

11-12-24
124
10.1.90

CONFDL GO

Seest. I (1)-10,006--7-10-70.

(1) Number of pages 6
(2) Date of repair 28-9-73
(3) Initials of the Referencer _____

TAMIL NADU ARCHIVES

GOVERNMENT OF TAMIL NADU

JUDL

DEPARTMENT

CONFDL GO

G.O. No.	2264	Press
B.P. No.	(2264)	Mis.
Dated 1-10-1887		197

Not to be folded or roughly handled

City Police Office, 12264

Madras 10th September 1887

My dear Stokes

Ross case was finally and formally committed yesterday. The lady was Cross examined at great length but I do not think her evidence was in any way affected on the contrary it rather confirmed her ex. in chief. There is no denying that Ross has a very formidable case to meet and the defence must rely on facts outside the present case for the prosecution which would justify a rejection of the direct evidence of the lady. Mr Morgan does no doubt feel her position but she is a woman of admirable nerve. It is to be regretted for her own sake that she has no legal adviser to look after her interests, as unless there be some understanding that she is to benefit by these disclosures she is running herself most gravely in both moral and financial matters. She has I believe returned

in a Bachelors house to 8th.

The Arsenal Theft & Lead Case
 ended in the acquittal of the Contractor
 - though it was admitted that
 the lead was Govt property - improperly
 taken from the forge which was in charge
 of Balfour and that Balfours books
 showed that - allowing for usage -
 he purchased Govt for a quantity of -
 and which as nearly as possible represented
 the quantity found. The Contractor
 to whom the lead was sold some bargain
 with Balfour and paid Balfour. The
 defence was admission that the lead was
 stolen but denial that Balfour was
 and shifting of the blame to a Tindal
 Govt was alleged had been the lead. The
 Tindal and Lascars case was dismissed
 because the lead at the forge was accounted for
 on the Ordnance books and it was proved
 to the Contractors books. It is almost impossible
 this could be done without the knowledge

of the Concurrence of the Contractor
 on duty - and the fact that the lead
 is that Balfour called on the
 one witness a relative I think - to prove
 that the money (100 odd Rs) was paid to
 the Tindal - in Balfours house!
 If the Tindal were dealing in stolen
 property without the knowledge of the
 present Officer he certainly would not
 go to the Tindal to be paid - he would
 go to the Tindal's bank or make the money
 come to his payees house. It has taken
 some three months to get this case half
 tried by a military Court - with the result
 now believe they are going to try the
 Tindal - most likely he

is a very fine man - and will now in addition
 be a scape goat - It was a great
 pity that the military Court to try
 the Tindal was a very small one - these are the
 only trials for this case in three days -
 Pres: Towns - the result
 will be a very small one - how the case will be
 decided is a matter of course as will generally happen
 are the same. The military authorities must

first have a Court of Inquiry - which
corresponds to our Preliminary Enquiry - to
record all evidence - both coming in which
the case is based on if it be considered a
Case for trial but there is an opinion that
that a Ct of Enquiry cannot compel any
non military person to attend or give evidence
nor have any power either to compel
the attendance of any witness before other
than a Civil Ct. Court so it is no use asking
us to help them.

I am not inclined to trouble you with such
a lengthy report.

Yours, Donald
McDonald

W.H.

For perusal.

It does not appear that
any steps are called for in the
Ordinal Case.

W.H.
11th Sept
H.E. the C. in C. & see this.

See I think a Military Court is
personally composed of a far more
intelligent body & more likely
to arrive at a correct decision
than a common jury -
I agree personally with H. (H. Widdie's
remarks about preliminary Court
of Enquiry. But when the
Witnesses are, as in this case,
in the employment of Govt, their
attendance can be assured.

Sept 24th/87

C. G. A. - 11/22/87
11/25/87

211
1887

[77]

ORDINARY, MS.

<i>Tull</i> DEPARTMENT.
G. O. DATED <i>1st October 1887</i>
No. <i>2264</i> .

211
1887

When given for copying

[Despatch Abstract.]

3-2-1887

P. no. 1 and 2