up as Relationship between British Government and Cis-Sutlej states, very first thing can be notice that Lepel Griffin never blames his own Government at any point he can be seen supporting his Government but sometimes in same matter, in very next pages he seems to reveal the truth in direct or indirect manner. But he seems to be under some pressure and cannot able to share his thoughts openly. Most probably this pressure was of none other than might of his own Government upon him.

Lepel Griffin does not offer detail account of entrance and meeting of Jaswant Rao Holkar with Cis-Sutlej chiefs whereas a historical source shares his intentions and meetings with chiefs of Cis-Sutlej states.

In the agreement of 1809 A.D it has been clearly mentioned that British would not interfere in the personal matters of the Princely state but David Ochterlony did the opposite and breaks the rules of policy. When Raja Patiala was willing to give administration into his step mother Rani Kehm Kaur's hand than Ochterlony by forcing him, made him to change his decision to give administration into Rani Aas Kaur's hand. But Lepel Griffin doesn't condemn this offensive step of Ochterlony. He doesn't give any explanation, on the contrary says that British Government was not wanted to interfere because situation of every princely state was same and therefore more state would ask for interference. So Government ordered Ochterlony to limit his interferences. But it has been clearly mentioned in the clause of 1809 A.D policy that no interference is allowed. On the other hand Lepel Griffin leaves untouched the explanation of David Ochterlony about his interference. There are other sources which manifest that Ochterlony in his defensive reply to Government said that it was us who saved the Cis-Sutlej chiefs from wrath of Maharaja Ranjit Singh therefore in return of substantial benefit a demand of the body of horse when required could be derived. David Ochterlony further remarks that "I hereby presume to think that, we are entitled to assume such a control as will ensure to us a slight return not merely for security and protection but for actual existence as a Government." It can be assume that mismanagement was just an excuse because in actual when Raja failed to furnish supply of horsemen than Ochterlony decided to give the administration of the Patiala to his trusted one and Rani Aas Kaur's relations were not good with Raja Sahib Singh and Rani Aas Kaur had also

expressed her desire to obey the orders according to British Government therefore she was perfect for Ochterlony. About the enhancement of supplies of cavalry got increased after Rani Aas Kaur got administration as mentioned by Lepel Griffin. Quite the opposite he admires Rani Aas Kaur by stating that due to her efforts, condition of mismanaged state got improved. Indirectly he was trying to prove the orders to be just, which were forcefully implement upon Patiala by Ochterlony. As it has been mentioned earlier, Lepel Griffin writes about Rani Aas Kaur to be corrupt when she was head of *Toshkahna*. She put the limits over expenditure of Raja and accumulated enormous wealth for herself. Later this became matter of dispute between her and his husband and after death of Raja Sahib Singh with his own son.

Even after Government's instructions Ochterlony didn't stop to interfere and his continuously interference made condition of Patiala state from bad to worst. Without any doubt it can be said that due to Ochterlony Patiala state became a stage of conspiracy between rivalries and Patiala state divided into two sects. But Lepel Griffin not at any single time pin points Ochterlony, instead put whole blame over Raja Sahib Singh of Patiala. However, at the end of this matter in brief he himself shares that interference was of failure.

Unfortunately, in this scuffle Raja Sahib Singh died. Therefore opposite party expressed doubt over sudden death of Raja. However Lepel Griffin by taking the Rani Aas Kaur's side writes that Rani could not do this because she could lose her seat. It should be noted that on the death of other Cis-Sutlej chiefs, Lepel Griffin says that sudden death of a chief could not be consider normal. Even after these misshappenings British had ordered inquires to find real cause of death but after death of Patiala's Raja nothing is mentioned about such type of inquiry.

After death of Raja of Patiala his own son Karam Singh became chief though the charge was in the hand of his mother Aas Kaur and minister Misar Naudha. Raja Karam Singh wanted to grasp all powers but after assuming all powers in his hand he again gave post of chief minister to Misar Naudha. Lepel Griffin assuredly says that after the death of Sahib Singh Government had stopped to interfere but from British Officer Captain Birch's diary it comes out that British Government had daunted Raja for to make Missr Naudha his chief minister. Quite the reverse, Lepel Griffin tries to show that Raja was very close to Misar Naudha that during his installation over throne by saying "He made a special request to agent of British Government in an open Darbar to bestow a valuable Khillat upon Missar Naudha as a sign of satisfaction." Other two

points are also worthy to note; Firstly in *The Rajas of Punjab* no similar example of such distinguish incident during the installation of other Cis-Sutlej chiefs has not been given nor any sign of special regard for any other expect chiefs. Secondly, Lepel Griffin says that he was very close to his mother than others.

When dispute occurs between son and mother over *Toshkhana* than Government starts to interfere. However, Lepel Griffin again and again gives statement about interference that this was last time and from now on British Government decided not to interfere. However in reality this inference remained in continuity. Missar Naudha was also a symbol of active interference of British Government.

As per given in *The Rajas of Punjab* Jaswant Singh of Nabha was given a separate proclamation letter of 3 May 1809 A.D from Governor General for his personal assurance. Most conceivable research attributed to it that these treaties were not of much important for British Government but was very beneficial for chiefs because of this they were getting exemption from tribute and got secured all their previous authority and right. That's the reason they were eager to sign a treaty of assurance which was much important for them from every perspective.

Lepel Griffin discusses the matter of Bhriog of Kapurthala state. According to him on the complaint of Ochterlony the Raja Fateh Singh confiscated the Brhiog. While, from inspection of Captain Brich's dairy it reveals that Raja Fateh Singh was intimidate by British General and was told that if he would not punish the Maha Singh than British would deprive him off from his supremacy over Bhriog. Lepel Griffin tells that after seizure of Bhriog by Fateh Singh, Ochterlony ordered Fateh Singh to withdraw his troops and to reinstate Bhriog to Maha Singh. But Fateh Singh denied obeying David Ochterlony. But from official letter it finds out that Fateh Singh forward a letter through his *Vakil* in which he explained that on the request of Ochetrkony he had punished Maha Singh without any delay and conduct of punishment was made without reference. Maha Singh's mother urged him to excuse them from British but he retained it. From Raja Fateh Singh's letter to Governor General it seems unobjectionably cleared that Government's action to reinstall Maha Singh made Raja Fateh Singh tempestuous. Because he had have spend a lot of money on Bhriog encroachment. That's why he refused to set free Bhriog. But Lepel Griffin doesn't refer these valid points of Fateh Singh. From which it could be observe that British Government acted in self willed manner and issued inappropriate orders.

Lepel Griffin further documents that when Raja Fateh Singh didn't changed his decision than Government directly warned him that if he would not restored the estate than British force would be sent to dispose off his encroachment. When this matter turn out to be more serious than Local Government forward it to Indian Government. Government of India changed the decision of Local Government and allowed Raja Fateh Singh to use his supremacy over Bhirog by any measures, which he might sees fit to employ. It is to be noted that Government changed its decision only when it noticed that Raja Fateh Singh got enraged by their conduct, so they immediately took action because they didn't want to break off their relations with Raja Fateh Singh which they were secretly building from many years. But on the opposite Lepel Griffin says that Fateh Singh was not in their direct contact until the matter of Bhirog.

According to Lepel Henry Griffin, Raja Bhag Singh was first among the other Cis-Sutlej chiefs, who made an alliance with British Government as well as other chiefs also wanted to do so. However, several historical documents suggests that both parties were seeking benefits from each other because from the British Government's side they wanted to secure help from Sikh chiefs again Martahas or to at least get assurance of neutrality from them. While on the other hand Raja of Jind like other Phulkian Chiefs wanted to overthrow the Perron, their former benefactor and wanted to attain some additional benefits in the form of escheats from British.

In the work of Lepel Griffin it has given that Raja of Jind joined the General Lake in his pursuit of Jaswant Rao Holkar in 1805 A.D. British Government deployed him as an envoy to his nephew Maharaja Ranjit Singh to stop him to help the Holkar against British. Lepel Griffin assuredly says that this mission was conducted by Bhag Singh to please the General Lake so he could be able to exert considerable influence with his nephew over British. While outcome of the study reveals that not only Bhag Singh wanted to attain benefits but the British Government was also seeking to create a connection with Maharaja Ranjit Singh which they had tried in 1800 A.D in order to create a front against Shah Zaman. But Maharaja Ranjit Singh had not showed any interest in British at that time. So most probably Raja Bhag Singh was person of their interest to persuade the Maharaja. Most likely Lake granted the lands to Bhag Singh to clear the way for their long waited policy in which they wanted to create a buffer zone. In beginning the policy of British was to create a close connection with these states in order to frustrate any attempt of invading army from the western side of Indus.

Lepel Griffin shares an important meeting's conversation which was held between Raja Bhag Singh and Otcherlony. In which Raja Bhag Singh told David Ochterlony that all of the Sikh chiefs are eagerly waiting to welcome the British Government. Though few chiefs like Sardar Jodh Singh Kalsia are under the heavy obligation and they cannot come forward at once and declare friendship with British yet. As per research, It seems true that Sardar Jodh Singh wanted to join British but circumstances were not favorable for him due to his close connection with Ranjit Singh therefore Ocherlony told Bhag Singh that Jodh Singh should not be need to break the connection with Maharaja Ranjit Singh at present but he needed written assurance from him that in event of the hostilities he would join the British. Whereas historical sources suggest that Lepel Griffin does not share the policy of British Government, which was continuously in touch with David Ochterlony while he was heading towards Punjab. By obeying the orders of British Government, Ochterlony was trying to lure every small and important chief to his side so they could use them if a war occurs between Maharaja Ranjit Singh and British.

As per *The Rajas of Punjab* David Ochterlony told Raja Bhag Singh that Raja has to return the land which he had occupied from the friend of the British. It had been taken from Rani Daya Kaur. Here Lepel Griffin didn't mentioned a point which can be presume from the *The Ludhiana Agency Records* that Raja Bhag was agreed to give up land because he was seeking for British Protection but when David Ochterlony asked him to return all the grants which he had gained from last expedition he questioned him about that what British Government has decided about his other grants when he agreed to return the land to Rani Daya Kaur.

On this David Ochterlony replied that he had not received orders about it yet, though in official documents he agrees that he didn't wish to give any answer because of fear of deceiving one party or encouraging other. From the above statement of David Ochterlony it can be clearly judged that Ocherlony knew the answer but at that time they needed the Raja Bhag Singh the most because he was the main key between chiefs and British connection and question which David Ochterlony was trying to hide was most probably related with Ludhiana because Ocherlony had kept an eye on Ludhiana fort for British cantonment which Bhag Singh had received from Maharaja. For which David Ochterlony had already wrote to British Government without the consent of Bhag Singh and even it did happen. Whereas Bhag Singh did get nothing for his lose. He had to pay heavy price for the British Protection.

As given in *The Rajas of Punjab* Bhag Singh requested for Karnal in exchange of Ludhiana but Government said that Karnal had already conferred on Muhhamad Khan and the conditions of Karnal State were not normal as it required strong measures. Government also rejected the proposal to restore the Ludhiana to Rai Alyas, former owner of Ludhiana. Government at first agreed to compensate Raja Bhag Singh for his loss but later they decided that British Cantonment at Ludhiana was only intended to be for short term and it would be revert to chief so no compensation required. This is to be noted that Lepel Griffin in his first statement says that Ludhiana was chosen to build permanent cantonment than on very next page he writes that cantonment was to be built for short term. He further tells that British military station at Ludhiana has not lifted yet. It can be understood that he was well aware of intentions of his Government but he doesn't condemn the blustering behavior of Government but gives a hint for reader by telling that the cantonment about which his Government was issuing statement in year 1809 A.D that it would be a built only for short term, was still existing in Lepel Griffin's times and by examining the *Ludhiana Agency* it founds that Government didn't want to left Ludhiana ever, even they didn't gave Karnal in exchange of the Ludhiana for any purpose. Government instructed the David Ochterlony that they need Bhag Singh in Ludhiana because he would at all times provide them supplies and secure the good will of District and if they would transfer the chief of Karnal to Ludhiana and Ludhiana chief to Karnal than they would have to suffer a lot. It can be comprehend that British Government was thinking of his own benefits. In fact Ochterlony was well aware of his Government's attitude so he had himself sent an application in the favor of Bhag Singh in which he mentioned that Bhag Singh was most trusted person of Maharaja Ranjit Singh even though he helped British Government much and now British Government must do justice with him but Government did the opposite.

Lepel Griffin boasts that British Government's protection saved the Cis-Sutlej chiefs from injustice. However, in reality British were playing them fool and using them as puppet. They had nothing to do with chiefs; their own benefits were above them all. They didn't care for the loss or benefits of chiefs. As Raja Bhag Singh of Jind in his stupidity not only lost the territory of Ludhiana but also lost the true friendship of Maharaja Ranjhit Singh. He had chosen the side of British to save his territory from Maharaja Ranjit Singh but he lost it immediately without any gain in return by seeking the British Protection, though he played crucial role

between British and Sikh Chiefs friendship. But intentions of British were clear they want to secure their own border.

Lepel Griffin has discussed the succession matter of primogeniture in Jind State. Bhag Singh due to his unstable health decided to choose a successor before his death so he wished that his younger son Prince Partap should be appointed his successor while government was in favor of rule of primogeniture. Therefore Government rejected the succession of Kanwar Partap Singh and authorized elder son to throne of Chief ship. By analyzing the matter as given in *The Rajas of Punjab* the fact can't be denied that British Government had intervened in the cases of Patiala, Nabha and Jind authoritatively for assertion of the primogeniture but historical sources contain ample evidences of controversy and disagreement about this very important point for example British Government didn't apply this rule in case of princely state of Bhawalpur when in 1850 A.D Nawab nominated his third son to succession. It can be easily comprehend by comparing the facts that British were always keep on seeking the chance to interfere in the Princely states' succession matters because as per their secret policy they wanted only those rulers to rule over princely states who would work under their command.

In matter of Jind British Government didn't limit their interference as Lepel Griffin has stated in the context of Patiala state despite British Government crossed its limits and established a Regent. David Ochterlony was specially sent to Jind to supervise these new arrangements. Rani Sobrahi was made regent. British Government did the same as it was done in Patiala state. But even on this second interference of the British Government, Lepel Griffin remains silent again. Moreover, in this case if British Government was directly involved so instead of questioning the British Government he put the whole blame over Partap Singh, younger son of Raja Bhag Singh. As a result of these steps of British Government, Jind had to suffer a lot as it had turned from peaceful state to ground of conspiracy and murders.

Lepel Griffin votes in favor of Metcalf because many British had condemned the diplomacy of Metcalf. Metcalf had been blamed by several authors that Maharaja was gaining his strength by taking possession over the Cis-Sutlej territories and Metcalf did nothing and was travelling with Maharaja mere as a spectator and let the Maharaja to take over the Faridkot. Lepel Griffin justifies that although British didn't want to permit the Maharaja to carry on his conquest but at that time French invasion apprehension didn't let it to do so and after removal of

danger Government changed his policy suddenly. It can be clearly understood that British were not like the other powers such as Marathas or Mughals. They have nothing to do with chiefs. They did not want to make Maharaja angry at that time because they needed the Maharaja to create a buffer zone against French invasion. At that time Maharaja was strong candidate for them and British let the chiefs suffer until their priorities would not got changed.

When British Government demanded the restitution of all states on the left side of Sutlej which were achieved during 1808 A.D and 1809 A.D at that time Maharaja put forward his claim over Faridkot but Lepel Griffin denied the firm claims of Maharaja which have been traced from various sources which have directly and indirectly pointed that Faridkot state had accepted authority of Maharaja Ranjit Singh willingly. So as Griffin has said earlier about apprehension of French invasion so on the basis of that term in can be understand that when fear of invasion fade away British changed their policy at once and curb the activities of Maharaja. But on the contrary Lepel Griffin instead of accepting this put the blame on Maharaja Ranjit Singh that he was forwarding invalid reasons.

Lepel Griffin with sharing the information of next phase of Faridkot matter says that Mokham Chand was not willing to give up Faridkot he told Maharaja that British were intending to occupy the city. However, Lepel Griffin denies his claim and says that Government had no intention to garrisoning the town but it was determined that it should be returned to its real owners. Nevertheless on the basis of research it finds out that British wanted to establish two cantonments in *Doaba*, one in Faridkot and second in Jalandhar. As it has been discuss in Jind's history that cantonment was made permanent by cheating on the Bhag Singh of Jind so it can probably said that British had made intentions of establishing the cantonment in Cis-Sutlej area in order to establish their authority over Cis-Sutlej states but when situation got tensed than Metcalf had to make a treaty with Maharaja and had to leave the idea of building a cantonment in Faridkot.

The subject of third chapter comprises the study of Relationship between Lahore Darbar and Cis-Sutlej States, very first, can be notice that although Lepel Griffin discuss various topics related to Princely states in his work but when it is being compared with other sources than the result never comes out to be similar. This dissimilarity can be seen a lot. Evidently, Persian sources belonged to Maharaja Ranjit Singh's time conveys a different story apart for the Lepel

Griffin's work. However, through cross analyzing the Persian and other contemporary sources it also comes out that these sources don't share any mutual understanding about any incident. The difference can be clearly seen from the facts about which they talked.

First example of this can be seen from the quarrel between the Rani Aas Kaur and Raja Sahib Singh of Patiala. The information which Lepel Griffin shares about their family rupture does not match with other sources and even these sources also shares different-2 perspective. There are lots of examples of such types in entire work of Lepel Griffin when his statement does not corroborate with other sources. However on some general matters, information can be seen identical to other primary sources.

When in 1808 A.D Cis-Sutlej Chiefs got scared after continuous expedition of Maharaja Ranjit Singh to south, than they went to Mr. Seton for protection but returned after getting no affirm assurance than Lepel Griffin instead of telling truth in a straight way he shares the matter from a different angle to cover up the truth and tries to blame the Maharaja. He says that Maharaja attempted to bring chiefs to his side by pressurizing them while they were seeking British protection. On the contrary, truth was that at that time British Government was worried about danger of French invasion. So to deal with this upcoming danger they needed the support of Kabul and Lahore. However, it doesn't mean that the British didn't want to bring Cis-Sutlej chiefs to their side but at that time they needed the Maharaja Ranjit Singh the most. So when group of chiefs went to seek protection from British than Mr. Seton didn't give sufficient answer. It should be noted the purpose of Metcalf's mission was also same. Even Lepel Griffin himself talks about the necessity of Anglo-Sikh alliance during French Invasion. When French threat got ended thus need of Maharaja not much required and when they got news that chiefs has decided to be with Maharaja they immediately took action to bring Cis-Sutlej chiefs under their protection.

Lepel Griffin further denotes that chiefs of Cis-Sutlej were not willing to meet Maharaja Ranjit Singh and on the other hand he himself says that chiefs went to meet Maharaja in hope to firm the friendly alliance. Another fact is that the Lepel Griffin keeps on emphasizing that though Patiala Raja went to meet Maharaja but secretly he was in their side but actual situation found different because when Government came to knew that chiefs are going to change side by meeting Maharaja in Lahore than Government wrote a letter to Patiala chief about which Lepel

Griffin himself agrees that protection was given to Patiala through this letter, prior to the meeting, by Delhi Residency without waiting the distinct order from Calcutta Residency. Another fascinating fact which is also traceable from Lepel Griffin's own work is that when Maharaja put forward some conditions for Anglo-Sikh alliance to Metcalf, Envoy of Delhi than Metcalf said that he has no authority to make promise without referring the propositions to Calcutta for the decision of Governor General. So most plausible research can be attributed to this is that the British were against Maharaja and Cis-Sutlej chief's alliance therefore they broke their protocol and without getting the permission of Home Government they acted swiftly. Moreover, after conferring protection when Ocherlony was heading to Punjab than he was strictly told not to trust Cis-Sutlej's chiefs in a blindfold manner because they were not trustworthy as they could change at any moment but Lepel Griffin doesn't discuss these crucial facts.

Lepel Griffin doesn't unfold the fact that what British Government could get from awarding protection to these minor chiefs and for what purpose this was being awarded because British Government had not demanded any escheats or money in exchange.

Lepel Griffin compares the Maharaja's rule with his own Government's and says that his Government's rule was not only better than Maharaja's instead it was better than all previous empires who had once ruled over India. While as per research, for princely state's chiefs rule of Maharaja was similar to sudden death after severe illness and of British rule alike gradually death by fever.

Major disagreement is evident over matter of Doladhi from the perspective of other historical sources when are being compared with Griffin's work.

In the context of *The Rajas of Punjab* there is lot of examples of its difference with other contemporary British historian on a same issue. For instance, in case of Morwan, Lepel Griffin says that no evidence was found to prove the innocent Raja of Nabha guilty, that he had looted the treasury. While J.D Cunningham says that Raja of Nabha was proven guilty. In very next example, Lahore Government put blame over British Government for conferring the Morwan to Nabha without any proper investigation. As obvious it could observe Lepel Griffin in support of

his Government held this blame invalid. Nevertheless, Broadfoot and J.D Cunningham consider it to be valid. There are lot of examples of these types can be seen in *The Rajas of Punjab*.

No matter which ever state is being discussed by Lepel Griffin, divergence will be found through comparing with other sources for example; Holkar's visit in Punjab. Nevertheless Lepel Griffin gives more authentic information about Fateh Singh's character. This could possible due to that he was the Superintendant of Kapurthala state in 1875 A.D. So it was equitable that he was very familiar with Kapurthala but apart from it he also says that he knew every chief of Cis-Sutlej states very closely. But apart from Kapurthala he lacks proper vividness in the context of other Princely states. Character explanation given by Lepel Griffin about Fateh Singh of Kapurthala cannot be denied and found similar in other sources as well.

However, Lepel Griffin leaves untouched an important point about Kapurthala state, that when British and Fateh Singh came close to each other. The beginning of their relations starts with secret meeting when Lake himself approaches Raja Fateh Singh. Lake and his fellow soldiers welcomed Fateh Singh into their camp by taking off their cap as a welcome gesture and try to impress him. British took special care to humor Fateh Singh and even Lord Lake proposed to have separate arrangements with him. But Fateh Singh tactfully evaded this agreement. The British General then offered Sonipat and Panipat to Fateh Singh as a mark of his appreciation if he plays a role in setting a friendly settlement with Maharaja Ranjit Singh. But Fateh Singh refused to accept this proposal and regarded it as bribe. Than Fateh Singh added that he would get these territories some other day since their friendship will going to be last forever.

When on 27 December of 1827 A.D after having some discord with Maharaja Ranjit Singh, Fateh Singh crossed Sutlej leaving behind his state. Than Lepel Griffin gives a very correct statement about Raja Fateh Singh that fear of Fateh Singh was result of his over thinking and exaggeration. Because Fateh Singh was one of the few, whom Maharaja had any sincere feeling of regards. These facts are corroborated by most of chronicles.

When for the installation of new successor of Kapurthala state after Fateh Singh's death, got disturbed due to the quarrel between brothers for throne. Lepel Griffin blames Maharaja Ranjit Singh to intensify the dissensions between brothers. A large number of sources agree with Lepel Griffin.

After death of Raja Sher Singh, Lahore state would have been left without rightful successor. Then Lepel Griffin says as a claimant of successor, Nihal Singh of Kapurthala should have come to front to claim the throne. But he was of timid disposition and unexcited person; therefore he didn't show any interest in Lahore politics. While the available historical sources suggest that when Nihal Singh came to know that British were also showing interest in Lahore politics than he thought that it would be wise to remain outside. Because he didn't want to put in risk his own state by confronting such a big power like British.

Lepel Griffin offers full fledged details of the Nihal Singh's Kapurthala succession and about the obstacles, which he faced from Maharaja Ranjit Singh and his brother. Many historical sources approve Lepel Griffin's approach.

Lepel Griffin further documents that Nihal Singh's brother hatched a conspiracy against him and tried to kill him. Lepel Griffin again blames Maharaja Ranjit Singh that he played double game in this matter, he expressed sympathy with Nihal Singh and at the same time he directed him to give Amar Singh a separate maintenance of 30,000 a year instead of 1 lakh which Amar Singh had demanded. Maharaja did this because Amar Singh as a bribe had promised him to pay *nazarana*. Even though Amar Singh was encouraged by him to extort territory of worth one lakh from his brother so Amar Singh did it accordingly and even captured Nihal Singh and didn't release him until he agreed to pay district of Sultanpur for his maintenance.

However, historical source contains different approach to this incident. According to them Nihal Singh went to Lahore Darbar after being attacked and told Maharaja that on the instigation of Lakha and others, Amar Singh had attacked Sardar Nihal Singh than Maharaja asked for proper investigation and both were being brought in front of him in his Darbar. When Maharaja asked for the reason behind misconduct of Amar Singh than Amar Singh replied that he was starving and was being got distracted quite on the account of the lack of means of the livelihood. Maharaja on hearing his reply said that he should have referred the matter to him first before to take any step, than Maharaja ordered punishment for his conduct. It is also to be noted that Captain Wade had also sent a letter in which he had requested to punish Amar for his crime. But on the Nihal Singh's request Maharaja pardoned him because Nihal Singh said that Amar Singh is like son to him and was astray from path by wicked persons and advocated for

maintenance for livelihood. Therefore Amar Singh was granted maintenance for livelihood on the consent of his own brother. There is no valid explanation from Lepel Griffin for this omission is noted.

Lepel Griffin further inscribes the dealing of Maharaja with Malerkotla. In which Phulkian chiefs became security when Malerkotla fails to pay ransom of 1 lakh rupees and chief of Jind got some land in favor from Malerokotla. But somehow Maharaja changed his decision after some negotiations and freed the chiefs from paying the debt of Malerkotla. Here Lepel Griffin completely fails to reveal the actual scenario of this whole incident. In actual Diwan Mokham Chand and other officials of Lahore was planning take over the Malerkotla along with Ambala and gradually to take the possession over Patiala so their boundary could reach to Jamuna. When Bhag Singh of Jind got intimation he discusses it with Bhai Lal Singh and Chanan Singh. They decide that it would be unwise to let the Maharaja to take over the Malerkotla under his charge permanently because in future he would create difficulties for them and therefore they placed bid over Malerkotla and offered Maharaja Ranjit Singh 1 lakh and 25 thousand in exchange of Malerkotla.

Fourth chapter of the present study deals with the British Paramountcy in Cis-Sutlej states. In this chapter, it has been seen that Lepel Griffin tries to hide negative points of its Government and in act of British Paramountcy over these states, Lepel consider it to be a legitimate right of British Government. Even British Government had inappropriately brought several territories under them but Lepel Griffin found it unobjectionable First matter in this is related with Patiala, Lepel Griffin shares the information about Haryana and Bhatiana dispute between British Government and Raja of Patiala. In this lengthy case Lepel Griffin blames Patiala for attempting to control British possession in Abohar. However, research reveals that Edward Gardiner, British officer, first started to colonize the land without discussing the boundaries with Patiala. Lepel Griffin proclaims that Patiala had no proof to acclaim his right over these districts. But through research, evidence in the favor of Patiala is being procured which advocates the authority of Patiala over these states, which are not discussed by Lepel Griffin. According to documents two different treaties were made with British officer, first were with Perron and second were with Lake to get authority over these states. Later, British Government deliberately declared these documents to be forged. Despite it, Charles Metcalf and

William Fraser pressurize him to accept all the terms according to their wish. But Lepel Griffin shows no interest to share these important points. On the contrary, Lepel Griffin vindicates the Ross Bell who was being installed to set up the boundaries. Lepel Griffin to support his own point puts finger upon his own Home Government when Home Government doesn't agree with the Local Government's methods. He states that "Home Government naturally knew less than of Indian Government of the character of Sikh Chiefs." Despite knowing it, that Home Government's order considered as final order in every case. Even when Home Government on the basis of the enquiry and evidences issued its decision than Lepel Griffin as expected, once again put blame over Raja of Patiala. While in the praise of Mr. Ross Bell he says that the investigation carried out by such an experienced person should not be challenged. It should be noted that Government ordered to reopen the case after getting disappointed from Mr. Ross's report. Lepel Griffin further claims that British had taken over far less territory than its lawful right while opposing the Patiala Raja he expresses that "Raja had obtained so much when he had right to nothing." But it isn't true because other historical sources put forwards that Patiala Raja was forced to accept the unacceptable proposal and even on his recurring requests no attention was being paid and deprived him from his legal right. It can be judged that indirectly Lepel Griffin was in favor of coercion.

In the case of Mahrajanian Sikhs Lepel Griffin shares the dispute of Phulkian chiefs for supremacy. Through analyze it has been discovered that Nabha also claimed for supremacy and David Ochterlony supported his claim. But Captain Burges, who was investigator officer of this case, was in favor of Patiala. Lepel Griffin doesn't share about this partially. This case was very similar to Doldahi case in which investigator officer Coolbrooke was in support of Patiala and had given decision in favor Patiala but due to the interference of Home Government, Local Government had to change its decision. Nabha keep on requesting British Government that he has the sufficient proof but Government neglected his requests completely.

Then British Government decided to make over the village for term of one year to Patiala along with some conditions. But Patiala Chief got dissatisfied with the decision. Therefore British Government in August 1833 A.D took the village under their own direct control. Lepel Griffin does not reveal these conditions. Through research it comes out that these terms which were applied were not easy to accept especially the third one in which it has been

given that Patiala Raja would not demand any Revenue or Land tax from Mahrajian. In reply Patiala Raja had also expressed his view by saying that Mahrajian were dependant of Patiala and even they had paid 4000 tribute in 1788 A.D. So without attaining any benefit why would Patiala bear the expenses of an unmanaged village without getting anything in exchange and especially that village which had been remained under his ancestors? So it can be said that without getting any benefit from the territory in shape of tax or gifts not only Patiala even no other ruler would accept the proposal. By comparing the facts it can be understood that in actual British Government's policy has come into a change. Before they seemed to support a creation of a safe zone and during this time period they seemed to support imperialistic thought as it can be seen in the case of succession matter of Jind and same in this case. Although British wanted to take over the village but at first they weren't ready to take over the village it was far away from their territory and needed much attention to manage the wild people of Mahrajian. So they planned that village should be given to Patiala for trail if Raja failed to do so than they would take over the village. So it was quite clear from the intentions of British Government that sooner or later British Government was going to take over the village. So as it was expected it happened and British took the possession of village. Instead of pointing out his own Local Government Lepel Griffin by praising British Government tries to proof that under the rule of British Government immediate change in behavior was noticed in Mahrajian people and further shares that anarchy had prevailed in their reign. It can be observed that Lepel Griffin is indirectly telling that Phulkian chiefs were anarchist ruler. Lepel Griffin in his account tries to show that his Government's rule was just and liberal who seems to be his major purpose that to highlight his Government's achievements through his work. But it does not seem true because as per research study, under the rule of British for three years matter of Mahrajian village's administrative reforms remained untouched. Therefore several important members of Mahrajian community had to go to Ambala to meet Clerk. Clerk than elected some head men who were to look after their matters of dispute. But this process got failed and people requested the Government to establish a Thana so that their matter could solve without delay. But Government was not willing to put burden upon them of expenditure therefore Government refused to make a Thana in Mahrajian. Again Lepel Griffin leaves the negative points of British Government untouched.

On the other hand sources consensually suggest that Mahrajian had well organized administrative structure did exist to pre-British Interference. However Lepel Griffin tries to

change the angle of the Mahrajikian case in an attempt to polish the image of British Government and neglects the actual fact deliberately.

A very important question arose, as per the interpretation of the *sanad* of 5 May 1860 A.D. As per the first clause of agreement Raja of Patiala, Nabha and Jind and their heirs were granted full sovereignty over their ancestral and acquired domains. About this *sanad* Lepel Griffin gives a fascinating statement in which he openly claimed that “The term full sovereignty was a loose rendering”. He explicitly state that “If a full sovereignty” meant a power such as this, the right of Government, as a paramount would altogether disappear. Full Sovereignty,” as far as *sandas* are concerned is a conventional term.

By setting aside the *Dastar-Ul-Amal* or the rule of practice of Late Raja Narinder Singh, council of Regency was made and when I didn’t work properly and had to dissolved than Lepel Griffin hold official of Patiala responsible for the dissolvent however other sources manifest that there was no doubt that there was great fraction in the council but Lepel Griffin does not uncurtailed that the real culprit behind this fraction was British agent Major General R.G Taylor. He openly and actively interferes in the state matters. Therefore, due to interference of British Agent the Council of Regency in three phulkian states had to be resolved by British Government.

As narrated by Lepel Griffin Raja Bharpur Singh died naturally and was not poisoned while other sources do not agree with Lepel Griffin.

As given in *The Rajas of Punjab* a new chief was installed after the death of Raja Bharpur Singh of Nabha by British Government. New chief Bhagwan Singh of Nabha was selected on the basis of the *sandas* of 1860A.D and 1862A.D chose by the British authority with the consultation of the chiefs of Patiala and Jind. However, on the basis of research it may be discerned easily that this procedure applied was an exceptional case because this type of concession was not provided to the other princely states except to the two other Phulkian states. That if a ruler died without choosing a successful heir than British Government had the right to appoint the rightful heir. Actually this provision was the product of the clever statesmen of British Government because at one hand they assured the perpetuity of the princes of their houses and on the other hand it benefited the British Government as they could show their right as a paramount power over the Native states. Even on the other hand they get economical

benefits too. As per the rule, *nazrana* of $1/3^{rd}$ of the value of one year's income of the state was being demanded on the failure of the adoption.

Lepel Griffin shares the matter of rebellion of Balinawali and Dadri. Lepel Griffin blames others for these rebellions. However, by thoroughly reinvestigating the cases it finds out that these rebellions were a result of defected revenue policy of British Government. Secondly, historical sources show disagreement with Lepel Griffin's work in these particular matters.

In the matter of dispute for throne of Kapurtahala among Ragbhir Singh and his two younger brothers, British Government denied hearing the claims of younger brothers on the basis of rule of primogeniture. Lepel Griffin supports the action of British Government. But it has also been given in Lepel Griffin's work that prior to 1858 A.D Government was in support of younger brothers and was in favor of division of the state. By thoroughly analyzing this confusion, it reveals out that reason behind this sudden change was Queen's Proclamation. This proclamation was in favor of Princely chiefs. But tussle among brothers went long. The actual cause behind this tussle was British official like John Lawrence and R.G Taylor. Nevertheless, Lepel Griffin never discloses their role in his work.

The fifth chapter of present study deals with the succession and dispute matters of Cis-Sutlej states. Lepel Griffin in his account inscribes the succession dispute of Raja Karam Singh with younger brother Ajit Singh. He justly provides the information of whole incident and all other sources validates his statements.

Lepel Griffin next in his work shares the matter of dispute between the father and the son. The case was of Raja Jaswant Singh of Nabha and his son Kanwar Singh. In his work Lepel Griffin supports the Kanwar Ranjit Singh. However a lot of evidences after thorough examination seem to support Raja of Nabha. These lengthy evidences have been discussed in the thesis in detail.

Lepel Griffin in his work discusses the lapse of Kaithal. When chief of Kaithal died without having any heir apparent and Government was about to gain control over Kaithal than Nabha, Patiala and Jind tried to obstruct the Government and tried to get succession for the nearest claimants. But Government was determined to get the escheat and to claim their right. But inwardly Phulkian chiefs believed that sooner or later their estates would also lapse to

paramount power. Only in this matter Lepel Griffin shares the true intentions of his Government and thinking of Cis-Sutlej chiefs. But one point should be noted that to share the history of Kaithal was not part of Lepel Griffin's work. Lepel Griffin could not talk openly against its Government but here he describes the intentions of his Government very boldly. This is quite odd.

In the matter of succession after sudden death of Raja Fateh Singh of Jind without male-heir Lepel Griffin himself agrees that first intention of British Government was to annex the whole state of Jind but then numerous claimants rose up to claim their right over the Jind chief ship. Through inspection of other materials it comes out that British Government changed its intention to take over the Jind by noticing some facts that remoteness of estate, their poverty, scattered position could create problems. Thus these facts changed their mind so they preferred the tribute collection scheme. In 1831 A.D political agent under the instruction of William Bentick suggested the chiefs of Cis-Sutlej states that if they would start giving 1/3rd of their income as tax to British Government instead of annexing the Jind. On the contrary this demand was totally unjust because as per the agreement of 1809 A.D these states were exempted from to giving any kind of tax. Therefore chiefs denied obeying the orders. Than British Government decided to gave only those land to late Raja Sangat Singh's relative Sarup Singh of Jind which were once under their common ancestor Gajpat Singh and the land which were occupied or won by Sangat Singh were being annexed by British It is important to consider that if British Government was in favor of implementing this law as per treaty of 1809 A.D then it was automatically and logically a condition in which Article 3 (The Chief shall remain in the exercise of same rights and authority within their own possession , which they were enjoyed before they were taken under British Protection) could have been justly applied. But Government instead of it used his paramount power and overruled his own policy for his own benefits which Lepel Griffin cunningly tried to hide. In the official records Sarup Singh's request to British Government justifies the above statement. A fact also came into light that Captain Wade had suggested Indian Government that Government should taken the benefit from the lapse of Jind state by putting the Ludhiana tenure at better footing. Study also reveals that they were not only looking to captured Ludhiana by attaining benefit for this opportunity instead Clerk had also suggested that Government should not approve the claim of Maharaja Ranjit Singh as they had done before in many cases. By examining the facts it can be assume that British were after the

Ludhiana which they had got from Bhag Singh by hook and crook and lapse of Jind state gave them golden chance to fulfill their desire to occupy the Ludhiana without any resistance. However, first priority of British official were also to usurp all the state but constant appeal of Phulkian chiefs and Maharaja Ranjit Singh as on the other side of Sutlej didn't let them to do so.

British Government was indulge at such level in the Cis-Sutlej's politics chief couldn't even issue will freely. Same happened in Nihal Singh's case. British Government compelled him to leave power to his elder son Randhir Singh instead of his younger son, which was the favorite of Raja. On the contrary, John Lawrence was in favor of disintegration of Kapurthalla state. But Lepel Griffin does not discuss these important factors in his work.

Dispute among chiefs for the territories was very common and as per the *sanad* of 22 August 1811 A.D British Government got power to solve their cases and to provide justice. Naturally every chief of Malwa state individually came under the jurisdiction of British Government while before it control over them was limited. Number of these dispute matters has been shared by Lepel Griffin in his work and he claims that British Government provided justice in every single case to the victim. However, the outcomes of the research shows differences because as per the analyze British Government's policy got changed in forties to fifties. Government attempted to reverse its previous policy in order to bring more and more territory under their rule. By baseless argumentation the agents of British Government tried to wriggle out the previous commitments. In some cases they succeeded in their motives and in some cases they reached to compromise. Same policy was adopted in matter of Khumanun village. But Lepel Griffin fails to share two face policy of British Government in his work.

Lepel Griffin explains the long unsolved matter of Sunti and Nabha. Through analytical study of *The Rajas of Punjab* can be said that this case present a typical example of British Government's policy. It was a clear demonstration of the fact that British authorities considered it their ultimate right as Paramount power to interfere as a supreme authority on the behalf of the feudatories of a state even in the violation of the existing engagements with that particular state, and impose their decision upon a chief much against his wish. It should be noted that British had created a mistake by adding a clause VII in *sanad* of granted to Phulkian chiefs. This made them wiser in the respect of dealing with other states. For example when Maharaja of Kashmir demanded a similar assurance as was given to Phulikan chiefs. Then British

Government of India denied fulfilling his request on the ground that such stipulations had been found in the practice not to work well and had resulted, notably in the case of Sonthi Sikhs and Nabha in misunderstanding and objectionable complications.

By thoroughly examining and analyzing the numerous dispute matters as given in the *The Rajas of Punjab* with the other primary and secondary sources the purpose of British can be comprehend which Lepel Griffin does not wanted to reveal to readers is that the authoritative intervention of the British Government for settling disputes between the chiefs and their feudatories even in the breaching the existing *sandas* or terms, tended to promote the interests of the Paramount power. Through entertaining the representations freely from the feudatories against their chiefs, the British Government brought the Native Chiefs under its firm grip and ensured their persistent loyalty. On the other hand, for the Chiefs being painfully conscious of the fact they could not afford to displease the paramount power. Thus under the circumstances they could only send petitions or counter – representations to Local Government or to Home Government. Thus British power took full advantages from the disputes and playing off one against others they cleverly pushed forward their imperial interests.

Lepel Griffin describes next about the Sujuarah village's revolt in his work. Sujuarah village was situated on the boundary of Rohtak which rose in revolt when a Telishdar, who had been sent by Jind to measure the cultivated area for settlement. This settlement model was adopted from English system of revenue. Villagers killed the Tesildar in contradiction. On hearing this Raja marched against insurgents with his forces As it has been mentioned before as Lepel Griffin's prime motive was to glorify the image of his Government, therefore he says that on the advice of Government Raja issued an order to grant free pardon to all of them except leaders if they would go back to their homes quietly. Idea to issuing Proclamation worked effectively thus majority of insurgents went back and revolt got normalized without any loss of single life. While comparing with other sources the major disagreement with Griffin is evidently appears. First of all the other sources shares that name of villages was Lajuana not Sujuarah and secondly they collectively states that fearsome battle took place between resident of the Laujuana and Raja, and due to this a lot of men got injured from both parties even some sources also register that the several number of people were also got killed. In addition some sources also claims that when situation got out of control than heavy artillery was being offered by British.

Thus with the help of canons they settled the matter by scaring the people and destroying more than half of the village. This wasn't happened first time when people got annoyed by unjust policy of British Government for example rebellion of Balanwali was also a result of faulty revenue policy of British Government.

In last chapter 'Cis-Sutlej States Services in War' role of these petty states has been analyzed as given in *The Rajas of the Punjab*. Lepel Griffin blames Cis-Sutlej chiefs that British Government was not satisfied with their performance during first Anglo-Sikh war. It has also been discussed that how and why people of Cis-Sutlej opposed British Government. But prime points which can trace through analyze are that though common people were been living under the British rule since 1809 A.D but they opposed the British at the time of war. That's why Anglo Sikh war forced British to implement precautionary measures for future. Here question arise that why? Even Lepel Griffin keeps on saying that British rule was just and benevolence towards people. These remarks he uses very often in his work but through analyze it reveals that people's sympathy were with Khalsa army and it deflated the fawn claims of Lepel Griffin because even after more than thirty years of rule British Government had failed to create a strong bond with Cis-Sutlej Chiefs and people of their respective countries. Lepel Griffin in his work further says that services provided by Cis-Sutlej chiefs in First Anglo Sikh as compare to 1857 A.D revolt were not satisfactory. However research reveals that chiefs could not be fully blame if they may had wanted to help British they couldn't because their own state army's sympathy was more with Lahore than British because many of their relatives were in Lahore army. Though Lepel Griffin gives hint of new policy for common people to create better connection but failure of British policy again confronted them in the shape of revolt of 1857 A.D but fortunately they succeeded to win over the chiefs into their side by the time of revolt of 1857 A.D.

Lepel Griffin shares that Patiala chief for his services and loyalty during Anglo Sikh war received award from British Government but along with these rewards he requested for the right of his former possession thus by receiving *sanad* he secured his and his successor's right over his hereditary states. But when attempt was being made to understand that why Patiala especially requested for the right of former possession when it was already under his control it comes out that policy of British Government in pre thirty years had seized number of territories by applying several tactics over Cis-Sutlej Chiefs. Jind and Kythal are the example of it.

Therefore it is not a matter of surprise that British policy should not have caused some alarms in mind of chief of Patiala and led him to request for the confirmation of his possession.

As per *The Rajas of Punjab* during interruption of 1857 no other Indian ruler showed great loyalty or rendered more evident service to the British Government than the Maharaja Narinder Singh of Patiala. He was well known head of Sikh Rajas; here Griffin tells that his hesitation or disloyalty would have cost British Government with the most disastrous results but due to honorable and principled environment of gratitude as well as the loyalty provided by British Government, to Maharaja due to which Maharaja without any doubt placed his whole powerful resources and energy under the absolute command of England. But in actual chiefs of Princely states helped British Government not due to liberal attitude of British Government towards them as told by Lepel Griffin rather they sought it as a golden opportunity to win over the gratitude of British government by rendering their services and then in return get concession from them for an example – ‘Paper of Requests’.

According to Lepel Griffin, Patiala chief without waiting the orders of British officials he saved the chief of Dholepur from rebels and thus he provided the help to British and proved his loyalty towards them. However the matter was not the same as Lepel Griffin has depicted. In actual, motive of Patiala chief was to march with his forces to save Dholepur was not that he wanted to please British Government or to suppress any rebellion but Rana Balwant Singh appealed to Maharaja of Patiala for his help. For Maharaja it was also necessary to save Dholepur because Rana Balwant Singh was his son-in-law. So for the safety of his daughter and his son-in-law he agreed to render services and his assistance as well as he communicated with Government of Punjab and North –west provinces related it. British Government agreed for assistance because they thought it would put good impact of Sikh Maharaja’s presence in the Dholepur and on the other affected areas. That’s why Patiala forces marched towards Dholepur and stayed there even after the mutineers left it for the safety of Rana and his city.

By analyzing the attitude of Cis-Sutlej chiefs by comparing the early nineteen and late nineteen as given in *The Rajas of Punjab* it can be observed that chief of late 19th century were much attached and loyal with British Government. The reason behind the changed attitude of native rulers and British Government for each other by close to 19th century is primarily based on the fact that many leading chiefs had disappeared from the political stage of Indian politics and

consequently in a good number of Princely states fell under the minority rule at once at the same time. Thus under the surveillance of the British Government the young princes by learning from them, they ruled on their states in changed attitude and in changed behavior. It should also be kept in mind that British had also took the responsibility of the education of minor under their authority and therefore they were imparted western study. It can be understood that western education was that powerful tool which changed the attitude of the new chiefs towards British Government.

By analyzing *The Rajas of Punjab* it can be pointed out that among all these princely states Jind state had to suffer a lot. First incident of Ludhiana cantonment than of succession matter of Jind and after that under the name of an award for serving the British in 1846 A.D an illusion was made to entangle the Raja of Jind though Raja of Jind was seeking his own safety and protection, he wanted assurance and security for his land and his property from British Government for future because Government had applied rule at various occasions over Jind by arbitrary and by considering them as Lord Paramount. On the contrary a *sanad* was being issued, by issuing mere a *sanad* of assurance to Jind the British Government got much important right in exchange from Jind. As per agreement if any enemy would approach to this side with the purpose of conquering this country, Raja will join the British with his army to expel the enemy. Second, British put another burden upon him, as per agreement Raja was told that he would build and repair military roads in his territory for the passage of British army from Amabla to Ferozpur even the width of road was to be decided by British engineers. British Government had experienced that in future if some disturbance occurred they would need allies like chiefs of Cis-Sutlej States and military roads for safe transportation and passage of military in difficult times. This pre-planning helped them in near future when in 1857 A.D mutiny happened. At that time protected chiefs stood along them as pillars of British power in Punjab.

Lepel Griffin affirms claims of describing British Government as the most excellent rule as compared to previous ruler especially Maharaja Ranjit Singh. His claims got deflated when Anglo Sikh war began not only the people from the Trans and Cis-Sutlej opposed British Government but also Cis-Sutlej chiefs were not on their side.

Lepel Griffin justly advocates the law of Primogeniture which his Government followed if a matter of succession arises among these principalities. On the other hand, he himself had said

that there were no particular rules of succession in Cis-Sutej states. British arbitrarily imposed this law upon them being a supreme power. However, this law made situation worsen. It deprived off the Rajas from issuing Will by which they used to select their predecessor before their death. This law also became reason for the rupture in states. Due to this law inefficient ruler might also get throne, without any efforts. These inefficient rulers were always being used by British Government as their puppet. Moreover this fact can't denied that British Government had intervened in the cases of Patiala, Nabha, Jind authoritatively for assertion of primogeniture but it didn't apply it as a rule in the case of Bhawalpur when in 1850 A.D Nawab nominated his third son to the succession. Policy of the British Government was not clear towards princely states of Punjab therefore chiefs had to send a paper of requests in 1860 A.D to procure their rights for future.

Though Lepel Henry Griffin had been remained superintendent of Kapurthala state but he didn't write a single word why or for what reason Kapurthala was treated inferior than other states. For an example some important concessions were given to Phulkian states for their *Paper of Requests 1858 A.D.* Kapurthala was exempted from the power of life and death sentences. Likewise Kapurthala was given 'Right of Adoption' on the failure of the heir apparent much later as comparative to Phulkian chiefs and there are number of other incidents when Kapurthala state was taken with inferiority.

Lepel Griffin has no doubt and has not ignored even minute detail. He not only depends upon the British official records but also collected the information on the basis of personal interviews. His account constitutes a complete history of the Sikh Chiefship of the region from their remote origin upto 1870 A.D.

As a high official he had an easy access to all the documents and could easily provide valuable information though Lepel Griffin's work all said and done is predominantly motivated. He seeks to justify the British policy and sings glories of British Imperialism. He writes in his prefatory note to *The Rajas of Punjab* that:

..... the policy of the British Government , so far as the Sikh States are concerned,

Has been uniformly liberal, enlightened and just; that in no single instance has it

abused its strength to oppress its weaker neighbours, but that, on the contrary
it had taken less than its undoubted right and has decided
disputed questions with a generosity and disinterestedness
which will be looked for in vain in the administration
of any country.

He also remarks that Government of India has had one policy and one alone, whether Punjab or Oude or Bengal was concerned. In other words Lepel Griffin believes that the British career of conquests in India was absolutely clean and unblemished. He ignores the unscrupulous means which the British authorities had adopted for example in the annexation of Sindh, Satara, Jhansi, Nagpur, Oudh and Punjab etc. Even Lepel Griffin was not right in holding that the British policy in respect of Cis-Sutlej states was uniformly liberal and generous. He himself contradicts this remark when he gives number of examples about the absorption of some territories of the Sikh Chiefship by the British in an unjust manner during the period of East India Company. After the Anglo Sikh war British Government absorbed many petty Cis-Sutlej Sikh states which were considered guilty of having supported the enemies of the British and it not only confiscated portion of territories of Kapurthala and Nabha states for their supposed disloyal conduct to the British but also dethroned Raja Davinder Singh of Nabha.

To sum up, it may be concluded that nineteenth century was not only important to the Sikhs but also to the British. Top most powers of India had vanished from the map. Subsequently British opportunist emerged as supreme power in India. Simultaneous, change in western political conditions happened to be the reason to intersect the British with chiefs of Punjab. This journey of British and Cis-Sutlej which started in 1803 had have to go through several political hurdles like Anglo Sikh wars, Revolt of 1857, internal and external complications. Fortunately, Lepel Griffin took the initiative to correspondingly inscribe this journey from historical perspective. The author claims that “No chapter of Indian History has ever been written so unreservedly or with so much detail as the present volume. Even relation of Princely states with British till 1947 remained intact and played an important part in Indian politics and history. So on, it attracts more attention of the thinker belonging to various classes.

Undoubtedly, *The Rajas of Punjab* historically momentous for several reasons though his main concern was to provide justification to the British rule in Punjab and basis for the reservation of the British Empire in India. Lepel Griffin's work leaves no doubt that like other conservatives thinkers he also believes in the policy of Divide and Rule. Like them he suggests that loyalty of aristocracy and army were the only dependable pillars of permanence of British rule in India. All the same, it has to be admitted that he was the one of those few administrative historians who left us a rich heritage of historical literature on the period which is though not very remote is yet obscure in history.

ABSTRACT

India's experience of 'History' in the modern sense came through its exposure to western forms of epistemology in the wake of the colonial experience. The British became acquainted with the Punjabi's and especially of the Sikhs quite late in the process of the sojourn and advancement in India. Many British administrative officers and European authors wrote about socio-political conditions of the Punjab and of the Sikhs. One of them was Sir Lepel Henry Griffin, compiled various works on the political and social history of Punjab viz *Maharaja Ranjit Singh*, *The Punjab Chiefs*, *The Rajas of the Punjab etc.* Sir Lepel Henry Griffin (1838-1908) was a British administrator and diplomat during the British period in India. He was born in Watford, England. His first posting was at Lahore as I.C.S officer.

"*The Rajas of Punjab*" by Sir Lepel Henry Griffin was first published in the year 1870. The work has been acknowledged as one of the most important historical accounts of the history of Punjab which documents the history of the major princely states of Punjab. Although biographical in nature, the book dwells on the political affiliations and power equations existing between the princely states and the center of power – the British. The work was mainly derived from the official records and papers of political agencies at important centers of political power like Delhi, Ambala and Ludhiana. Besides these, the work draws its substance from the dispatches of important British generals and officials like Malcolm, David Ochterlony, Metcalfe and H.T Princep. While tracing the history and lineage of the Rajas of the Princely states of Punjab like Patiala, Nabha, Jind, Kapurthala, Faridkot who constitute the subject of the study, the book keeps its focus on the history of the relations and policies adopted by the British Government towards its feudatories. Lepel Griffin died at his home in London after suffering from influenza in 1908 in England. The aim of present study is to analyze the political relations of British Government with princely states of Punjab from 1803 A.D to up to 1870 A.D as given in Lepel Henry Griffin's *The Rajas of Punjab* to provide Historical clarity of every aspect discussed by Lepel Henry Griffin.

ਅਬਸਟ੍ਰੈਕਟ

ਆਧੁਨਿਕ ਤਰਕ ਦੇ ਅਨੁਸਾਰ ਭਾਰਤ ਦਾ 'ਇਤਿਹਾਸ' ਦਾ ਤਜਰਬਾ ਬਸਤੀਵਾਦ ਦੇ ਅਨੁਭਵ ਦੇ ਮੱਦੇਨਜਰ ਇਸਦੇ ਪੱਛਮੀ ਰੂਪਾਂ ਵਾਲੇ ਗਿਆਨ-ਵਿਗਿਆਨ ਦੇ ਸੰਪਰਕ ਤੋਂ ਆਇਆ। ਬ੍ਰਿਟਿਸ਼ ਭਾਰਤ ਵਿੱਚ ਆਪਣੇ ਪ੍ਰਵਾਸ ਤੇ ਉੱਨਤੀ ਦੀ ਪ੍ਰਕ੍ਰਿਆ ਦੌਰਾਨ ਬਹੁਤ ਲੰਬੇ ਅੰਤਰਾਲ ਬਾਅਦ ਪੰਜਾਬੀ ਅਤੇ ਖਾਸ ਕਰ ਸਿੱਖਾਂ ਤੇ ਜਾਣੂ ਹੋਏ। ਬਹੁਤ ਸਾਰੇ ਬ੍ਰਿਟਿਸ਼ ਪ੍ਰਸ਼ਾਸਨਿਕ ਅਧਿਕਾਰੀਆਂ ਅਤੇ ਯੂਰਪੀਅਨ ਲੇਖਕਾਂ ਨੇ ਪੰਜਾਬ ਬਾਰੇ ਜਾਣਨ ਲਈ ਪੰਜਾਬ ਦੇ ਸਿੱਖਾਂ ਅਤੇ ਇਥੋਂ ਦੀਆਂ ਸਮਾਜਿਕ, ਰਾਜਨੀਤਿਕ ਸਥਿਤੀਆਂ ਬਾਰੇ ਲਿਖਿਆ। ਇਹਨਾਂ ਵਿੱਚੋਂ ਹੀ ਇੱਕ ਸੀ, ਸਰ ਲੈਪਲ ਹੈਨਰੀ ਗ੍ਰਿਫਿਨ। ਜਿਸਨੇ ਮਹਾਰਾਜਾ ਰਣਜੀਤ ਸਿੰਘ, ਦਿ ਪੰਜਾਬ ਚੀਫਜ਼, ਦੀ ਰਾਜਸ ਆਫ ਪੰਜਾਬ ਆਦਿ ਦੇ ਰਾਜਨੀਤਿਕ ਅਤੇ ਸਮਾਜਿਕ ਇਤਿਹਾਸ ਦੀ ਰਚਨਾ ਕੀਤੀ। ਸਰ ਲੈਪਲ ਹੈਨਰੀ ਗ੍ਰਿਫਿਨ (੧੮੩੮-੧੯੦੮) ਭਾਰਤ ਵਿੱਚ ਬ੍ਰਿਟਿਸ਼ ਕਾਲ ਦੌਰਾਨ ਇੱਕ ਬ੍ਰਿਟਿਸ਼ ਪ੍ਰਬੰਧਕ ਅਤੇ ਡਿਪਲੋਮੈਟ ਸੀ। ਉਸਦਾ ਜਨਮ ਵਾਟਫੋਰਡ, ਇੰਗਲੈਂਡ ਵਿੱਚ ਹੋਇਆ ਸੀ। ਉਹ ਆਪਣੀ ਪਹਿਲੀ ਪੋਸਟਿੰਗ ਸਮੇਂ ਦੌਰਾਨ ਲਾਹੌਰ ਵਿੱਚ ਬਤੌਰ ਆਈ.ਸੀ.ਐਸ ਅਧਿਕਾਰੀ ਵਜੋਂ ਨਿਯੁਕਤ ਹੋਇਆ ਸੀ।

ਲੈਪਲ ਹੈਨਰੀ ਗ੍ਰਿਫਿਨ ਦੁਆਰਾ 'ਦਾ ਰਾਜਸ ਆਫ ਪੰਜਾਬ' ਪਹਿਲੀ ਵਾਰ ਸੰਨ ੧੮੭੦ ਵਿੱਚ ਪ੍ਰਕਾਸ਼ਿਤ ਕੀਤੀ ਗਈ ਸੀ। ਇਸ ਰਚਨਾ ਨੂੰ ਪੰਜਾਬ ਇਤਿਹਾਸ ਦੇ ਸਭ ਤੋਂ ਮਹੱਤਵਪੂਰਨ ਇਤਿਹਾਸਿਕ ਸ੍ਰੋਤਾਂ ਵਿੱਚੋਂ ਇੱਕ ਮੰਨਿਆ ਗਿਆ ਹੈ ਜੋ ਕਿ ਪੰਜਾਬ ਦੀਆਂ ਪ੍ਰਮੁੱਖ ਰਿਆਸਤਾਂ ਦੇ ਇਤਿਹਾਸ ਨੂੰ ਦਰਸਾਉਂਦਾ ਹੈ। ਹਾਲਾਂਕਿ ਜੀਵਨ ਬਿਰਤਾਂਤ ਦੇ ਸੁਭਾਅ ਪੱਖੋਂ ਹੋਣ ਦੇ ਬਾਵਜੂਦ, ਇਹ ਪੁਸਤਕ ਰਾਜਸੀ ਰਿਆਸਤਾਂ ਅਤੇ ਸ਼ਕਤੀ ਕੇਂਦਰਤ ਬ੍ਰਿਟਿਸ਼ ਸਰਕਾਰ ਦਰਮਿਆਨ ਮੌਜੂਦ ਰਾਜਨੀਤਿਕ ਸੰਬੰਧਾਂ ਅਤੇ ਸ਼ਕਤੀ ਸਮੀਕਰਣਾਂ ਉੱਪਰ ਚਾਣਨਾ ਪਾਉਂਦੀ ਹੈ। ਇਸਦੀ ਰਚਨਾ ਦੇ ਲਈ ਸਰਕਾਰੀ ਬ੍ਰਿਟਿਸ਼ ਏਜੰਸੀਆਂ ਦੇ ਦਿੱਲੀ, ਅੰਬਾਲਾ, ਲੁਧਿਆਣਾ ਵਰਗੇ ਕੇਂਦਰਾਂ ਦੇ ਅਧਿਕਾਰਤ ਦਸਤਾਵੇਜ਼ਾਂ ਦਾ ਇਸਤੇਮਾਲ ਕੀਤਾ ਗਿਆ ਹੈ। ਇਸ ਤੋਂ ਇਲਾਵਾ ਬ੍ਰਿਟਿਸ਼ ਸਰਕਾਰ ਦੇ ਮਹੱਤਵਪੂਰਨ ਬ੍ਰਿਟਿਸ਼ ਜਰਨਲ ਅਤੇ ਅਧਿਕਾਰੀਆਂ ਜਿਵੇਂ ਕਿ ਮੈਲਕੋਮ, ਡੇਵਡ ਅਖਤਰਲੇਨੀ, ਮੈਟਕਾਫ ਅਤੇ ਐਚ.ਟੀ. ਪ੍ਰਿੰਸਪ ਆਦਿ ਦੇ ਡਿਸਪੈਚਾਂ ਦੀ ਵਰਤੋਂ ਕੀਤੀ ਗਈ ਹੈ। ਪੰਜਾਬ ਦੇ ਰਿਆਸਤੀ ਰਾਜਾਂ ਜਿਵੇਂ ਕਿ ਪਟਿਆਲਾ, ਨਾਭਾ, ਜੀਂਦ, ਕਪੂਰਥਲਾ ਅਤੇ ਫਰੀਦਕੋਟ ਦਾ ਅਧਿਐਨ ਕਰਦੇ ਹੋਏ ਇਹ ਪੁਸਤਕ ਬ੍ਰਿਟਿਸ਼ ਸਰਕਾਰ ਦੁਆਰਾ ਉਹਨਾਂ ਨਾਲ ਸਥਾਪਿਤ ਕੀਤੇ ਸੰਬੰਧਾਂ ਅਤੇ ਉਹਨਾਂ ਪ੍ਰਤੀ ਬ੍ਰਿਟਿਸ਼ ਸਰਕਾਰ ਦੁਆਰਾ ਅਪਣਾਈ ਗਈਆਂ ਨੀਤੀਆਂ ਦਾ ਜ਼ਿਕਰ ਕਰਦੀ ਹੈ। ਲੇਖਕ ਲੈਪਲ ਹੈਨਰੀ ਗ੍ਰਿਫਿਨ ਦੀ ੧੯੦੮ ਵਿੱਚ ਇੰਗਲੈਂਡ ਵਿੱਚ ਇਨਫਲੂਐਂਜ਼ਾ ਕਾਰਨ ਆਪਣੇ ਹੀ ਘਰ ਵਿੱਚ ਮੌਤ ਹੋ ਗਈ ਸੀ। ਮੌਜੂਦਾ ਅਧਿਐਨ ਦਾ ਉਦੇਸ਼ ਲੈਪਲ ਹੈਨਰੀ ਗ੍ਰਿਫਿਨ ਦੁਆਰਾ ੧੮੦੩ ਤੋਂ ਲੈ ਕੇ ੧੮੭੦ ਤੱਕ ਦੇ ਪੰਜਾਬ ਅਤੇ ਬ੍ਰਿਟਿਸ਼ ਸਰਕਾਰ ਦੇ ਰਾਜਨੀਤਿਕ ਸੰਬੰਧਾਂ ਦਾ ਵਿਸ਼ਲੇਸ਼ਣ ਕਰਕੇ ਲੈਪਲ ਹੈਨਰੀ ਗ੍ਰਿਫਿਨ ਦੁਆਰਾ ਪੇਸ਼ ਕੀਤੇ ਹਰ ਪਹਿਲੂ ਨੂੰ ਇਤਿਹਾਸਿਕ ਸ਼ਪੱਸ਼ਟਤਾ ਪ੍ਰਦਾਨ ਕਰਨਾ ਹੈ।

Supervisor's Certificate Research Papers

It is to certify that Pushpinder Singh has been published the research paper in following reputed journals (All Ugc Approved) :

- Paper entitled **Historical Analysis of Relations of Raja Fateh Singh of Kapurthala with Maharaja Ranjit Singh as given in *The Rajas of Punjab*** published in *Remarking An Analisation*, Vol. III, Issue-10, Part – I, January – 2019, P: ISSN: 2394-0344, E: ISSN 2455-0817, Kanpur.
- Paper entitled **Analysis of British Government's Policy in Cis-Sutlej States During Uprising of 1857 As given in *The Rajas of Punjab*** published in *Journal of Emerging Technologies and Innovative Research* ISSN- 2349-5162, Vol VI, Issue 6, June 2019, Gujarat.
- Paper entitled **An Account of the Operation of the British Government in Supressing the Rebillion of Zamindars of Balanwali in 1836 A.D** published in *International Journal of Research and Analytical Reviews* E-ISSN 2348-1269, P-ISSN- 2349- 5138. Vol. 6, Issue 2, June 2019.

Dr. Balraj Singh

Assistant Professor
Department of History
Punjabi University, Patiala