En la familia de la familia

and the sea

a and alandin

MARLE CONTRACTOR

Full Tilmingson

er at gred bee

agon it. In. (

noun auonita

nioner duodate

gerier agential

to ton Leanung

in a constractor

letunggo oda Ti

in orthogram and

6 C.A.P. 281.

la sample out

in thous our to

paper and orosa

constant to be based

to arthmetic and

.5.A.5 8. edgans

wote p. 330 et

BIA TOOLOT B OJ

i od to mountains

er is gnomitical

Vict. c.18 ...

rus, and a snimuma

in regarts on

a. open nedw ba

it . not partness to

tipes and requi-

chone in a contra

. annahitya

the opposite counsel, in re-examining the witness, is consined to such questions as may elicit the meaning of the expressions, and Tut where a the motives of the witness for using them. witness deposes to certain expressions being used by a party to the cause, the counsel for that party is entitled to re-examine the witness as to the whole of the conversation in which the expression occurred; because the expressions are given, in evidence, in such a case, as an admission of the party, and the whole of his admission should be taken together. 2 Frod. &. F. 294. If a witness whose name is on the back of the indictment be called merely to allow the prisoner to cross-examine him, any question put by the prosecutor's counsel afterwards must be considered as a re-examination, and nothing can be asked which does not arise out of the cross-examination. R v Beezley 4 C.&.P. 220, Pares 330,331,332.

proved that J.N. was the person killed otherwise the defendant must be acquitted, unless the variance be amended at the trial (see ante p. 224). If the name of the deceased be unknown, it should be stated so in the indictment. Id.

OF HIS MALICE AFORETIOUGIT DID KILL AND MURDER; - The law presumes ever homicide to le murder, until the contrary appears Fost 255. Therefore the prosecutor is not bound to prove malice, or any facts or circumstances besides the homicide, from which the jury may presume it; and it is for the kanaxiexaex defendant to give in evidence such facts and circumstances as may prove the homicide to be justifiable or excusable, or that at most it amounted to but manslaughter. R v Greenacre 8 C.&.P

In cases of express malice the homicide is usually committed in secret, and it is rarely practicable to substantiate it by direct and positive testimony; in most cases, the defendant is convicted upon circumstantial evidence merely. Upon this xxx is convicted upon circumstantial evidence merely. Upon this xxx subject it is only necessary to refer to what has been already subject it is only necessary to refer to what has been already said upon the doctrine of presumptions (ante p. 259) repeating

Indian Affairs. (RG 10, Volume 2958, File 205,060,