

BEFORE THE RECORDER.

(Wednesday, September 7, 1910)

Reference Number: t19100906-21

GODDARD, Augustus (28, butcher), and WATSON, Edgar Frederick (41, clerk) , demanding and obtaining from Thomas Guntrip and others an order for the payment of £7 14s. 1d. by virtue of two forged letters each purporting to be a letter in course of transmission by post, well knowing the same to have been forged, and with intent to defraud.

Watson pleaded guilty.

Mr. Muir and Mr. Forster Boulton prosecuted; Mr. Lynch defended Goddard.

HERBERT THOMAS BAYLIS , manager to T. Guntrip and Sons, commission agents, Catford. About March last prisoner opened an account with us. It is my duty to open the letters. On June 22 I received this betting slip from him signed "Guss" (Exhibit 9), backing Mercutio for the three o'clock at the Newcastle Meeting and Royal Realm for the 3. 10 at Newbury and 2s. 6d. each way. We always pay by the results as announced in the "Sportsman." The two horses won their races and prisoner stood to win as the result of that week's betting £7 4s. 9d. Our week ends on the Friday and we pay on that day. On June 25 we received another letter from him (Exhibit 1), enclosing a betting slip signed "Guss" backing Crooked Answer Filly in the 2. 30 race and The Major in the four o'clock at Sandown Park for 5s. each way. Crooked Answer Filly won and The Major came in second. In the result we lost to prisoner about £1. We sent him this cheque for £7 14s. 1d. dated June 24 for balance due to him up to the week ending Saturday, June 25. The date June 24 is probably an error, because the cheque included prisoner's winnings on the 25th, as is shown by this copy account that was sent to him. On July 23 I received this betting slip (exhibit 10) signed "Guss" from him backing Swynford and Vigilance, which both won. The amount shown on the ticket as due to him is £3 15s. 11d. On July 22 I received another betting slip (Exhibit 11) signed in the same way backing Bouton Rouge and Chateau Vert at Hurst Park which both won, with the result that we owed him £2 19s. 10d. All his winnings were paid him by cheque in the usual way.

Cross-examined. He was introduced to us as A. H. Goddard; Guss was his nom de plume. Sometimes at the end of the week he lost and then he would pay us through George Davey, one of our agents, who had introduced him to us and who drew a commission from us in the event of our winning. I was under the impression that Mouton Rouge had won, but for all I know it may have lost and Davey sent us prisoner's money in postal orders.

Re-examined. This cheque for £7 14s. 1d. is in John Guntrip's handwriting. An account of which a copy is kept would always be sent with the cheque. We did not pay on Exhibits 10 and 11 in consequence of information we received from the General Post Office. (Mr. Lynch here admitted having received an account dated June 25, which showed that the cheque for £7 14s. 1d. included prisoner's winnings on that date, and that Exhibit 12 was a correct copy of that account.)

FREDERICK WILLIAM DENHERT , postman, Forest Hill Post Office, At 1. 30 p. m. on Saturday, June 11, I was in uniform in the Swiss Cottage Hotel when Watson, saying he had seen me about on my bicycle, said that he knew of a way of defrauding bookmakers by means of forged date stamp impressions and that he had been doing it with the help of a postman for four years. He said that he

would give the postman an envelope which he stamped at a time earlier than the race and then returned; that he Watson) then ascertained the name of the winning horse, enclosed it in the envelope, and returned it to the postman, who put it in the course of post. He asked me if I could do one for him, and I said I thought I could. In accordance with the rules issued by the Post Office I reported the matter to my overseer. I afterwards received instructions from Mr. Stratford as to what I was to do. I saw Watson again on June 14. He said he had been that morning on his way to Catford to see a postman about getting a letter stamped and he asked me if I could get one stamped for his on either Thursday, Friday, or the Saturday following. I told him my hours of duty would not permit of my doing so. He offered me 2s. 6d. for each envelope I stamped and a share of the proceeds. It was I who put this postmark June 22, 1. 15 p. m., on this envelope (Exhibit 9). At 8. 55 a. m. on that day I was in St. Jermyn's Hotel when he came in, branded it to me and asked me to get the 1. 15 stamp on it. It was unsealed and contained a blank piece of paper. We arranged to meet at the Swiss Cottage Hotel about 1 p. m. I handed the envelope to Mr. Stratford, who marked it with invisible ink. I then put on the stamp. I gave Watson the envelope at 1 p. m. and he gave me 2s. 6d., which I gave to Mr. Stratford. Subsequently Watson told me he had given the envelope to another postman. I got no winnings in respect of it. About 8. 45 a. m. on June 25 I met Watson again at St. Jermyn's Hotel. A few minutes later prisoner came in and talked to us, but not about this matter. After he had gone out Watson handed me another envelope (Exhibit 1), which I dealt with in the same way; it was marked by Mr. Stratford, I stamped it and returned it to Watson later that day on the arrival at the Swiss Cottage Hotel. He gave me 2s., which I gave to Mr. Stratford. I cannot remember whether I got any winnings out of that. I got Exhibit 11 from him on July 22 and I stamped it. I did not give it to Mr. Stratford but I manipulated the stamp so that I could identify it again. I returned it to Watson. I used to see prisoner almost every morning at the St. Jermyn's Hotel but I had no conversation with him with reference to these matters. I got Exhibit 10 from Watson on July 23 and I dealt with it in exactly the same way as I had with Exhibit 11. I cannot remember whether I got any money when I returned this to him but I generally did get something.

Cross-examined. Prisoner was a butcher's assistant. He was never really introduced to me; I used to call him "Butcher," like other people.

FREDERICK CHALES CARTWRIGHT , messenger, G. P. O. On various dates between June 21 and July 12 I had kept observation on Watson. I had seen him frequently with prisoner. About 8. 30 a. m. on June 25 prisoner drove up in a cart to the St. Jermyn's Hotel, and Watson whistled to him. He then went into the hotel with Watson, and they stayed there 10 minutes. About 1 p. m. Watson met Denhart at the "Swiss Cottage Tavern." I followed Watson to Brockley, and from there to Deptford Broadway, where a news vendor lent him an evening paper. About 3. 26 p. m. he went to a telephone box in the High Street, where he remained, a little time. From there he went to Honor Oak Park, where he entered at 3. 55 p. m. a telephone cabinet in a tobacconist's shop. From there he went to the stables of a Mr. Lyne, prisoner's employer. He remained there for two minutes speaking to someone. I followed him from there to Catford, where he remained in the vicinity of a pillar-box in Catford Road. At 4. 15 p. m. a postman cleared the box; Watson was waiting for him about 20 yards away. On June 22 I saw him go to St. Jermyn's Hotel, where he met Denhart. At 11 a. m. he went to Honor Oak Park Station, where he spoke for about 10 minutes to prisoner, who was in his butcher's cart.

CHARLES ALFRED NEWLEY , overseer, Catford Postmen's Office. On June 25 I received instructions about examining letters collected at the pillar-boxes at 4. 15

p. m., which would not, in the ordinary way, have any postmark on them. I found this one (Exhibit 1) with a postmark on it, not that of the Catford, but of the Forest Hill Post Office, stamped 1. 15 p. m. I gave it to Mr. Stratford.

EDWARD JOSEPH STRATFORD , clerk, Secretary's Office, G. P. O. In June I put myself in communication with Denhart, who from that day acted under my instructions. On June 22 he handed me this envelope (Exhibit 9), and I put "E. S. 1" in invisible ink upon it. I subsequently developed it before the magistrate. I gave it back to Denhart, who later gave me 2s. 6d. He handed Exhibit 1 to me about 12.15 p.m. on June 25, which I marked "E. S. 2. "It was open and contained a blank piece of paper. At 5 p. m. Newy handed it to me, and it was put in the course of post. Denhart reported to me with reference to Exhibits 10 and 11, and I gave him instructions as to them. On August 11, having communicated with Guntrip's, I had all the letters in my possession. On August 10 I saw prisoner at the G. P. O. and told him I was an officer in the Investigation Branch, and was making inquiries respecting these fraudulent betting letters, and cautioned him in the usual way. He made this statement, which I took down in writing (Exhibit 5): "I look at the letter dated June 22. I posted the letter myself soon after 12 noon on June 22, I believe, in the pillar-box at the corner of Rosedale Road, Forest Hill, but I cannot be certain as to the letter-box I posted it in. The betting slip was written by me and placed in the letter before I posted it. I look at the letter postmarked June 25. The betting slip is in my hand-writing, and I posted the letter in Forest Hill, I believe in the pillar box at the corner of Herschell Road about 12. 25 p. m. I look at the letter postmarked July 22. I posted it about 12. 35 p. m. in the box outside Honor Oak Park Station. The writing on the slip, with the exception of the figures is mine. I look at the letter postmarked July 23. I posted it soon after 12 noon in the pillar-box at Bovill Road. All the writing on the slip, with the exception of the figures, is mine. The cheques shown to me dated March 25 and June 24 were received by me from Messrs. Guntrip in payment of winnings made by me. I cannot be certain whether or not the cheque dated April 1 was received by me. "In my opinion the slips contained in the letters of June 22, July 22, and July 23 are all in his handwriting; they are all signed "Guss. "The slip in letter of June 25, which is signed "Gus," may or may not be in his handwriting; he said at the police court it was not. I had received on August 8 a letter from him (Exhibit 13) from his address: "Sir, I understand from Messrs. Guntrip and Son, of The Park, Bromley Road, Catford, with whom I do business, they are making inquiries of you with respect to three letters I sent them on July 19, 22, and 23 last respectively. I wish to inform you that each letter bore Messrs. Guntrip and Son's printed address. Two of the letters I posted at the grocer's shop, at the corner of Rosedale Road, Forest Hill, at about 12. 30, and the other one in a pillar-box at the corner of Devonshire Road, Honor Oak Park, about the same time. Messrs. Guntrip duly received my letter and I am at a loss to understand what the inquiries are about. I should, therefore, feel obliged if you would reply to them at your earliest convenience, so that I can learn from them the result in due course. I am, sir, yours obediently, A. Goddard. "

Cross-examined. I was not aware of this letter at the time I interviewed him on August 10, when I told him I was making inquiries about fraudulent betting letters and cautioned him; it did not have much apparent effect on him. He did not ask me what I meant. I never referred to the fraudulent postmarks. He had no objection to signing the statement. I did not mention Watson's name.

Police-constable ALBERT BLAKE , 527 A. On August 9 I arrested Watson. I found upon him this small book (Exhibit 6). (Mr. Lynch objected to its admission, and it was withdrawn.) On August 11 I arrested prisoner in the stables at the back of his employer's premises. I told him what I was and said that he would be charged with obtaining a sum of money from Thomas Guntrip by means of a falsely post-

marked letter. He said, "No, sir—wrong, sir. "When formally charged he said, "False, sir. I contradict the charge. "

LEWIS LYNE , butcher, 45, Honor Oak Park. About June 27 prisoner, who was my servant, asked me to cash this cheque for £71 4s. 1d. for his father, and I did so. I have three assistants. He is a roundsman and does stable work. The other two do the rounds and shop work, but not any stable work.

Cross-examined. His hours on a Saturday would be from 7 to 1.30 p.m., and he would then start again at 3 or 4 p. m. He has always borne the best of characters; he has been with me just under twelve months. He came to me with a good reference. His people are highly respectable and have lived in the neighbourhood all their lives.

HENRY GEORGE COOK , distributor of "Evening News. "About 3. 20 p.m. June 25 I was distributing copies of the "Evening News" in High Street, Deptford. The "stop press" column states that Crooked Answer filly won the 2. 30 race at Sandown. It was rather a slow result that day. I should be distributing this edition, called the "Home Edition," that day from 5 p. m. It had not up to that time got the result of the four o'clock race at Sandown, which is extraordinarily slow. I should be distributing the 6. 30 edition at about that time. It contains the result of the four o'clock race. The Major was second.

GEORGE PARKER , Inspector S. E. District "Evening News," was called to corroborate the last witness, but there having been no cross-examination he was not examined.

Mr. Lynch submitted that there was no evidence to show that prisoner acted in concert with Watson in what he did. The Recorder held that there was sufficient evidence to go to the Jury.

(Defence.)

AUGUSTUS HENRY GODDARD (prisoner, on oath). I drive Mr. Lyne's, a butcher, cart. About February last I started an account with Guntrip's. My winnings would be paid me direct on Monday mornings, the accounts being made up to the previous Saturday, and my losings I would pay through a Mr. Davey, their agent. Watson told me he could get very good information and I allowed him to make bets with Guntrip's in my name. I limited him to a sovereign each bet. He was to tell me what bets he had made for me. I had no knowledge that he was doing anything wrong. I would give him about a fifth share if I won. He paid nothing when I lost. This betting slip of June 25 (Exhibit 2) is not in my writing; it must be Watson's. Exhibits 9 and 10 and 11 are in the same handwriting. They are bets made by Watson for me on my authority. I learnt in August that it was suggested that the bets were not properly made and I told Watson what I had heard, and wrote on the 8th to the G. P. O. I was invited to attend there and I went and saw Mr. Stratford, who told me that I need not answer any of the questions he put to me, but that he was making inquiries as to fraudulent betting letters. That dazed me a bit. I made a statement to him which he wrote down and I signed. It is not true. I did not know what I was saying at the time. I did not understand what he was talking about.

Cross-examined. My wages are 23s. and a joint a week. My limit to Watson was £1 a week. I betted at times myself with Guntrips, who gave me £2 a week credit. At times I made the bets myself and then I would write the slips; sometimes I lost, sometimes I won. Exhibits 16, 17, 18, 19, and 20 shown to me are betting slips all written by me, on all of which I lost. They are written on bits

of envelopes off letters that came to me. I see Exhibit 9 is written on a piece of envelope also The handwriting on it is a bit like mine; it is rather larger writing than mine. I believe Watson can give a good imitation of my writing. The writing on Exhibits 1, 10, and 11 is a bit like mine. I cannot swear that Exhibit 16 to 20 are in my writing; it is like it. Exhibits 9 and 19 have both got the name "Mercutio" on them. I first met Watson on Derby Day this year; he stopped me on my rounds and suggested he should make bets for me and save my time. I had seen him about before but not to speak to. He asked me if he could send on to Guntrips any tip he got and I said I did not mind. I let him have Guntrips' printed envelopes to do so. Sometimes he would find his own slip of paper to write on, sometimes I would supply him with scraps of envelopes. I gave him a specimen of my handwriting to copy, so that he should write in such a way that they should think it was I who was writing. I do not know what that was for. I wrote the letter of August 8 to the G. P. O. on Watson's instructions. I had not heard from Guntrips, but he had. He asked me to go to Guntrips to inquire why I had not received the winnings from my bets and my father went on August 3, as I had not the time, and they referred him to the G. P. O. I told Watson about this. The facts contained in the letter of August 8 are not true. Watson had given me to understand that the letters were just as if I had posted them. Watson did not tell me to mention his name either in the letter of August 8 or at the interview of August 10 and I only did what he told me.

Re-examined. I am living at home with my parents. There was nothing in the accounts I got to arouse my suspicion as to what Watson was doing. The account of June 11 shows three winners and three losers resulting in a win of 5s. 4d. for me. The account of July 2 shows a loss of £1 18s. 2d.

(Thursday, September 8 1910.)

LEWIS LYNE (recalled, further cross-examined). I have entrusted prisoner with large sums of money to pay into the bank and I have always found him honest.

Verdict (Goddard), Not guilty. (For sentence on Watson see below)

BEFORE THE RECORDER.

(Thursday, September 15 1910.)

Reference Number: t19100906-93

WILLIAMS, John Thomas, and WATSON, Edgar Frederick (41, clerk) feloniously demanding two orders for the payment of money, that is to say two postal orders for the payment of 16s. 2d. and 15s. respectively, by means of a forged instrument, to wit, a forged post marked letter, well knowing the same to be forged, and with intent to defraud.

Mr. Muir and Mr. Forster Boulton prosecuted. Mr. Cecil Whiteley defended.

Mr. Whiteley asked that there should be a fresh jury, on the ground that the jury had already made up their minds and convicted in two similar cases [Connelly and Attree]. The Recorder refused the application, remarking that the fact that the jury were acquainted with the character of the evidence, which a new jury would not be, was an advantage; and that Counsel was casting an improper aspersion upon them.

Mr. Muir, in the course of his opening, said that a clerk from the Secretary's office of the General Post Office called upon prisoner in order to give him an opportunity

of furnishing an explanation. He submitted that it would have been an exceedingly dangerous thing if the Post Office had not given him an opportunity of explaining. The public would have a right to complain if people were arrested in such circumstances without having had an opportunity given them of making explanations. Prisoner was cautioned that he need not say anything at all unless he liked, but that anything he said might be given in evidence against him.

The Recorder asked whether Mr. Muir suggested that there was any difference between a private policeman of the Post Office and a Metropolitan policeman.

Mr. Muir. I say that, even in the case of a Metropolitan policeman, before he arrested any person on facts such as these it would be his duty to the public to give that person an opportunity to explain.

The Recorder. And ask questions?

Mr. Muir. Yes.

The Recorder. All I can say is that you are propounding a doctrine which is opposed to that laid down by some of the most distinguished Judges who have occupied the Bench.

Mr. Muir. I have studied a series of cases in the Court of Criminal Appeal, in which the principle laid down is that a policeman or Post Office official is entitled to ask questions of persons if they are not in custody, provided that he holds out no hope of exemption and no threat of consequences. And not only is he entitled to ask the questions, but the answers to them are admissible in evidence. That principle has been upheld again and again in the Court of Criminal Appeal.

The Recorder. The question is not whether the answers are admissible in evidence—they are—but whether it is a desirable practice.

Mr. Muir suggested the case of a tradesman in the possession of stolen goods; was not a policeman going into his shop entitled to ask him where he got the goods?

The Recorder said a case of stolen goods was entirely different from this.

Mr. Muir. I submit that the cases are exactly the same. I submit that the Post Office clerk did his duty to the public and to his employers in the most proper way.

The Recorder. I said distinctly yesterday in Attree's case that no blame was attachable to the clerk. All I was endeavoring to suggest, is that the practice was undesirable. Having regard to the fact that public departments have now increased powers, their police ought not to exercise the power, which all the Judges in my experience have condemned and said they ought not to exercise, of putting questions to persons who are about to be charged.

Mr. Muir. The Post Office is a great public department, and its legal branch is under the control of persons of the highest standing and attainments. They have studied the series of decisions in the Court of Criminal Appeal, and they have sanctioned this course of conduct. In their judgment it is a proper course, and it will be continued.

FREDERICK WILLIAM DENHERT, postman, Forest Hill Post Office, repeated the evidence that he had given in Goddard's case (see page 463, 531) as to his

interview with Watson on June 11, and what had happened thereon. About 8.45 a.m. on August 4 I saw Watson at the "Napier" public house, Forest Hill. He said, "I have got to get some money somewhere, I know a chap that has lost a lot of money lately with a bookie at Le wish am. Do you think you could get one stamped for me?" I said I could. I met him at 10 a.m. at the "Swiss Cottage Hotel." He told me to go over to the "Telegraph" public house. He gave me a plain envelope (Exhibit 1b), which was open, and contained a piece of blank paper. At his request I date stamped it 1. 15 p. m., manipulating it so that I could recognise it again. About 12. 30 p. m. I gave it back to him, and at 2.55 pm. I met him in Devonshire Road, where he handed it to me sealed and addressed to "Mr. Johns tone, 39, Rime Road, Lewisham," saying "I have just come up from Catford with this, I shall see you about 4, and you can let me know if it goes all right. "I marked it with blue pencil and put it in the course of post. On meeting him at 4.10 p.m. I told him it had gone through all right. I met him by appointment the next morning at 8. 10 at the "Napier," when he said, "We can go to Perry Hill and get the money. I expect I shall be able to get 11s., and you can have a dollar. I had to go right over there this afternoon. I asked him to let me have the postal order in his handwriting, and I would copy his writing on the ticket the same as I did Connelly's, but he would not do so. I had to 'phone for this and go to him to get the ticket made out, as he is ill in bed. His name is 'Williams.' "I met him again at 8. 30 a. m. the next day, August 5, when he said he was going to Perry Hill to get the money from Williams for yesterday, and I was to go down to the "Two Brewers" and wait for him there. I went to Perry Hill. Watson went into No. 60, where Williams lives. He came about 9.10, and I went to the "Two Brewers," Watson following me. He told me to go towards Blythe Vale, and he would see me there, and I went. He came and gave me a postal order for 4s., saying he had got 8s. from Williams and the 4s. was for me, and asked me if I could do another one for him that day.

Cross-examined. In my transactions with Watson between June 11 and August 4 Williams's name was never mentioned. The first time I saw him was at the police-court. It struck me on August 4 that Watson was in rather a destitute state. It was about 20 minutes' sharp walk from 60, Perry Hill, to Devonshire Road, where Watson handed me the envelope.

CHARLES WOOD , assistant head postman, Lewisham. Exhibit 1b bears the Forest Hill 1. 15 p. m. postmark, August 4. It would have reached us in the ordinary course at 2. 58, but it, in fact, reached us at 5.40 p.m. I delivered it to Jones at Rime Road.

DENHERT was recalled to identify Exhibit 1b, the postal order handed him by Watson on August 5, issued at Blackpool on July 30, and bearing his endorsement.

EVAN JONES. I carry on business as a bookmaker at 39, Rime Road, Lewisham, in the name of Mr. Johnstone Williams, had been betting with me from about 18 months before August last. This Exhibit 1b was specially delivered to me at about six p. m. on August It contained a postal order for 15s. (Exhibit 3b), and a betting slip (Exhibit 2b), backing Waterleaf in the 2 p.m. race that day at Brighton, for 7s. 6d. each way, and Orpiment in the 3 p.m. at Manchester, with instructions to back another horse if they won with the winnings. He signed "Williams "at the back in his usual way. Waterleaf won at 9 to 4, and Orpiment came in second. I sent him his winnings in 4s. postal orders, of which this is one (Exhibit 11b). This account, which I also sent, shows £1 11s. 2d. as due to him, of which 15s. is his stake. On receiving the further betting slip (Exhibit 10b) I wrote to him on August 5: "I am holding over payment of your bet of to-day. Your letter bore the 1. 15 postmark, Forest Hill, and did not arrive until 7. 30 p. m. the same as your letter

the day before." I got another betting slip from him on August 6 (Exhibit 8b) on which I wrote, returning it, saying, "No bet with me." I see written on the betting slip, "This bet was made out by 9 a.m. Saturday," and at the bottom, "This bet was posted at Forest Hill by 10 o'clock collection. See you Monday. "I could not say whether the first sentence was on it when I sent it back, but the second sentence was.

Cross-examined. My transactions with him were always satisfactory. I know that Waterleaf and Orpiment were given as tips in the "Daily Mail" of that day. The horses on abetting slip of August 5 are not in his handwriting. I cannot say about the slip of August 6.

HARRY ALBERT TURNER , clerk, Exchange Telephone Company. At 2.6 p.m. on August 4 Waterleaf was received as the winner of the 2 p.m. race at Brighton and the news was distributed by our tape machine.

FRANCIS MURCH HILL , clerk, Secretary's Office G. P. O. On August 11 I saw Williams at his house, 60, Perry Hill, Catford. I told him my name and position and that I was making inquiries regarding certain betting letters and that I was going to ask him certain questions, which he need not answer unless he liked, but that anything he said would be taken down in writing and might be used in evidence against him. I then showed him all the exhibits and he made the following statement" (Exhibit 6b), which I took down in writing: "I look at the letters of August 4, and August 5 addressed to Mr. Johnstone, the betting slips contained in them and the postal orders. I hear you say there is reason to think the bets made in those letters are fraudulent. I hear you ask if I wish to offer any explanation of them being made in my name. I wrote the betting slip contained in the letter of August 4, I did not purchase the postal order contained in that letter. I addressed the cover to Mr. Johnstone. The slip and cover were written by me last Thursday between 10 and 11 a. m. I put the slip in the envelope and gave the envelope to a man whose name I do not know with 15s. to purchase the postal order. I told him to enclose the postal order in the envelope and post it. I wrote the address on the envelope dated August 5. The four postal orders you show me I gave to the said man with the envelope dated August 5. The written communication is not in my writing. I did not know the horses backed on that slip were going to be backed. The man told me he might have something good to send about 12 o'clock and if so he would back it, There is no agreement between me and the man. I was going to give him a couple of shillings for posting it. I gave the letter of August 4 to the man to post because I was home ill in bed. He called to see me. I do not know why. I have not passed a score of words with him in my life. I received the winnings in the bet made in the letter of August 4. I kept it all myself. The first time I saw the man was, when he came to my house here about an order for some beer. It was about six months ago. I do not know where he lives. I do not know where to find him. I believe his name is Foster. "I reported that to my superior officer and on August 13 a warrant was taken out. I took statements from other persons in connection with this matter and in all cases warrants were taken out. Stratford was also taking statements, and in two cases warrants were not taken out.

Cross-examined. I took this statement with one other man in Williams's front sitting-room. I put a series of questions to him.

Police-constable ALBERT BLAKE , G. P. O. At 3.30 p.m. on August 13 I saw prisoner at his house, and read the warrant to him. He said, "That is false altogether. I have done nothing of the kind. I have never done a crooked thing in my life. I absolutely know nothing about it. When taken to the station and charged he made no reply. On him I found Exhibits 7b, 8b, 9b, and 10b. On

Watson I found two memorandum books, one of which contained the address of a bookmaker named "Johnstone. "

Cross-examined. Williams has lived at 60, Perry Hill six years. He has been employed by the West of England Brewery Company over four years as a traveller, and bears a very good character.

(Defence.)

JOHN THOMAS WILLIAMS (prisoner, on oath). I first met Watson last February when he called on me with an order for beer. I discussed horse-racing with him. I did not know what his name was. I did not see him again until August 4. I was in bed with bronchitis, where I had been since July 26, when at about 9.30 p.m. he came to the door, my wife came upstairs and said someone of the name of Watson wanted to see me. I did not know the name, but when he came up I recognised him. He said he was sorry to see I was in, and we started talking about racing. I told him I had had two horses sent me on the night before for that day's racing, and I showed him the letter. I wrote them on a betting slip. One was Orpiment and the other Waterleaf, a horse I had seen in the "Daily Mail" that morning. I asked him to get me a 15s. postal order, a packet of envelopes, and a penny stamp, and gave him £1. He went out at about 12. 30 p. m. and returned at about 12. 45. He handed me an envelope to address, and I addressed it in the usual way to Mr. Johnstone, the bookmaker. I was in bed at the time. I did not notice that there was a penny stamp on it, nor that a postmark had been put on it. The blinds were down, and I am shortsighted. I had not my glasses on, and I could not see without them, although I can write. I then put the slip and the postal order in the envelope, and, without sealing it down, gave it to him, and asked him to post it. I told him to put it in up the road to secure it reaching in time for the bet to be good. I generally posted them at Perry Hill by the 12 o'clock post, and this was 12.45. I gave him the difference in the change for his trouble—about 1s. 5d. He left before one p.m. He came to see me the next morning at about 9.30. I was in bed. I told him I did not intend betting that day, and he said if I liked to give him some money, later on in the day he might get some good information, and he would put it on for me. I gave him the postal orders that I had received from Johnstone just previously, three for 4s. and one for 3s. He said he was very hard up, and I gave him a 4s. postal order. The next morning the bet that he had made for me was returned by the bookmaker. I made a bet on my own on Saturday morning, which was again returned to me. The statement made on August 11 by me is correct, except that I did not write the slip of August 4 at between 10 and 11 a. m. I got confused between that and the following day. There was no arrangement between myself and Watson that he should post the letter after the race was run.

Cross-examined. My sight has always been a little funny. When Watson called on August 4 I understood the name my wife brought up to me was "Foster. "I suppose he came because he had some information to give me. On my asking him he said he was a tipster. He did not say he had come to see me about racing. I could not have asked him his name because when giving my statement I said it was "Foster. "It is not true that I had been losing a good deal with Johnstone just before this. It is not true that I saw Watson at 8 a.m. on August 4. I could not have told him that I was losing. I never had any agreement with Watson to share my winnings with him. The betting slip of August 5 is like my writing but it is not mine; it is authenticated in the same way as that of August 4 with "Williams" at the back. Watson had no specimen of my writing on August 5, except the envelope of August 4. There was no reason why I should not have sealed Exhibit 1b.

Re-examined. Watson saw my betting slip of August 4, with my name at the back of it.

THOMAS EDWARD WHITE, M. D. (St. George's Road, Catford Hill), and EDWIN WILLIAMS (retired detective officer of City of London Police, 181, King Edward Road, South Hackney) gave evidence to character.

Verdict, Williams, Not guilty; no evidence being offered on the indictment charging him with conspiring with Watson to commit the offence of which he had been found not guilty, a formal verdict of Not guilty was returned.

Reference Number: t19100906-94

MASSEY Joseph James (34, paperhanger), and WATSON, Edgar Frederick (41, clerk), pleaded guilty of feloniously demanding from Thomas Guntrip and others £1 14s. by virtue of a forged instrument, to wit a forged postmarked letter, well knowing the same to be forged and with intent to defraud.

As to Massey, it was stated that there were circumstances in his favour, he having fallen a victim to the temptation held out by Watson. He was sentenced to two months' imprisonment, second division.

Watson now pleaded guilty of feloniously demanding and endeavouring to obtain from Bert Fry the sum of £4 8s. 9d. by means of a certain forged instrument, to wit a forged postmarked letter, well knowing the same to be forged, and with intent to defraud.

Prisoner, who had pleaded guilty of five similar offences, was suspected of having approached two postmen other than Denhert, who had not given information to the Post Office of the matter, and whose cases were now under consideration. He was believed to have been engaged in this kind of thing for some years. It was stated in his defence that he was out of employment and had adopted this means of supporting his wife and ten children.

Sentence (Watson), 20 months' hard labour.

Connelly (see p. 531) and Attree (see p. 537), who were convicted of like offences and were stated to have been the victims of Watson, were sentenced to eight months' and nine months' imprisonment (second division), respectively.