

(1) Number of pages

78

(2) Date of repair

3. 9. 49

(3) Initials of the Referencer

MADRAS RECORD OFFICE

Government of Madras

Judicial

DEPARTMENT

G.O. No.

576

~~B.P. No.~~

Press

~~Mis.~~

Original

Dated

31st March 1874.Not to be folded or roughly handled

No. 228. Read the following letter from the Hon. H. S. CUNNINGHAM, Advocate-General, to the Hon. W. HUDLESTON, Chief Secretary to Government, Fort St. George, dated Madras, 5th February 1874:—

IN continuation of my demi-official letter of yesterday, I have the honour to submit a report of the grounds on which I thought it necessary to abandon the prosecution of the two men, Iyahsawmy and R. ~~my~~ my, committed by the Police Magistrate to the present Sessions on charges of fraudulent misappropriation of Government property.

2. The principle on which I acted, and which I trust that the Government may approve, is that it is not right for the prosecution, when a case depends wholly on the truthfulness of certain witnesses, and the untruthfulness of those witnesses is conclusively established, to invite a Jury to act upon evidence which is, on the face of it, unsound. I will now show how this principle applied to the case when I brought it to a stand-still yesterday. In the first place, the manner in which the evidence had been procured was such as to expose it, however consistent and otherwise unimpeachable it might have been, to the gravest suspicion. It was impossible for me to prevent the defence from bringing out in cross-examination the great pressure which had been brought to bear upon the witnesses, in order to wring from them the reluctant admissions, which constituted the whole evidence in the case. The inquiry started with the dismissal of a workman named Manickum, in consequence of his replies while under interrogation; the dismissal had apparently the desired effect, for the next day he came back with a statement, and was thereupon reinstated—no more distinct menace could, of course, be held out to a set of mechanics and coolies than such a proceeding—and a Jury might reasonably refuse to put any confidence on statements so elicited.

3. But this was not all. During the prolonged interrogations to which the workmen were submitted, and which began with an absolute denial on the part of all, save Manickum, that any work had been improperly done, it came out that, on one occasion, the Accountant-General, enraged at what he considered the falsity of one of the men examined, had seized him by the throat. The man explained afterwards that he had misunderstood the question, which, as it had to be interpreted, is likely enough to have been the case. But however that may be, the effect of the Head of a Department treating subordinates who are before him under interrogation with violence of this description was obviously calculated to drive ignorant and frightened natives, some of them mere boys, into saying whatever they thought would be safest to say. In fact, as one of our witnesses said, the proceedings of the Accountant-General "struck terror into the whole Office."

4. It came out, moreover, that the case had been put into the hands of a Police Inspector, who had for weeks constantly been about the Office, and who had (from unavoidable causes I believe) detained the men at his house sometimes as late as one o'clock at night. This, again, bore an aspect highly unfavourable to the idea of the evidence being spontaneous, straight-forward or truthful.

5. Another circumstance which bore most unfavourably against the prosecution was the summary dismissal of Iyahsawmy, the prisoner, during the preliminary investigation, on grounds which certainly appeared so glaringly insufficient, as to give the proceeding an aspect of oppression and vindictiveness, besides, of course, encouraging the witnesses to treat the dismissed official as a fallen man, whom it was certainly safe, and probably advisable, to assail with accusations.

6. Another difficulty was that the articles to be identified, and which the witnesses professed after a lapse of several years to be able to swear to without hesitation, were such as, in their nature, hardly to admit of identification. Some of them, such as iron hasps, iron crowbars, hinges, &c., had about them absolutely nothing distinctive, and it was obvious that any one, who said he could identify them, was lying. The same may be said of the iron chains, brass rings for door-posts, and iron cauldrons, which formed part of the property alleged to have been stolen; several brass door-knobs and a brass door-handle, which were the articles most susceptible of identification, had nevertheless hardly anything distinctive about them, which would enable a witness to speak confidently as to their identity. As to this part of the case I think the Judge would have told the Jury that the positiveness with which the witnesses identified the articles evidently showed either recklessness, stupidity, or fraud, because the articles did not admit of being so identified by the most careful observer.

7. Every witness, moreover, was shown to have had a direct interest in Iyahsawmy's dismissal, or a reason for bearing a grudge against him. The behaviour of the first witness, Kissun Sing, in getting Iyahsawmy dismissed for a proceeding, for which the witness himself was responsible, and which he admitted he had sanctioned, showed that Kissun Sing fully appreciated the requirements of the position, understood that the way to please his superior was to find an excuse for dismissing Iyahsawmy, and was prepared at the expense of any amount of baseness to do what was wanted. We thus started the case with a witness who admitted that he had not scrupled to get the prisoner dismissed on wholly unjust grounds, and who would not be likely, having gone so far, to be scrupulous as to what other means he adopted against one whom he saw it was his interest to ruin. It is also material to note, as evidencing the state of feeling of Kissun Sing to the prisoner, that there appeared to be numerous instances in which, since Iyahsawmy's removal, his policy had been reversed by Kissun Sing. The cases of Ramnada Pillay, Moorogasum, Mootoosawmy Appay, as shown in Kissun Sing's cross-examination, are specimens of this, and certainly indicate a considerable divergence of opinion between the two officials, and a readiness on the part of the one to supersede the proceedings of the other.

8. Of the other witnesses, it was shown that Manickum had his pay stopped when absent through sickness, and that this order had been altered on the side of greater indulgence by Kissun Sing on Iyahsawmy's removal; another witness, Jeyram, had been suspended for two months on the prisoner's representation; another, Narrainsawmy, had been fined once on the prisoner's representation in 1872, and again in September 1873, a few weeks before the prosecution, on the prisoner's recommendation, for having made a false representation against a fellow-workman. Another witness, Ramasawmy Razo, who was prepared to swear to

every thing, (but whom I did not call,) was shown to have been dismissed from the office, to have come to Kissun Sing shortly before the prosecution, saying that he was starving and that he had come "down from the country about the case." Kissun Sing thereupon gave him 2 annas, kept him about the office, and he was at last produced as a material witness.

9. Upon the whole, the defence would have urged, and, in my opinion, have urged with justice, that the evidence was got out of the witnesses by means which robbed it of all pretensions to trustworthiness.

10. Such being the *a priori* pretensions of the witnesses to credibility, it was obvious that nothing but the clearest and most consistent testimony, given in a truthful manner, and corroborated by its complete harmony throughout, could have warranted a belief in their statements. But this was as far as possible from being the case. It is unnecessary for me to trouble the Government with the details of their examination, but it may be stated generally that there was not one who was not convicted of serious inconsistencies or contradictions, and it was impossible not to see that not a single one of them left the slightest impression of truthfulness on either Judge or Jury.

11. With regard to that part of the case against the prisoner Rungasawmy, which referred to water-marked paper, there was not, on the depositions, even a *prima facie* case of fraud against the prisoner; the witnesses called by the prosecution clearly established that, though the detention of the excess water-mark paper was irregular, it had been customary in the office for the last two years, and that the paper had been employed, not for fraudulent purposes, but to supply occasional deficiencies in the stamped paper returned to the Stamp Office. The evidence of Mr. Luxa seemed to me clear on the point, and was corroborated by the other witnesses. This charge, therefore, the only important one of the whole, must in any case have been abandoned, and the residuum of bits of string, rulers, and pen-knives assumed an almost ludicrous aspect of insignificance when contrasted with the gravity of the original charge, and the trouble and expense incurred in launching the case. The Jury would inevitably have laughed it out of Court.

12. These observations will, I believe, satisfy the Government that the case, when I abandoned it, was not only desperate but so transparently desperate that to have persisted in it any longer would have been only to invite an inevitably hostile verdict, coupled, probably, with some severe observations from the Court on the unsubstantial character of the prosecution, and the unwise precipitancy with which it was set on foot.

No. 229. ORDER THEREON, 31st March 1874, No. 576.

On receipt of the foregoing report on the prosecution, at the late Sessions, of Iyahsawmy and another official of the Accountant-General's Office on charges of fraudulent misappropriation of Government property, preferred by the Head of the Office, the Advocate-General was requested, demi-officially, to furnish a confidential statement of the suggestions he would propose for providing against similar ill considered proceedings.

2. Mr. Cunningham suggests, in the first place, that an order shall be issued prohibiting Heads of Offices from prosecuting their subordinates without the sanction of the Government, who would ordinarily, if there were any doubt, place the case in the hands of the Government Solicitor. His Excellency in Council observes

G. O., 30th November 1868, No. 1817.
" 1st September 1869, " 1446.

that this is exactly the present rule on the subject; but, in the present case, the Accountant-General first took out a war-

rant against the accused from the Magistrate, and then, next day, obtained permission to employ the Government Solicitor, who immediately employed Counsel, who conducted the case during the long inquiry before the Magistrate, and ultimately received a brief to prosecute it at the Sessions, as the Advocate-General's junior. As, however, two Courts of Session were on this occasion held at the same time, and, as this gentleman was engaged to defend a prisoner in the second Court, the Advocate-General was deprived, as the Government learn, of the advantage of his assistance. A similar occurrence happened, it appears, from the same cause about the same time in the Perjury Case, Reg. v. Kasi Basappa, ordered to be tried by the Chief Justice. There the Counsel retained by Government to prosecute absented himself, when the case was half way through, in order to act against Government in defending the persons accused by the Accountant-General.

3. In the next place, it is imperatively necessary, in the Advocate-General's opinion, that the Government prosecutions should be placed in the hands of a responsible official, owing a direct allegiance to Government. He strongly recommends a return to the old system, viz, "a responsible Government official who shall be bound to attend at the Magistrate's Court and to conduct the case in the High Court, and who would, as a matter of course, decline all briefs for the defence, and who would, moreover, have sufficient regard for Government interests not to go on with a transparently hopeless case."

A 4. His Excellency in Council has given his careful consideration to these suggestions. He observes that on the recent resignation of Mr. Mayne, who held the joint offices of Crown Prosecutor and Clerk of the Crown on a salary of 1000 Rs. a-month, a Clerk of the Crown was appointed on the salary of 300 Rupees a-month, subsequently raised to 400 Rupees, and the office of Crown Prosecutor was abolished. The advantages supposed were, first, those attainable by entrusting the duties of the office to a junior Counsel selected for the occasion from the whole of the Bar; and, secondly, a considerable reduction of expenditure. Experience has now shown that nothing can compensate for the absence of a responsible official, to be retained in the regular service of the State for these express duties; and that the saving contemplated is not likely to accrue. The junior Counsel, it was observed, "will watch the case before the Magistrates, conduct the prosecution before the High Court when the case is unimportant, and assist the Advocate-General as his junior in all the more important cases of which that officer would, as at present, take charge." All this, it was expected, would not entail a greater annual charge than Rupees 3,600; whereas it appears from a memorandum furnished by the Government Solicitor, that in this one case alone of the Accountant-General's prosecution, the fees paid to Counsel for twenty days' attendance at the Police Court amounted at no less than Rupees 1,962.

5. There is no doubt, therefore, that both as a question of policy and a question of expense, it is expedient to permanently retain a Crown Prosecutor, who shall appear in Government cases before the Magistrates of Police, conduct the less important prosecutions in the High Court, and act as the Advocate-General's junior in the remaining trials. It only remains to decide what shall be the salary of the office, to which the Governor in Council resolves to appoint Mr. Tarrant. He receives at present Rupees 400 a-month as Clerk of the Crown; Rupees 300 will be the salary henceforth of that office, and Rupees 500 of the separate appointment of Crown Prosecutor; there will thus be a saving of Rupees 200, the salary of the two offices when they were united having been Rupees 1,000. Mr. Tarrant will, therefore, receive for his two appointments an aggregate salary of Rupees 800 per mensem.

(True Extract.)

D. F. CARMICHAEL,
Acting Chief Secretary.

Para 5 to the High Court 1/4
+ officers concerned

S.D. & Confidential and ... 10/74

... and ...

My dear ...

There is, I imagine, an order ...

prohibiting officials from launching either ...
 investigations or suits against either their subordi-
 nates or any one else for matters connected

with their official business without the express
sanction of Government. It might be well, in

... as ...
 can of other officials as ...

...
 very important of ...

it is imperative that the Government should have due notice
before any proceedings are taken. Similar
instructions should be issued by the Military
Authorities to Officers. We had a very
boisterous discussion some time ago,
which an officer started on his own
account & then reported Govt to order
taken. This Govt thus informed would
ordinarily if there was any doubt, plan

5
the matter in the hands of the Govt. Secretary,
who would take the opinion of the Attorney
General, if deemed proper, and if he considered
it necessary, as in any other case, it should
be referred to the Council of State.
In the next place it is imperatively necessary
that the Government Prosecutions should be
placed in the hands of a responsible official
not left, as at present, to be handled about
by counsel, who have already too much to do
that they scarcely can attend to the work
owing Govt no allegiance, an utterly indef-
erent as to what expense Government

incur or what defeats & miscarriages
This was clearly shown at the
an involved. ~~It is clear that~~
last. Persons. The briefs had been given to
Mullin & O'Sullivan principally, & as they
were engaged in other cases to defend, they
threw up the case & left Government to do
as best it might. In the Accountant General's
Can, I was thus left to conduct a long
Can alone against a man who had been
every day for weeks engaged over detail
of it. It is obvious that no amount of
apudus on the part of the prosecution
Can compensate for the close acquaintance

6
disadvantage which is obtained
by conducting the Can in the Magistrate's
Court. Nothing could possibly have secured
a conviction in the Accountant General's
Can, but supposing it had been so
good as it was bad, the prosecution would
have been exposed to an overwhelming
disadvantage in being confronted with
Council who knew the Can in the Magistrate's
Court, without having any such knowledge
of its own. As it was, Lordarch tells me

that I examined a witness who
had, to his knowledge, gone over to the
enemy, but I had not the slightest
information of the facts -
The same thing occurred in the persons
Can, R v Karetupapa, ordered to be
tried by the Chief Justice - then Melu had
been engaged for the prosecution, & left the
Can half way through to go and act
against the defendant in the
Account of the case.

I strongly recommend that a return to
the old system, viz a responsible
official who shall be bound to attend at
the Magistrate's Court to conduct the
Can in the first instance, who act as a
matter of course, dealing all cases for the
defence & who would moreover, have
sufficient report of the interests of
the people in the proceedings, & be
able to go on with the proceedings
Can, as the recent case, leaving
the Court official, with the power at the
last moment to hear the defence as

to assist with this inquiry. Either the Clerk of the
Court or the Government Pleader are
perfectly competent to do the Government's
work in this respect, and both as could be
wished, & no doubt, either would be glad
to do it at a fair time, and then
that which Government may prefer. As to
Garrett I am very far from holding
the opinion of some which I know that
Mr. Whitford has been more than once ex-
posed. Mr. Garrett & Popham has always
been regarded as against him, has been

with reference from his conduct & generally
this man. But I have no doubt that,
if the Govt were pleased to modify the
existing arrangement by allowing him to
find a substitute at the Sepoy's trial before,
& to act for Govt at that committee, might be
when it was necessary to employ counsel,
hearing that at the Sepoy's trial, then would
be reason to complain of the result.
Handley, again, is, in every way, an
unexceptionable official, & the cases
could be entrusted to him with
perfect safety - as it is, he is
with certain well known & recognized

passed a resolution in which it was decided
that the Advocate General should be
responsible for the whole of the defence
cases, so that he could be
much prepared to
accept any offer the Govt. made to
take over the subject in 1873.

I must express my hope that,
in any new arrangement, the Govt. will
be pleased to consider that portion of
the order, which appears to place the
responsibility for the whole of the defence
cases upon the Advocate General, by

9
making him responsible leader in every case.
Formerly the Advocate General had nothing to
do with any prosecution except where
the interests were concerned, i.e.
offences against the Revenue, Comptrol &
the Murder cases. I confess that I felt
somewhat aggrieved at a change being
made without any reference or warning
to me, by which so serious an addition
was made to my official duties. I was
appointed by Her Majesty to the post
with certain well known & recognized

duties attaching to it: & I felt that
the course of suddenly transferring his
work in large measure to another, without
any reference to the latter, was hardly fair
& certainly most unusual. I need hardly
say that I have no wish in the matter
to carry out the wishes of the Govt.
to the best of my ability: but as you have
called upon me for an opinion, I wish
to ask that in any rearrange-
ments of the matter, a return may be
made to the old state of things so far
as I am concerned. I am much
Yours truly
H. C. Connelley

My dear Hadfield.

I hope that you will
think that I have exercised a wise discretion
in abandoning the prosecution of anti-
Jasamer & Rengasone (the Accountant
General's case). The case in the endence
as shown in the depositions, appeared
to me next door to hopeless; as
regards the Water marked Paper

indeed there was obviously no
human can make out - then there were
the awkward facts that ~~had~~ had
spainted one witness, dismissed another
for refusing to say what he was witness
to say & reinstated him when he gave in,
and had in fact instituted what looked
uncommonly like a series of terror -
Every witness, when I called, more or
less broke down, & at last the

11
Shut up, who was alleged to be the person who
had made most of the articles, contradicted
all the other witnesses in a most important
particular. The thing was rapidly becoming
a joke, or I thought it the most desperate
thing, when a connection was abruptly
out of the question, to return of its own
accord rather than seem to prop a bad
cause on a jury.
You will not, I am sure, think that I
have neglected the case in any way: I.

have given it my most earnest attention,
but have found that the time I want I
have not in the day could I not hold
of any solid fact.

I think the answer shows that what
I have done has your approval.

Ever yours faithfully

Wm. Lawrence

12
4th Feb 1874

My dear Mr. Rodwick

I am unable to say why Mr. Cummappah Cherry was called for the prosecution - I was very much to my regret unable to appear today for the prosecution with the advocate general although I held a brief for the prosecution for I was engaged all day at the Session defending a prisoner as leading Counsel - I should probably not have taken two briefs for the same day in different Courts if I had known there would be two Session Courts but the Chief Justice resolved recently to hold two Courts for the trial of Session Cases on the same day a course which I have never known to be adopted before this - When therefore I held two briefs in one case for the prosecution & in the other for the defence I considered myself bound to attend to the case in which I am engaged for the defence and more especially so when I am leading Counsel for the defence & junior Counsel for the prosecution - If I had appeared for the prosecution I should not have

had the conduct of it - The conduct
of every case is in the hands of the
leading Counsel & in the prosecution
of Dyasami. I should only have had
the right of suggesting to the Advocate
General the course to be taken -
I think if I were able to be present
have suggested to the Advocate Genl
that Moulden Cunnappah Chavry
should not be called - The Advocate
General would act on my suggestion
or not as he thought fit - I think
he would probably have acted
upon it - Indeed I think I told
the Advocate General some days
ago that Cunnappah ought
not to be called but the Advocate
General probably did not remember
his name in the mass of witnesses

Yrs very faithfully

(Signed) J. O'Sullivan

True copy

Prabod'ish

and seal

DEPARTMENT.

No. 114.

Fort Saint George,
Accountant General's Office,
February 5th 1874.

FROM THE ACCOUNTANT GENERAL
TO THE GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS,

TO THE

Chief Secretary to the Government

SIR,

In accordance with the verbal instructions
received from you yesterday, I have the honor to
forward the accompanying extracts from the
"Times" newspaper referring to the evidence
given for the prosecution in Dyasami's case
& to offer the following observations.

2. You are aware, that owing to Mr. B. S. S.
& Mr. Donald being unable to state positively
that they had not seen Mysore stamps burnt
before them, (though in the Telegram received
from Calcutta it was distinctly stated that
the former gentlemen knew nothing of these
stamps having been burnt) the main charge
against Dyasami was abandoned by the
lawyers, though I earnestly begged that it might
be proved with, Kipin Sing being prepared
to swear, that in his time, no Mysore stamps
were burnt & the persons who superintended
the burning, ^{all along,} deposing, that they had not seen
the stamps referred to destroyed.

3. Dyasami was therefore put up for trial on
a charge of theft, smothering away with
property belonging to Government, & P. S. S.
= Jany was similarly charged.

4. These men, I knew, together with those brought
in the Province Bond Office, who is a man of
considerable influence, had spared neither
money nor pains to win over my witnesses,
promises, threats, bribes having been freely
distributed, & moreover, I & the Police felt
sure that in such a case, conviction was

- had several witnesses on whom we could rely.
5. The accompanying copy of a letter received by me in reply to a deuce official addressed to Mr. G. Allen yesterday, explains why that gentleman did not appear in the case at the High Court.
6. He was thoroughly acquainted with it in all its details & his absence was fatal.
7. Mr. Cunningham, the advocate General, who appeared before His Lordship the Chief Justice, thought proper to call Cunningham, a man who had been gained over by the other side & denied his first statement before the Magistrate.
8. This man of course declared that certain articles pointed out to him had been made by him at his house & not at the Mint, as he originally confessed, of good material, & therefore, the advocate General threw up the case, though there were several important witnesses to be examined, & among them, the woman Achmoo, who had defied to taking things out of the Fort.
9. In my opinion, the case should certainly have been fought out to the last, all the witnesses examined, & the opposition witnesses closely cross-examined.
10. For my part I have spared neither time nor trouble to bring the 3 persons, whom I believe to be all guilty to punishment, & the result of the trial is a disappointment in the extreme.
11. I have now the honor to inquire what I am to do with the men who have been convicted, & their witnesses, who are all, without exception, men on whom no reliance whatever can be placed.
12. I earnestly trust that Government will not reinstate Iyasami, & will sanction the dismissal of Purnasami & Theroorayada.

13. Both these men, though acquitted by the High Court & Magistrate respectively of the criminal charges preferred against them, have been shown to have been guilty of grave irregularities in the discharge of their duties, having kept in a place where it had no right to be kept, watermarked paper, as their own witnesses affirmed, for the purpose of supplying deficiencies in the stock received from the Stamp Office for the purpose of being stamped.
14. This in itself is a fraud, for the paper so kept back instead of being returned to the Stamp Office, even supposing the above account to be true, was made to appear as expended, and its value was therefore lost to Government, but, as I have done my utmost to show to the lawyers, this story could not be true, seeing that the paper was nearly all soiled or torn, & therefore could not be substituted for deficient sheets, as the Stamp Office would not have received it. The only possible use therefore that could be made of this paper, was to stamp it surreptitiously, & palm it off in the bazaar.
15. With respect to the filers & other subordi-
nates of inferior grades, I trust H.E. in Council will permit me to exercise the power I possess as head of a Department of dismissing such men as I consider should no longer be retained.
16. It is in my opinion quite certain, that a number of these men have been working surreptitiously for Iyasami for a long time past, & although Iyasami has been acquitted, in a great measure owing to their combining to screw his acts, & in my opinion, he was inadvisable to retain such men in this office, upon whom, I am almost amounting to certainty, such a high degree of confidence could not be placed.

17. I propose therefore to have a further formal inquiry into the proceedings of these men, & to discharge all those who are shown by the muster roll, or evidence, to have stayed away from office long after the proper hour for coming to it, & been excused by Syasani. When necessary.

18. This letter has been written by means of a "manifold writer" to prevent anything being known of what I have said in the office. I therefore trust that the fact of the writing being different to that of official letters generally will be caused.

19. I have only in conclusion to solicit early orders from my guidance, as it is necessary that the posts in the office, which have been temporarily filled, should be given substantially to selected candidates.

Yours truly
Sir

Your most obedient servant

W. Loderick
and Galt

do this from the last page
to the old book
August 5th 1874
Rec'd to office
Forwarded as ordered
extract from the
"Times" paper dated
27th by name of
enclosed copy of
letter from the
British Consulate
for the prosecution
of the prosecution
and makes the
"action" on the
trial of Syasani
at the High Court

De l'Esprit Acet. Galt
No 114
of 5-2-74

It would be
some what un-
becoming to send
the Advocate Galt
the criticism
of an unpro-
fessional person
in his conduct
of a case. The
Advocate Galt
always reports
at the end of
each session
on the persons
involved.
I would
await this before
saying anything
I do.

Shall Mr Loderick be sent to
the Advocate Galt for his remarks on
Paris 10.
It seems the Adv. Galt. unhappily
called one "Cunneappah Cherry" a witness
who before he deposes contradicted,
on & examined by Mr. Milner, all he had
at first said, criminalizing his accused.

Mr O'Sullivan, who conducted the
case for Mr Loderick in the Police Office,
was retained as junior counsel under
the Adv. Galt, at his request in his case;
but having to defend another prisoner in
another Court, being to himself justified
in holding himself aloof from the Prosec.
he knew "all about it" - & had coached
up the Adv. Galt - particularly - it
seems - advising him to fight shy of his
particular witness "but the Adv. Galt
probably did not remember his name in
"the map of witnesses".

I don't see any use in asking the Adv. Galt?
why he forgot this? - The moral is, I think,
that the Govt. should have one fixed Counsel to
conduct prosecutions from beginning to end,
as was suggested by the Chief Justice, some
time ago. L.S.T. 5/2-74

L.W. Mather W. Loderick

the Adv. of under any
circumst: When a case is
entrusted to counsel we
are bound to accept his
conduct of the case & I
think that had the case
dragged thro' days a waste
of Public time would have oc-
curred. The C.J. approved of

what the Adv. did.
The fact is the case
ought not under ordinary
circumst: to have been
committed - there was
no case to go to a jury
but Mr. Clarke desired
it to be thrown out

and told Mr. L. to
deal with his subordinates
according to his own judgment
of the appeal but with
less noise.

10/2 - M.B.

I agree with Mr. Robinson



Memo:

As held by W. Mayne the
 Officer of Clerk of the Court
 & Court Director cost
 \$100.00. inspection
 of the Valuation.
 On W. Mayne's pointing
 to app't. the Gov. suggested
 to the Ch. Justice on January
 73. that the enumeration
 of the office might be
 reduced to \$200 monthly
 and that probably economy
 could be effected by employing
 clerical occasionally as
 necessary instead of retaining
 the office of Court Clerks.
 The Ch. Justice in reply
 stated that a committee

W. Mayne
 Court Director

Reverend, just
 adv. Govt's Report
 on the case.
 23/10/72.

W. Mayne
 Court Director

the services of the United
States of Clerk of the Court &
Court. Executive action
as practicable. The desirable
the abolition of the last clerk
of the Court. The feasible:

In the proposed action to print
office on the existing printing for
the present. It is about new
dates. &c.

The Govt. has decided (2 May 73)
to carry out the abolition of the
office of Court Executive. The
substitution of the occasional
employment of several clerks
as necessary. In the majority
cases in D.C. it was not desirable
to employ the Adv. Sec. or as
the Adv. Sec. is present in important
cases. It was at the same time
decided that the Clerk of the
Court of the Court & his relatives

must be brought in then
at \$5000 yearly. 18

On the representation of
W. A. C. J. following. The
was on 11 June 73. Since
\$10.6200. viz \$4800
for the C. of the (r. at
\$10.400 monthly. & the
balance for the related
distributed as the C. of
might approve.

As the total cost prior to
W. Morgan's resignation was
\$17208. There was left
a margin for employing
Clerks & necessary or
existing savings of \$11000
yearly.

Lin. Walter Morgan was

also that the question may be
reconsidered in view of the
of the suggestion originally
by: as understood that
the first office should be maintained
in the original footing. but
addl. duties imposed on
it. perhaps has fallen to
Govt. Secy. for the
Govt. Secy.

He suggests that it might be
held for a year. if it seems
to be well or the necessary
time reduction might be again
be expected.

He also says that
for requiring the case is that
on a given occasion the Govt.
has immediate business
& must proceed to a case
of injury committed before
the. I suppose I think

2/

19
that the Govt. would still
stand altogether if after
a term the trial during
part of the Govt. has been
in view. on the first
representation of a single
case of light difficulty
the Govt. would abandon
altogether the economical
experiment & revert to
the old arrang. I had
been fully discussed &
concluded.

The time has not been
sufficient to test the
working of the new plan
sufficiently. The past
year has been exceptional
expensive in law & courts.
But I feel confident the
G.D. & L. will listen to the

suggestion of dividing the
old Executive system in that
now cause shows.

Mr. H. H. Green
is of course, I am sure, recent
creation. I can't understand
why since its abolition the
H. H. could not give precisely
the same instructions for
prosecutions of crimes
committed in the
immediate cognizance as
they did formerly when it had
not been created.

That the course was, I am
not prepared to say. But I
never heard that it was
unplanned of.

I cannot see that any
H. H. ground is shown

for adding the ²⁰ President
to the Ch. J. this admission
was a desirable arrangement.
No advantages seem to be
H. H. are especially attainable
at present. The difficulty of
again adding the postmaster
a new incumbent has been
put on the high scale of pay
will be very great. No
disadvantages in the present
system seem mentioned by W.
Holloway. He has suggested an
increase of pay for the Terr.
H. H. has pointed.

No single reason that
I can see for supporting
a consideration of the
to be taken. Except
that the Member of the
who specially advocated
it is no longer here.
I submit that the

present state of things shd
be maintained -

I have no hesitation in
saying that from the de-
cline of him, W. Tennant
H. never have been selected
by Govt. for the post of Crown
Prosecutor. But if the
Office is re-created in
conjunction with that of
Ch. of the Gr. his appt. &
it is provided for...
in effect. the Ch. p. obtains
an appt. B. does not
belong to that Ministerial
Establishment. & B. alone he
has the right to nominate
under the letters patent

[Signature]

21

Mar 5 1852

21

Dear Lord Abbot

I spoke to you yesterday
of the unsound condition in which Mr.
H. Attorney and myself had been placed
reason of the want of an ^{official} ~~proper~~ official who
he be charged with the duty of prosecuting
and appeared to be properly ^{legally} ~~legally~~ an
advocate in a case before us. The man so
to the other Magistrate in order to a formal
obligation and commitment for trial at
Lewes. His opponent in the suit was
brought to prosecute. but as we were unwilling
to trust entirely to him the duty of prosecuting

a grave offence against public justice. It is
de shuld have been within the power of the
the authorities called in aid the Government
Minister. But we were informed (from proper
by the gentleman that he was to have to obtain
the sanction of the Government before he could
act. The required permission was obtained
at the meeting of the Government in which
apportioned with the other in the conduct of the
Enquiry. I am sure we may always rely upon
the aid of the Government in such cases. But I am
sure it is not fitting that we should be entirely
helpless or placed in the predicament of ^{either} ~~being~~
an important duty to ourselves persons or praying
for your aid. Now this is one of the duties which I
have promised to the Crown Prosecutor to do.

provisional and experimental arrangement with
the Government in my absence. I shall do
summarily. Regarding that matter as one which
for the present I could not usefully move further
in I have better to abstain from ^{even} ~~even~~ reading the
correspondence which will follow after my departure
from India. But I must leave Henry's remarks
to the Committee yesterday, which I must think
that I may attend upon with some degree of
matter which deserves further consideration
and upon which little more can be said
thence new light. I have just ^{now} seen the paper
and in doing so I looked for that had been
and ^{in the final order of the Government} concerning the part of my proposal already
I had suggested as one of the latter.

"the conduct of preliminary investigation in the
Police Courts in cases in which the Government
may be concerned - and also in cases of
prosecution for Offences against Public Justice
and other Offences when directed by the High
Court" - It was simply left unnoticed - possibly
because the cases are rare in which the
Government gives such direction hitherto -

The Government Order (2. May 1873) merely
says that the Government Pleader will attend
to the Government cases - This is all -

And as to my other proposals it is thought
enough to say ^(as to one) that the Govt. Pleader will appear
in Criminal Appeals being entitled to a fee of
30 Rupees for each appearance - and (as to
the other) that under the new Code of Criminal

Procedure and otherwise the service of
Counsel in the conduct of investigation &
against European British Subjects in the
Districts are rarely or never required.

Certainly it is added that the Government
Pleader was employed but three times in
1871 and four times in 1872. This is to support
the conclusion that the "new duties" proposed
are really formed no sufficient justification
for the longer maintenance of the joint office
on its present expensive footing.

I will remind your Excellency of the terms
of my original proposition made in Decr.
1872 - I then proposed ^{for} the Crown Prosecutors
certain additional work. The ^{permanent} maintenance of

The Joint Office on its present footing was never contemplated by me. I did indeed wish to preserve both the place and the pay but with new and (as I thought and still think) very important duties added. Afterward when the Government did me the honor to ask my opinion on their suggestion for a reduction of expenditure in connection with the two Offices (a proposed reduction, if I rightly remember, very different from the one which was afterwards insisted upon at a later time) my answer was (24 Feb. 1873) that I w^d prefer to maintain for the present the existing Offices with the addition of new duties such as those which I had already indicated and others which it

204
The first creation of the Office of Comm. Prosecutors were intended to be assigned to the Office.

What I meant then and what I believe I expressed about that time in conversation with your Lordship is this - I think I can find work enough and more than enough for the Office on his present salary - but if your Government say that a reinforcement ~~now~~ is absolutely necessary there will hereafter arise an opportunity for reduction going far beyond what you propose. Let me experiment for one year - let it be seen what with its new duties, the work of the post will be - and then let the question of reduction be reconsidered.

I had indicated in vicinity, as I supposed, the general nature of the new duties. When one sitting down on one's own, as mine, charged

with very overns and answers etc., makes a
proposition such as this it is due, I venture
to think, to the Office which he holds ~~that~~
to suppose that he has received some consideration
and that objections and answers such as are
stated in the Government Order have not
escaped his consideration. It was not possible to
say precisely what in new duties could be so
to what extent they will occupy the time of
this Officer. and I wish add with all respect
for what is stated in the Order ~~that~~ to his
effect - that the duties are few and trivial ^{propos} that
their extent has yet to be ascertained, though
it is very certain that they will be onerous
and I believe also numerous. I had in mind
as I told you previously, that a new law relating
Criminal Jurisdiction and Procedure was then coming

into force. I can well understand to say that some
of the provisions might not be found for their
due exercise to need at the time we can
proceed. I am still impressed with any decided
opinion though I have considered the matter
well. We have Appellate jurisdiction and we
have the most ample powers of Revision and
in order to the due exercise of the latter and
for other reasons we have a power to
frame general rules. As to the old
rules, having become in force. New ones must
be framed now and ^{in making them} ~~they~~ must be had to
the changes which the new law has worked.
I have prepared some rules which are now
for consideration. Whatever form they may
finally take one result seems almost inevitable

ing that our own Agents and Revisers will
will grow. It is work which must be done - and
as well done as it can be. If we are to
expect only such aid as we have hitherto received,
we shall have some cause for complaint. The
appearance of the Government Pleader on three or
four occasions in the year will hardly suffice for
the purpose. I apprehend and hope that he
frequently appears, may not take far short of that, &
will ensure the Crown Prosecution pays. I cannot
add to the length of this long letter. It cannot
be enough to say that I anticipate work. Not
less in extent and of a most useful kind
under this head. If I am mistaken, let
experience show this. If the other new duties
are in truth little more than nominal.

26
let time prove this also. I do not allude
particularly now to the economy of the new
arrangements. It can readily be ascertained
what has been the cost to Government of
prosecutions at the last two Sessions. They
cannot have fallen far short of a half year's
pay of the post - and by which certainly must
exceed this when the cost is added of the conduct
of the Police Court & at the Sessions of the
perjury prosecution to which I have referred.
Not long since there was occasion for the
attendance at Gough's Court on behalf of
the Crown on a commission for the examination
of witnesses in a prosecution against a Captain
Annan Stewart - and it was found that
this ^{along} cost about 3000 R. This sort of work

order properly be made one of the Court Processors,
his travelling expenses being allowed to him.

What has been done seems to be a mistake
even of the question of cost only is required.

But for other and much weightier reasons,
and in fairness to myself I must I may
ask for a reconsideration of the whole
affair. I have also been fully advised

to the importance of attachments. In
the establishment of the High Court I have
been right of this. My predecessor on the
very eve of his departure recommended
strongly an addition to the establishment
on the original side of the Court at
a cost, unless my memory fails me,

of nearly 1000 ²⁷ Rs. monthly. This fact is
well known in the Office and has much
increased my difficulties. For the answer
is always ready for every complaint.

It is I have been saying for me. And I
should have been much misapprehended
if I had at once supported the (Sitting)
suggestion. In this and in other

matters I have acted and I wish
ask your Excellency to give me
credit for acting from one honest
motivation and not without due
consideration. Again I say respectfully

permit me to say the plan I have
 proposed. & it falls to it to stand
 but do not misinterpret lay it
 aside. Be true men
 your very faithful servant
 W. H. R.

Just Sept.

Read taken from Adm. Genl.

28
d/s. Feb 3 '74.

Order thereon 21 March 1874 N 576

On receipt of the foregoing report

on the prosecution at the late Sessions

of Tyahsawing and another official

of the Sect Genl's office on charges

of fraudulent misappropriation of

Govt property, prepared by the Head of

the office - the Advocate General

was requested semi-officially to furnish

a confidential statement of the sug-

gestions he wd propose for providing

against similar considerations pro-

ceedings.

Mr Cunningham suggests in the

first place that an Order shall be

issued prohibiting Heads of Offices

from prosecuting their subordinates

without the sanction of the Govt, who wd

ordinarily, if there were any doubt,

place the case in the hands of the Govt

Solicitor. His Secy informs that

this is exactly the present Rule in the

subject; but in the present case the

Acct Genl first took out a Warrant

and he accused from the Magistrate, then,

next day, obtained permission to employ

Secy to
Adm Genl

G.O. 30-11-68

no 1817

1-9-69

no 1446

... who immediately
employed Counsel, who
conducted the case during the long
inquiry before the Magistrate & ultimately
acted a brief to prosecute it at the
Sessions, as the Adv. Genl's junior.
As however two Courts of Sessions
were on this occasion held at the
same time, and as this gentleman
was engaged to defend a prisoner
in the second Court, the Adv. Genl
was deprived, as the Govt learn, of
the advantage of his assistance. A
similar occurrence happened, it
appears, from the same cause about
the same time in the Pappu case,
Reg. v. Kari Basappa, ordered to be
tried by the Ch. Justice. There the
Counsel retained by Govt to prosecute
absented himself, when the case was
brought on, in order to act
against Govt in defending the persons
accused by the Adv. Genl.

3. In the next place, it is imperatively
necessary, in the Adv. Genl's opinion, that
the Govt prosecutions should be placed
in the hands of a responsible official,
owing a direct allegiance to Govt. He
strongly recommends a return to the

24
old system, viz. "a responsible Govt
official who shall be bound to at-
tend at the Magistrate's Court & to con-
duct the case in the High Ct, & who
will, as a matter of course, decline
all briefs for the defence: and who
would moreover have sufficient
repaid for Govt interests not to grow
into a transparently hopeless case."

4. His Ex^{ty} in C. has given his careful
consideration to these suggestions. He
thinks that on the recent resignation
of Mr. Mayne, who held the joint
offices of Crown Prosecutor & Clerk
of the Crown on a salary of 1000 Rs.
a month, a Clerk of the Crown was
appointed on the salary of 300 Rs. a
month, subsequently raised to 400 Rs.,
and the office of Crown Prosecutor was
abolished. The advantages supposed
were, first, more attainable by entrusting
the duties of the office to a junior Counsel
selected for the occasion from the whole
of the Bar; and, secondly, a considerable
reduction of expenditure. Experience
has now shown that nothing can com-
pensate the absence of a responsible official,
to be retained in the regular service of

"and miscarriages

"are involved". The true

security therefore is to revert to

the old system, - or rather -

to the Chief Justice's proposal - to have

a Crown Prosecutor & Clerk of the

Crown at 600 W² or 300 for each

Office - such official being expected

to conduct public prosecutions at

the Police Courts & at the Sessions,

except, in the latter case, in

very serious crimes, when he will

act as the Adv. Genl's junior.

Mr. Manningham, to be seen,

has a very good opinion of Mr. Tarrant,

the same has already been expressed

by Mr. Justice Colclough, when acting

for the Chief Justice -

5/3/6.

I am entirely in favor of
this measure and I
ask the Adv. Pl. to convert
his D.O. into an official
paper. 1/8 - W²

a no department.
B-435

From

Advocate General

Dated 5th
Recd 10th } Feb: 1874.

E-2.
No 51 March 74 No 576.

576 6
31-3-1874

26 X 12 1/2

no of cases. not
discontinued. to be
- done in the

To report to an Ad system, 6 months
after we have deliberated and after very
full discussion & discussion, submitted a
report on it. It is a measure which shall
have rather in expectation, that ground
of it. For the
Office of the Advocate General
Lecture in which the Advocate General
the ultimate solution of the office of the
Advocate General which he said should be
satisfactory to the Advocate
generally. The post decided as follows:-

That the duties of the Advocate
General should be performed by the Advocate
of 2 days. General with the account of the
of a private Council. In the case of the
care - to the post. Monday - and the
for the Advocate.

Adv. Genl's Opinion
as to Prosecutions by
public servants —

I have, with a few others, been
 present at the same time, and have
 been told that the same thing
 has been done before, and that the order
 for the removal of the decision was fully given, &
 they appear to be very expert in executing the change
 has the approval, as an prospective arrangement,
 of the Chief Justice, ^{himself} and it is difficult to see
 to what objection, in the case of the interests of the
 port, they can be liable. The arrangement,
 however, does not appear to have been acted
 upon in this the present case: for the only one
 of the three officials named ^{in the S.O. appointed} who, originally, acted
 for the port in the case was the port collector.
 But that is not the fault of the arrangement,
 but if time should not ^{be} allowed to it.

I do not therefore see my way, without
further discussion, to agree to the proposed
retraction.
I enclose an unofficial & confidential letter
(with a memo. by Mr. Sedgwick)
which I received from the Chief Justice, in Dec^r last
and which I feel it wrong to me.

I feel that the best
 way to get a step to the best
 of his judgment and I believe
 he would say so - but I do not
 understand why he collected
 his traces as before the undigested
 virtually nullified his statement
 - hence! or why - maintaining the
 opinion he did of the case. he did
 not justify his conduct.

The case was for Felt - entering the
 Field office at once - and the
 Acc^t had should have dealt
 separately with the Mi-
 nister - instead of prosecuting
 him criminally -

This case however & the
 other two, which also have been
 brought before the court, are
 being tried by the same judge
 who is in the habit of trying
 the cases of the same kind, and
 is therefore well qualified to
 decide upon them. The court
 is composed of three judges, and
 the cases are tried by a majority
 of two. The court is held in
 the city of New York, and the
 cases are tried in the court
 of the city of New York.
 The court is composed of three
 judges, and the cases are tried
 by a majority of two. The court
 is held in the city of New York,
 and the cases are tried in the
 court of the city of New York.
 The court is composed of three
 judges, and the cases are tried
 by a majority of two. The court
 is held in the city of New York,
 and the cases are tried in the
 court of the city of New York.

There is not the smallest doubt
 that the Advocate of the
 cause exercised a
 wise discretion and saved
 from a despicable exposure
 the well established principle
 on which he acted properly
 & the case and his exposure of the
 weakness of his case is complete.
 In fact the committee was a mis-
 take, as Mr Clarke told me, oc-
 curred before the Magazine of
 the unpleasant duty which the Ad-
 vocate had to perform.

He received approval of his
 action (and express regret in re-
 gard to the precipitancy mani-
 fested by the Ad-
 vocate).

I cordially join with
 you in deeming it advisable
 at once to reconsider the econo-
 mical step recently taken at the
 expense of a sacrifice of principle.
 A responsible Crown prosecutor
 we must have. This, I gathered
 from conversation with the Ch. Justice, &
 the view he also holds.

1872
 J. D. L.

I do not know whether we can expect
 active approval of the Ad-
 vocate's action. It is
 true that a 'post prosecution' as
 they appear to have been, has no binding

C. 10

[illegible]

proceedings. It always
seemed to me very possible
that the system ~~was~~ ^{was} ~~not~~ ^{not}
for it - if any ~~one~~ ^{one} ~~was~~ ^{was} ~~not~~ ^{not}
in it. ~~It~~ ^{It} ~~was~~ ^{was} ~~not~~ ^{not}
factors on economical. The
system ~~was~~ ^{was} ~~not~~ ^{not}
being ~~used~~ ^{used} ~~one~~ ^{one} ~~of~~ ^{of} ~~admit~~ ^{admit} ~~and~~ ^{and}
centrally ~~has~~ ^{has} ~~not~~ ^{not} ~~been~~ ^{been} ~~either~~ ^{either}
the one or the other. And ~~there~~ ^{there} ~~is~~ ^{is}
have the Chief Justice and the
Advocate ~~General~~ ^{General} ~~formally~~ ^{formally} ~~deciding~~ ^{deciding}
over to the former ~~by~~ ^{by} ~~the~~ ^{the}

30
The Judge. I am ~~not~~ ^{not} ~~at~~ ^{at} ~~all~~ ^{all} ~~sure~~ ^{sure}
distinctly concerning in the
view of the case. This is
think over a ~~long~~ ^{long} ~~time~~ ^{time} ~~ago~~ ^{ago}
I do not by any means in the
relative economy of the two
systems, as I believe that there is
a ~~great~~ ^{great} ~~deal~~ ^{deal} ~~to~~ ^{to} ~~be~~ ^{be} ~~done~~ ^{done}
I do not think it is
salary than Rs. 500 ~~per~~ ^{per} ~~month~~ ^{month} ~~shall~~ ^{shall}
be ~~all~~ ^{all} ~~in~~ ⁱⁿ ~~the~~ ^{the} ~~app~~ ^{app} ~~to~~ ^{to}
should I think be a ~~definite~~ ^{definite}
I do not see. There has been

a great deal of feeling aroused here
against the Sarrant: in consequence
of his being a stranger to "the law"
but it is assured by those who
know that he is a good & reliable
officer. If this looks like ^{it} to ^{be} ^{fit} to ^{be} ^{made}
I shall have to stay by ^{the} ^{side} ^{of} ^{him}.
I should have the less ^{to} ^{be} ^{the} ^{officer}
^{who} ^{is} ⁱⁿ ^{the} ^{best} ^{one} ^{to} ^{be} ^{that}
if at any time the Chief Justice shall
select as Clerk of the Crown a person
whose the ^{fit} ^{and} ^{best} ^{to} ^{be} ^{appointed}
as Crown Prosecutor - or ^{v.v.} the
the ^{for} ^{all} ^{the} ^{complications} ^{of} ^{the} ^{case}
depend on the ^{choice} ^{of} ^{the} ^{officer} ^{who}
be ⁱⁿ ^{charge} ^{of} ^{the} ^{case} ^{is} ^{of} ^{great} ^{importance}
I.D.S. 27. 3

I venture to think
that the revival of the
Office of Crown Prosecutor
is necessary and I
agree with all that
Mr. Cunningham urges.
But it further
appears to me that
the change inaugurated
last year was made
without reference to the
Advocate General and
I think that it imposed
duties connected with
Criminal Courts (including
occasional appearances
in Magistrates' Courts)
and prosecutions, which
I

I think, none of his predecessors would have accepted without acknowledgment - duties such as are always disagreeable to lawyers in high position; for I believe few lawyers of eminence will appear - save in very exceptional cases - in the Central Criminal Courts or Magistrates' Courts in London.

I cannot think that this was quite fair to the Advocate General and therefore we can only search for him responsible for failure of cases before lower or even higher Courts if mismanaged. are they
read.

reach the latter tribunal. Of course the answer³⁷ is that a junior barrister might be sent to the lower Courts by the Solicitor General in communication with the Advocate General and re-employed in the High Court as a junior to the Advocate General. But still the latter's responsibility would remain uncertain and the position is at best anomalous while we still run the risk of falling into uncertain and inexperienced hands. The practical fact however, is that the Solicitor does not entrust his briefs to junior men and we

we cannot consider
the time of these he
naturally employs - in
regard to those employ-
-ment the Government
having no voice - Charges
are thus increased
and risks run.

The question is how
best to arrange for the
future? I submit
that the Office of Crown
Prosecutor should be
made worth holding
without reference to
the Clerkship of the Crown
and I would venture
to name Rs. 400 ^{or 450} per
month - as a fair
Salary. For this we
could retain a good
steady barrister not
in the highest practice
- which is all we need
with the Advocate General
to fall back on - the Crown Prosecutor
could

could watch Government
Cases throughout in
communication with
the Solicitor General
and Advocate General.
Under these circum-
stances the Office
of the Clerk of the Crown
should be placed on its
old footing as respects
Salary viz Rs. 300 per
month from which
it was raised, it appears
to meet Mr. Larrard's
cases.

The patronage should
as respects both Offices
remain as it was. The
Appointment of Crown
Prosecutor should be
in the gift of His Excellency
the Governor and the
Clerk of the Crown as a
ministerial office of
the Court in that of the
Chief Justice.
Possibly His Excellency
would

would be willing to let
his nomination under
the circumstances now
before us fall on Mr. Tarrant
New Clerk of the Crown.

Mr. Justice Holloway
writes very highly of
his merits and in the
general belief is that
he is well fitted.

I have personally
conversed with
Mr. Holloway and
Mr. Jones on the subject
of the union of the two
offices in the hands of
one man and how
far the duties are
compatible with each
other. The opinion of
both seemed to me to be
very favourable to the
proposition of managing
both duties. Mr. Holloway
emphatically considers
that it is good that

the duties of the
indictment (the
Clerk of the Crown) should
have the handling of the
case throughout and
be required to support
his own indictment
by the evidence with
which he has become
familiar in the preliminary
stages.

I make this suggestion
with diffidence and
apology for passing
I fear, beyond my
province.

27/3 M.O.

14-3-98
11-7-92
16-1-96

16/6/01 ✓
9-5-08 ✓
12-3-09 ✓
4-2-16 ✓
24-2-16 ✓
13-12-17 ✓

25-1-27 ✓
6/6/28 ✓
2-5-32 ✓

7-10-40 ✓
5-4-43 ✓
31-12-43 ✓
1-3-45 ✓
18 x 45 ✓
13-3-46 ✓
15-1-47 ✓
27-2-48 ✓

30-4-55-14 ✓

31-12-74

judicial
no 576
31-3-74