

for rent then due. After some further correspondence, on the 6th October, 1903, Mr. C. F. Griffiths, as surviving executor of William Arrowsmith's estate, sued Mr. Greenhead in the Magistrate's Court, Auckland, for rent for the property from the 28th May, 1900, to the 28th August, 1903, £42 5s., and for insurance premiums paid during the years 1899 to 1903, £3 11s.: total, £45 16s.

Mr. Greenhead came to Auckland on the 20th October, two days before the day fixed for the hearing of the action, and consulted Mr. Thomas Cotter, solicitor.

Mr. Greenhead did not wish to dispute that the amount was due, but he sought advice as to what power Mr. Griffiths had to sue. Mr. Cotter, after looking into the matter, and seeing the agreement with Mr. Hill, advised Mr. Greenhead to confess judgment, and pay part of the claim on account, which was done.

On the 29th February, 1904, Mr. Greenhead's lease expired. Shortly before he cautioned Mr. Griffiths not to draw from the A.M.P. Society the amount due to him as executor of Arrowsmith under the agreement with Hill, and he also requested the society not to pay the money to Mr. Griffiths. The society replied that they would pay the money into the Supreme Court, and they issued an originating summons in that Court. Mr. Greenhead on receiving it went to Auckland, and consulted Mr. Brookfield, solicitor, and on his advice (given after looking into the case and examining documents) Mr. Greenhead withdrew his claim, and Mr. Griffiths drew the amount out of Court. Some attempt was made by Mr. Brookfield to settle with Mr. Mahony the amount which was due to Mr. Griffiths on the policy, but apparently Mr. Greenhead withdrew the business from Mr. Brookfield's hands before it was settled, and, after some further correspondence, Mr. Greenhead, being still in possession of the land, was served by Mr. Mahony, acting for Mr. Griffiths, with a Supreme Court writ, claiming possession of the land, or, in the alternative, damages.

The hearing took place on the 12th December, 1904, and the plaintiff was nonsuited on a technical point in connection with the attestation of the signatures to the documents produced by the plaintiff.

In May, 1905, a second writ was served. The hearing took place on the 5th June, 1905, before Mr. Justice Edwards. Mr. Greenhead conducted his own case, and, notwithstanding his statement that the agreements produced were "forgeries," judgment was given for the plaintiff, affirming that Arrowsmith was the real owner of the mortgage over Greenhead's land. After that Mr. Greenhead settled with Mr. Griffiths, in terms of the judgment of the Court. (See letter of Wynyard and Purchas—Exhibit P.)

Mr. Greenhead's next step was, on the 29th July, 1905, to write to Mr. Justice Edwards (Exhibit F), informing him that he had obeyed the judgment, and that he was perfectly satisfied with His Honour's decision with regard to the land—that it really belonged to Arrowsmith. He reiterates his statement made at the trial that the agreement then produced was not the original—that the signatures and initials were not his, and that they were forgeries. He goes on to ask His Honour to cause an inquiry to be made, when it could be shown that the agreement produced was not the original. He said he wished an opportunity to show that he had not sworn falsely, but did not then complain of any loss.

A reply signed by the secretary to Mr. Justice Edwards (Exhibit F) was sent to him, in which it is said, *inter alia*, that His Honour cannot correspond with any litigant about his grievances, real or imaginary, but that as he (Greenhead) appeared to be under a delusion as to what took place at the trial, His Honour informed him that, while he had no doubt at all as to the genuineness of the documents referred to, he was satisfied that he (Greenhead) conscientiously believed they were forgeries, and that he did not therefore impute perjury to him, nor did he understand any one else to do so.

On the 30th September, 1905, Mr. Greenhead (through Mr. Massey, M.H.R.) presented a petition to the Hon. the Minister of Justice, reiterating and amplifying his statements as to the alleged forgeries, and asking for an inquiry.

On the 10th October, 1905, a reply was sent to Mr. Massey that the Government had no power of interference (Exhibit F).

On the 6th November, 1905, Mr. Greenhead again wrote to Mr. Justice Edwards, informing him that the latter had been misled by a bogus deed—that Mr. Mahony, instead of depositing in the Deeds Office the deed produced at the trial, which he (Greenhead) asserted to be "bogus," had deposited the "genuine original" deed. In this letter Mr. Greenhead repeated that he was satisfied with His Honour's judgment, as he had never once disputed his obligation.

On the 13th August, 1906, Mr. Greenhead addressed a petition to the House of Representatives in Parliament assembled (J. 1907/689). The petition is a lengthy one, in fourteen paragraphs, and is on one of the files of papers referred to me. It prays in the last paragraph that a rehearing of the case Griffiths *v.* Greenhead may be granted.

On the 11th October, 1906, the A to L Public Petitions Committee reported on the petition: "That the Committee is of opinion that the petition should be referred to the Government for favourable consideration, and suggests that a Commissioner be appointed in Auckland to inquire into the case of petitioner."

This report having been referred to the Justice Department, the Under-Secretary for Justice, on the 23rd October, 1906, made a report recommending that no action be taken, which recommendation was for the time adopted.

On the 9th November, 1906, Mr. Greenhead addressed a letter to the Hon. Sir J. G. Ward, Premier (Exhibit G), in which he prayed that Government would give effect to the recommendations of the Committee, and he also, for the first time, made a charge against the officials of the Deeds Office at Auckland. He states that some official had assisted to get removed the deed mentioned in the petition, and substituted the duplicate. He also asks that he may be examined on oath, *in camera*, before the Commissioner takes general evidence.