

any warrant or order of court does not render them inadmissible in evidence for the prosecution. The introduction of the letters in evidence was objected to on the ground that they were obtained by unlawful seizure, in violation of the rights of the defendant Siebert; and reliance was placed on the case of *Boyd v. U.S.*, 116 U.S. 616, 6 Sup. Ct. Rep. 524. The court conceded that the letters might have been obtained by artifice and perhaps unlawfully, yet they did not find it necessary to enter upon an elaborate discussion of the admissibility of the evidence, as they had recently had occasion to go over the same question in *Gindrat v. People*, 27 N.E. Rep. 1085, the decision in which settles the question involved here. After citing several cases, it is said in the above case: "We think that the case last cited, as well as the present case, are clearly distinguishable from *Boyd v. U.S.* In the latter case the unconstitutional and erroneous order, process, and procedure of the trial court compelled the complainants to produce evidence against themselves, and such order, process, and procedure were also held to be tantamount to an unreasonable search and seizure; while here, and in other cases cited, the question of illegality was raised collaterally, and the court exercised no compulsion whatever, to produce evidence from the defendants, and neither made orders nor issued process authorizing or purporting to authorize a search of the premises, or a seizure of property or papers, but simply admitted evidence which was offered, without stopping to inquire whether possession of it had been obtained lawfully or unlawfully. Courts, in the administration of criminal law, are not accustomed to be over-sensitive in regard to the sources from which evidence comes, and will avail themselves of all evidence that is competent or pertinent, and not subversive of some constitutional or legal right." In *Greenl. Ev.* (Redf. Ed.), s. 254, it is said: "Though papers and other subjects of evidence may have been illegally taken from the possession of the party against whom they are offered, or otherwise unlawfully obtained, this is no valid objection to their admissibility if they are pertinent to the issue. The court will not take notice how they are obtained—whether lawfully or unlawfully; nor will it form an issue to determine that question."—*Central Law Journal*.