

BACK PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.	G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

FURTHER PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.	G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

Petition for Pardon

From

Ratnam.
Convicted No 6055
Central Jail. Bellona.

To

His Excellency
The Governor in Council
Fort St George.

CURRENT NO. 5471

No. 6524

Submitted for the orders of

Government.

Dated 28
Received } November 1895.

ootacamund
4 Dec 1895

By Cardew
Inspector of Prisons

No 34

Recd 6/12/95
Rep 7/12/95

Encs. 3

Enclosures.



Subject

Praying for release as
he has not committed
the offence of which he has
been convicted

Date.

To

Petition for Pardon

FORM No. 53.

Nominal Roll of Convict No. 6055 Ratnam

Crime.	Sentence.	Date of Sentence.	Adjudicating Court.	Present Age.	State of Health.	Conduct in Jail.	Result of the Appeal to Appellate Court.	Number of previous convictions if any and remarks.
Murder Sec. 302 IPC	Transportation for life	29 April 1895	Court of Sessions, Singapore	23 years	Good	Good	Death commuted to Transportation for life	Nil

Attest
JAIL OFFICE,
28th November 1895.

D. 000-0.01.

Rules 701 and 704.

H. H. Kaurindish
Superintendent of Central Jail.

er by some misfortune resulting from the clever combination of the Police with certain of your petitioner's enemies was held to be sufficient in the opinion of the learned Sessions Judge and in that of the High Court as a court of confirmation to warrant the sentence of Transportation for life.

3. That your petitioner have had no motive and are not shewn by the Crown to have had any motives strong enough to stab the deceased in an open manner inside the Police station and amidst such a number of people

Nominal Receipt
Cornick No 6055
Autumn.

1889 November 95

William Central Jail

1895	Dept.
Enclos. No.	To
C.A.	5471

To Petition for Pardon
His Excellency the Governor-in-Council
Fort Saint George
Madras

The humble petition of Ratnam, now a
prisoner in the central jail, Vellore
Most humbly sheweth,

That your petitioner was charged with
the murder of one Balasundram, was found
guilty of that offence and was awarded
the sentence of death which was subsequently
commuted to Transportation for life by the
High Court.

(2) That the evidence against your petition-
er by some misfortune resulting from the
clever combination of the Police with cer-
tain of your petitioner's enemies was held to
be sufficient in the opinion of the learned
Sessions Judge and in that of the High
Court as a court of confirmation to warrant
the sentence of Transportation for life.

3. That your petitioner have had no motive
and are not shewn by the Crown to have
had any motives strong enough to stab the
deceased in an open manner inside the
Police station and amidst such a number of
people

people.

4. That the evidence as to the identification of your petitioner as the person who stabbed the deceased is utterly defective and what little evidence there is, untrustworthy and should not have been accepted as sufficient in a case of murder.

5. On the other hand, there is positive documentary evidence to show that your petitioner could not have committed the murder in as much as neither in the Village Munsiff's Report written on the very night of the occurrence nor in the Crime Register prepared ~~by the~~ by the Police Inspector at 7. A. M the next morning, was any mention made of your petitioner's name though other names are mentioned in these two documents. If it were true that the crowd cried out that your petitioner had stabbed the deceased it is very suspicious why your petitioner's name should not have been mentioned in those important documents.

6. That the document in which your petitioner's name appears is timed at 9 A.M. and the gathering of the crime upon your petitioner is purely an after thought.

7. That Munisawmy deposed that the light in the Police station was extinguished when your petitioner was alleged to have stabbed Balasundaram. The learned Judge commented upon it to a certain extent in paras 15 & 16 but unfortunately

to the prisoner arrived at a contrary conclusion.

8. That Varadappa Naidu, a public servant
P. W. 5
who must of necessity desire a connection, ^{with you} deposed
that he did not at all see your petitioner nor
does he identify Ratnam as being present on
the occasion

9. That your petitioner never deposed before the Sessions Court that he pointed out the knife to the Station House Officer or to the Village Munsiff. It is a pure fabrication. True it is that your petitioner was taken to the coral merchant street and was ordered to search in a certain spot in a drain for the knife saying that I should have buried it there, your petitioner obeyed them with the result that the knife was not found, but the Police officer himself picked out one from underneath.

10. That the knife was not identified as the prisoner's property or as the one said to have been used to stab Balasundaram.

11. That the evidence of the 10. P. W. Vanugopaul Naidu that your petitioner offered a knife saying that he had just stabbed a man is beyond belief. At moments' consideration.

will convince your Excellency that a culprit too would not have said uncalled for that he had just stabbed a man.

12. That your petitioner and the deceased were good friends which may be established by the fact that your petitioner assisted the deceased in his endeavour to recover from Erusappa Gramani Rs 3000 and some other property which were in his possession and which he would not hand over. There was great dispute about it. Erusappa Gramani entertained a spite against your petitioner since then.

13. That your petitioner is a poor man and Erusappa Gramani being rich has easily bought off the witnesses. In now a days a rich man always gains his cause while a poor man fails to meet the ends of justice.

14. Under the above circumstances your petitioner humbly prays that your Excellency in Council in the exercise of the prerogative of mercy may deal with your petitioner as his present sad fate deserves and in consideration of his tender age and that of his young wife, only 15 yrs old, and remit the punishment.

For which act of kindness your petitioner will as in duty bound ever pray.

28 November 95
Vellons Central Jail

Signed in my presence

H. H. Curjish
Superintendent

[J]
14

1,000-5-2-04.

JUDICIAL DEPARTMENT.

CURRENT No. 5771 of 1895.

Application for remission of sentence from convict in the Central Jail, Vellon.

FOR ORDERS.

I see no reason to interfere

M

13/12/95

Name of the Convict

Ratnam. No 6055. (No 1)

Offence committed.

Murder. Sec. 302 I.P.C.

Adjudicating Court.

Cossim Court. (Hing Report)

Sentence imposed.

Death

Result of appeal to High Court.

Sentence of Death commuted
to transportation for life

Previous Convictions.

Nil

At. 11/12/95

PETITION FROM CONVICT

H. M.

C. 12/12
R. 13/12

[J
15
190-18-3-95.]

Judicial Department.



R

PROCEEDINGS OF THE MADRAS GOVERNMENT.

Read the following endorsement :—

From the Inspector-General of Prisons, dated

189

No.

C. No 5771

ORDER, dated 16th Dec 1895, R. No. 2599

The Inspector-General of Prisons will cause convict No. 655 Ratnam

confined in the Central Jail at Villur

to be informed that the Government declines to interfere with the sentence passed upon him

(From order)

(True Extract.)

R. B. 12/5

14/12/95

for Chief Secretary.

To the Inspector-General of Prisons,

with judgment

desp'd
19/12

C. 11/12
R. 12/12

When given for copying _____
 When copied _____
 When examined _____
 When signed _____

189

READ AGAIN G.O., No. _____
 189 _____ DATED _____

CURRENT No. _____

ENCLOSURES TO C. No. _____

ORDER OF GOVERNMENT A A A A A A A

LETTER OF GOVERNMENT

STATEMENT WITH DITTO.

PAPERS NOT FILED UP, BEING MEANT FOR DESPATCH
 IN ORIGINAL.

N.B. --
 A = Copy in full.
 B = Not to be copied.
 P = Copy abstract only.
 Q = Copy heading only.