APPENDICES
APPENDIX I

SYSTEM OF LAND MEASUREMENT IN MANIPUR

2 Loushens = 1 Tong
2 Tongs = 1 Loukhai
2 Loukhais = 1 Shangam
2 Shangams = 1 Lourak
2 Louraks = 1 Pari

A pari is nearly 2.50 acres of land. It is 100 metres long and 100 metres breadth.

APPENDIX II

AMOUNT OF LAND HELD BY THE ARMY OFFICERS AND SEPOYS

A Major received one pari of land for each company he commanded.

A Poila received 6 paris of land.
A Subadar received 4 paris of land.
A Jamandar received 3 paris of land.
A Kotwal received $2\frac{1}{2}$ (two paris and one lourak) of land.
A Havildar received 2 paris.
A Amondar received $1\frac{3}{4}$ (one pari and three shangams) of land.
A Kothondar received $1\frac{1}{2}$ (one pari and one lourak) of land.
A Sepoy received $1\frac{1}{2}$ (five shangams) of land.

These are full pay rates. No one was entitled to pension. But the king could give anyone if he pleased.
APPENDIX III

Petition of Tikendrajit Bir Sing submitted to the Viceroy and Governor General of India in Council.

To

HIS EXCELLENCY
The Viceroy and Governor-General of India
IN COUNCIL.

The humble petition of Tikendrajit Bir Sing, of Manipur; at present, prisoner under sentence of death.

Humbly Sheweth:-

That your petitioner was, on the 10th June last, convicted by a Special Court at Manipur, (constituted under orders of Your Excellency in Council) of the offences of waging war at Manipur against the Queen of Great Britain and Ireland, and Empress of India; and of abetment of murder; and sentenced to death; subject to confirmation by Your Excellency in Council.

Your petitioner begs leave to appeal against the said conviction and sentence on the following grounds:-

1. For that as regards the offence of waging war, your petitioner submits that he is not a British subject, and that while gratefully acknowledging the assistance which the Rulers of Manipur have from time to time received from the Government of India, he ventures to submit that the
subjects of the State of Manipur have never owed any allegiance to the Queen of England, and Empress of India, and are therefore not liable to be punished for the offence of treason, or waging war against Her Majesty.

2. That so far as your petitioner is aware, there never was any such reservation or declaration of allegiance on the part of any Ruler of Manipur to Her Britannic Majesty, as would legally create the sort of allegiance requisite to render a subject of Manipur liable for such an offence.

3. That on the 24th March last, Manipur was a Sovereign State, though in some respects under British protection, and hence your petitioner is not liable to be tried for this offence.

4. That no evidence has been adduced by the prosecution to show that your petitioner owed allegiance to the Queen-Empress of India, so as to render him punishable on this charge.

5. That assuming your petitioner could be lawfully tried for such an offence in any British tribunal, in whatever manner constituted, the evidence shows that your petitioner never intended to wage war against the Queen-Empress of India, but that he merely resisted an attack on his house, and his forcible seizure by British officers
and soldiers, who ought not to have attempted such an arrest without the authority of the Ruler, or Maharaja, of Manipur, who alone, it is submitted, could have lawfully directed your petitioner's arrest.

6. That there was no declaration of war by Mr. Quinton against the Ruler of Manipur; but a sudden invasion by British soldiers of your petitioner's house, situated within the palace enclosure at Manipur, and your petitioner respectfully submits that his soldiers and adherents, who were guarding his house at the time, were not guilty of any offence as against the Queen-Empress of India, by repelling the said invasion.

7. That assuming the Government of India, or Mr. Quinton on behalf of the Government, had authority to arrest your petitioner without any orders from the Ruler of Manipur; your petitioner ventures to submit that the Government ought to have heard him in his defence before ordering his deportation from Manipur. Had that course been adopted, the Government possibly might not have thought fit to insist upon his leaving Manipur at once.

8. That assuming it was your petitioner's duty to submit to all orders and directions issued by the Chief Commissioner of Assam, your petitioner respectfully urges that, under the circumstances disclosed, Mr. Quinton
was in error in attempting to seize your petitioner in the manner he did: 1stly, because your petitioner was at the time suffering from ill health and was entitled to consideration on that ground alone; 2ndly, he ought not to have been asked to attend a "Durbar" which was to have been held at the British Residency, so that he might be conveniently arrested there; 3rdly, because arrangements for a nautch party at the Residency on the night of the 23rd March, ought not to have been ordered, as your petitioner not unnaturally suspected that he would be taken by surprise and arrested if he attended such a party. The proposed nautch, however, after preparations had been made, was ultimately abandoned; 4thly, that when your petitioner, out of deference to the wishes of Your Excellency in Council, expressed his readiness to surrender, but only prayed for a few days' time to enable him to get better and to make preparations for leaving Manipur, the Chief Commissioner should have, as a matter of sound discretion, granted your petitioner's prayer for time; 5thly, that instead of invading your petitioner's residence before daybreak the Chief Commissioner ought to have insisted upon the Maharaja sending your petitioner to him within a reasonable number of days.

9. That the Special Court is in error in supposing that prior to Mr. Quinton's arrival, your petitioner had
made preparations to oppose the British troops. The evidence for the prosecution shows that a rumour had been spread to the effect that Maharaja Sur Chandra was coming to Manipur with troops to take forcible possession of the throne, after having abdicated it in September last, and there was some talk in Manipur of opposing him; but your petitioner never for a moment thought of forcibly opposing the orders of the Government of India, or resisting the entry of the Chief Commissioner.

10. As regards the charge of abetment of murder; your petitioner submits that the evidence fails to establish any such charge against him.

11. That your petitioner directed the cessation of hostilities as soon as the "Cease Fire" was sounded from the British Residency, and readily came forward to discuss matters with Mr. Quinton, though he was lying down from ill-health and prostration, and that he did everything that struck him at the time, to ensure the safety of Mr. Quinton and his party, when they were leaving the Palace, by directing Angao Mingto, one of the chief ministers of the State, to escort them back. This shows that your petitioner did not intend any harm to the British officers who had come to speak to him.
12. That your petitioner's hesitation to accept Mr. Quinton's mere verbal assurance was not unnatural under the circumstances, and even if such hesitation was unjustifiable on his part, it ought not to have been construed as evidence against him on this charge.

13. That as soon your petitioner heard the shouts of the excited soldiers he came back to assist Mr. Quinton and party, and with some difficulty succeeded in saving them except Mr. Grimwood, who had been unfortunately killed before your petitioner had time to return. The Special Court instead of using this fact in your petitioner's favour has erroneously used it against him.

14. That your petitioner, considering it was absolutely unsafe for the sahibs to venture out even with an escort, thought the safest course was for them to spend the night in the Durbar Hall, which was the only place in the Palace (pat) where the sahibs could have stayed comfortably; and he accordingly ordered one of the principal ministers, Angao Mingto, to place sentries all round for the protection of the sahibs. Your petitioner submits that the finding of the Court, that he neglected to take proper precautions, is not borne out by the evidence.

15. That as soon as your petitioner heard that the Tongal General had suggested that the sahibs should be
killed, your petitioner at once countermanded the order; and soon afterwards came to the General to enquire if he had really given such an order. Your petitioner repeatedly told the General that the sahibs should or no account be harmed; the General acquiesced, and remained silent, and your petitioner, believing that the General would never venture to carry out such an idea after the strong protests made by your petitioner, and being exhausted with the excitement and labours of the day, in his then weak state of health, fell asleep. This state of facts has been clearly established by the evidence in the case.

16. That when your petitioner fell asleep, as stated above, he had no reason whatever to doubt the safety of the sahibs, as he believed the Tongal General would not venture to act in opposition to his protests, and as he had already ordered Angao Mingto (one of the chief ministers of the State), to look after the safety of the sahibs; and as sentries had been placed to guard them; and as he had previously told Usurba the officer in charge of the sentries, that the order of the Tongal General was on no account to be carried out.

17. That your petitioner never, either before or after the execution of the sahibs, by word or deed, approved of the idea conceived and carried out without his knowledge,
and against his protests by the old General, and that your petitioner is therefore not guilty of the charge of abetment of murder.

19. That your petitioner complained to the Maharaja the next morning of what Tongal had done; but neither the Maharaja, nor your petitioner, could then venture to inflict any punishment on so powerful a minister.

19. That there is no evidence in the record to show that your petitioner ever intended that the sahibs should be killed. The finding of the Special Court is based purely upon assumptions.

20. That it will appear from the facts set out in the annexed affidavits of Babu Janoki Nath Bysak, and Brojamohan Sing, and from the record itself, that your petitioner has not had a fair trial at Manipur, and that he was practically undefended.

21. That the answers recorded by the Court, in the course of the long cross-examination to which your petitioner was subjected, ought not to be used against your petitioner.

22. That nothing in the written statement in the English language, filed on behalf of your petitioner, should be used against him, having regard to the circumstances under
which it was prepared; as disclosed in the declaration of Babu Janoki Nath Bysak hereewith annexed.

23. That some ought to have been given to your petitioner to enable him to obtain proper legal assistance from Cachar or elsewhere.

24. That your petitioner has been seriously prejudiced, by reason of the manner in which the evidence of the witnesses was interpreted and recorded; as disclosed in the affidavit of Babu Janoki Nath Bysak.

25. That if in any respect your petitioner has been guilty of any error of judgment, or of any disrespect to the Government of India; he entirely throws himself on the clemency of Her Majesty the Queen-Empress of India, and of Your Excellency in Council.

Your petitioner therefore prays, that on the foregoing grounds, and after considering all that has been urged by your petitioner's counsel in the annexed printed memorandum, in support of this appeal, as well as the annexed original telegram received from Mrs. Grimwood, certifying to the fact that Mr. Grimwood really found your petitioner ill on the 23rd March last; Your Excellency in
Council will be pleased to set aside the conviction and the sentence of death passed on your petitioner.

And your petitioner, as in duty bound, shall ever pray.

25th July 1891.
APPENDIX IV

AFFIDAVIT OF JANOKI NATH BYSAK

In the matter of the Petitions of Maharaja Kula Chandra Sing, and Tikendrajit Sing, of Manipur, to the Government of India.

I, Janoki Nath Bysak, son of Rup Chand Bysak, inhabitant of Nalcondha, in the sub-division of Tangail, in the district of Mymensingh, do hereby, solemnly and sincerely affirm, and declare as follows:-

1. That I am a trader by profession, and that I had a shop at Manipur, prior to the occurrence of the 24th March, 1891, but the said shop was plundered and destroyed by fire during the disturbances of that day; while I was living with my family in the cantonment of Langthobal.

2. That on the 25th of March, I was seized by some Manipuris and kept in the Manipur jail, where fetters were put on my legs; and where I remained the whole night, and was released the next day by order of the Jubraj Tikendrajit Sing.

3. That on or about the 4th June, two days after the trial of the said Jubraj had commenced at Manipur, I received a slip of paper written by Major Maxwell, the officer who
conducted the prosecution of the Manipur Princes, of which the following is a true copy:—

"DAMA CHARAN BABU,

The Jubraj, now under trial, wishes to have you and Janoki Babu to assist him. Please come and see me this morning before 9 A.M. and send this to Janoki Babu.

3rd June, 1891. 

H. MAXWELL."

The original is now in my possession.

4. I then, on receipt of Rs. 1,000 (one thousand), agreed to defend the said Jubraj.

5. That I am not a lawyer, and that I never had any experience of how criminal trials are conducted; but I have some knowledge of the Manipuri language, having resided in Manipur for about two years, and I can read and write English, of which I have some, but imperfect knowledge, besides knowing Urdu and Bengali, which latter is my own tongue.

6. That from the 4th June, I was present in Court during the trial of the Jubraj. When Jatra Sing was examined, I attentively listened to the evidence which
he gave in the Manipuri language, which evidence was translated into the Hindustani language by one Partha Sing, a pensioned Police officer. That I have a distinct recollection, that the said Jatra Sing stated, that when the Jubraj began conversing with the Tongal General regarding the order said to have been given by the General to kill the sahibs, he (Jatra Sing) went away without waiting to learn what reply the Jubraj made to the Tongal General. I further say, that I did not hear Jatra Sing say that the Jubraj remained silent, or "made no reply." I verily believe that Jatra Sing's correct answer on this point has not been recorded by the Court.

7. That I was also present in Court when Aru Sing alias Utsaba (described by the Court as Usurba) was examined, and that I distinctly remember his saying, when in the course of his examination-in-chief, he narrated all that he knew, that he had heard the Jubraj tell the Tongal General that "the sahibs must not be killed on any account," or words to that effect. I was under the impression that this statement of Usurba had been heard and recorded by the Court, and therefore, I thought it unnecessary to examine him on that point.

8. That as a general rule, the Manipuri witnesses who have been examined by the prosecution were allowed by the
Court to state what they knew all at once, and after a witness had spoken for two or three minutes, or sometimes longer, in the Manipuri language, Partha Sing used to translate into Urdu the evidence given; and frequently Major Maxwell, the Political Officer conducting the prosecution, had again to translate into English what the interpreter said for the information of the Court.

9. That the above mode of conducting the examination of witnesses led to much confusion at times during the trial, and that I had several times to complain of Partha Sing's incorrect translation of the answers of witnesses. On several occasions, Major Ridgeway, one of the Judges, had to find fault with Partha Sing's translation of the evidence.

10. That when the Jubbaj was examined by the Court, he gave his answers in Manipuri to questions put to him in that language by Partha Sing. That the questions were originally put by one of the members of the Court in Urdu; and it frequently happened that Partha Sing himself failed to understand the meaning of the question, and it had to be explained to him in Urdu either by one of the Members of the Court, or by Major Maxwell.
11. I further declare that after I had written out a
defence for the Jubraj according to general instructions
received from him, and after it had been signed by him
and delivered to the Court, the President of the Court
suggested, that as my English was defective, it would be
desirable to alter my language, as the document would be
printed, and that corrections had to be made in the said
document. Two days after the said document had been
presented, it was returned to me by the President of the
Court with certain alterations, and I was then asked by
the President of the Court to seek the assistance of
Captain DuMoulin, who used to attend the Court as Special
Correspondent to the Pioneer and certain other Anglo-
Indian newspapers, and who, the President said, would be
able to revise the said statement properly. I therefore
gave the document to Captain DuMoulin, who took it away
and returned it to me the next day. I then copied out
statement as altered and got it signed by the accused and
I filed it. The original statement signed by the prisoner,
and containing alterations in the handwriting of Colonel
St. John Michell, the President of the Court, and Captain
DuMoulin, was all along in my possession, and I made it
over to counsel on the 19th July instant, the day I arrived
in Calcutta. Most of the alterations in the said document
are verbal, but there are, as has now been explained to me,
some which had the effect of imputing to the accused what
he never meant or said. The said original written statement bearing the signature of the Jubraj and containing the additions and alterations made therein by the President of the Court, and by Captain DuMoulin, is herewith annexed and marked A.

12. I declare that the word "them" underlined by me in the following passage extracted from pp.14 and 15 of exhibit A (the insertion of which, I am now told completely alters my original meaning, and imputes to the accused what neither he nor I ever intended to express), is in the handwriting of the said Captain DuMoulin in the said exhibit A:

"The defendant urged the improbity of such a dreadful action of killing such high officers, and the General said 'have you lost your senses; and do you think that there is any chance of reviving the lost friendship with the British?' It is better to do away with the British officers and subjects, who were ushered in of their own accord."

"The defendant then fully explained to him the inevitable consequences hereafter, and the old man seemed willing to abide by them, and remained in silence."
As I had originally written the document (exhibit A), I had simply used the words "abide by," intending to mean that Tongal was willing to abide by his (the defendant's) wishes, and from my imperfect knowledge of the English language, I failed to notice that the interpolation of the word "them" by Captain DuMoulin had the effect of altering my meaning, and that of the Jubraj, in such an important part of the written defence. I declare that the said word "them" in the said original document, and many other words similarly interpolated between the lines of my writing, were written by Captain DuMoulin with a stylographic pen belonging to him, as the appearance of the added words themselves in the document (exhibit A) shows.

13. That after the said document (exhibit A) containing numerous interpolations and alterations; some in the handwriting of the President of the Court, and some in that of Captain DuMoulin, was returned to me by Captain DuMoulin, I made a copy of it, adopting all the alterations and additions, and got that copy signed by the accused.

14. That besides the interpolation of the word "them", as stated above, there are other additions and alterations, which though not so important, have, I now see, a tendency to alter the meaning of the Jubraj, and to impute to him what he did not mean to admit, such as use of the word
"mutiny" (referring to the events of the 21st September, 1890) in two places, in page 7, instead of the words "business" and "incidents," which I had originally written in two different places of the written statement. These two alterations were made, I believe, by Colonel St. John Michell, the President.

15. That having failed to notice at the time the significance of the said alterations, I did not think it necessary to read over to the accused Jubraj, in the Manipuri language, the fair copy now filed with the record before I got him to sign it; and I declare that he put his signature to the said copy now on the record without having had its contents translated to him, under the belief that this copy accurately contained what he had originally instructed me to write on his behalf.

16. That I also appeared as representative of Maharaja Kula Chandra Sing when he was tried subsequently before the same Court; and that the draft of the written statement which I made in his case was also revised by the said Captain DuMoulin; who made several alterations and additions therein. The said draft is now in the possession of the counsel for the Prince.
17. That both the said Jubraj Tikandrajit Sing, and
the said Maharaja Kula Chandra Sing, are wholly ignorant
of the English language.

18. That I verily believe that Captain DuMoulin,
during his stay at Manipur, acted as Special Correspondent
to the Pioneer, and some other Anglo-Indian newspapers
hostile to the Manipur Prince.

JANOKI NATH BYSAK.

Declared at Calcutta aforesaid,
this 25th day of July, one
thousand eight hundred and
nintey-one. Before me.

COCKERELL A. SMITH,
Notary Public, Seal.

CALCUTTA.
APPENDIX V

AFFIDAVIT OF BROJOMOHAN SING.

In the matter of the Petition of Tikendrajit Sing, of Manipur, to the Government of India.

I, Brojomohan Sing, son of Nadyar Chand Sing, inhabitant of Manipur, in the State of Manipur, do hereby solemnly and sincerely declare as follows:

1. That I was the Private Secretary to Jubraj Tikendrajit Sing of Manipur.

2. That about the beginning of June last, I wrote out, at Manipur, a petition on behalf of the Jubraj in the Manipuri language, praying that time might be given him to enable him to get pleaders from Cachar to defend him at the trial. The said petition was duly signed by the Jubraj, and presented to the Special Court at Manipur, by one Chandra Sing on behalf of the Jubraj; but the prayer was rejected, and the petition returned; and we were told to engage some one who might be available at Manipur to defend the Jubraj.

3. That thereupon, at the suggestion of one Partha Sing, who acted as Interpreter at the trial, and of one Kalendra Sing, a Police officer who arrested the said Jubraj, I advised him to engage the services of Babu
Janoki Nath Bysak, and of Babu Bama Charan Mukerji, two Bengalees who were then at Manipur, and who were the only persons available there for that purpose, and who understood English.

4. That the said Partha Sing, who acted as Interpreter during the trial of the Jubraj, had formerly been in his service as Drill Instructor, but subsequently left him, and took service under his step-brother, Pucca Sing, with whom the Jubraj is at enmity.

The foregoing declaration was signed by the declarant, (who does not know any but the Manipuri language,) in my presence, on the 25th day of July 1891, the same having been first explained to the declarant through Major Golap Sing, of Manipur, but at present residing at No.18, Sib Thakoor's Lane, in manner hereafter mentioned, that is to say, he said Major Golap Sing declared to me, in the Hindustani language, which I understand, and can speak, that he himself is a native of the Manipur State and can understand, speak, and read, and write the Manipuri language and character, and thereupon I read over the said declaration, and explained the same to the said
Major Golap Sing in Hindustani, who in turn explained the same in my presence, sentence by sentence, to Brojomohan Sing, the declarant, in the Manipuri language, and the said declarant appeared to understand the same when so explained, and signed the same in what, I am assured by the said Major Golap Sing, is the Manipuri character.

Seal.
Cockerell
A. Smith,
Notary
Public.

COCKERELL A. SMITH,
Notary Public,
CALCUTTA.

The contents of the foregoing declaration have been duly explained by me to the declarant, Brojomohan Sing, in the Manipuri language, with which I am fully acquainted.

GOLAP SING.

I hereby identify the declarant Brojomohan Sing, and Golap Sing.

JANOKI NATH BYSAK.
APPENDIX VI

JUDGMENT IN THE CASE OF TEKENDRAJIT SING, SENAPATI, CALLED JUBRAJ OF MANIPUR.

I. COUNT OF CHARGE

The accused pleads not guilty to the first count of the charge against him, viz.: Waging war against the Queen-Empress, and though he admits having fired upon the British troops sent to arrest him, he states he did so more in self defence than with any idea of waging war against the Queen. That it was the intention of the Manipuri Durbar to resist forcibly any order of the Government of India which was not in accordance with their wishes: we have the evidence of Bama Churn Mukerji, Clerk to the Regent, who states that preparations for resistance and attack were made a fortnight before the arrival of the Chief Commissioner. The Manipuri Durbar had heard that the late Maharaja of Manipur, who abdicated, was on the road from Kohima to Manipur in company with the Chief Commissioner of Assam, and the accused does not deny that warlike preparations were made to resist. The accused was President of the Council when it was decided to send a thousand Manipuri soldiers to Mao Thana to oppose the advance. It was only on receipt of a telegraphic message stating that the ex-Maharaja was not in company with the
Chief Commissioner, that this most daring attempt to oppose the Government of India orders was abandoned.

We may take the events which occurred from the 21st March, when the Chief Commissioner arrived at Sengmai up to night of the 23rd March, as related by witnesses and the accused himself, as they agree except on the points, first of an interview with Mr. Grimwood; second, the illness of the accused; and third, his presence at the Regent's Durbar. The plea of sudden illness, through which the accused was unable to attend any Durbar on the 22nd and 23rd, cannot be accepted as valid. Everything tends to prove that it was a mere pretence to avoid a meeting with the Chief Commissioner. Some miles out of Manipur, he was able to attend the Durbar at noon on the same day on horseback, and it was only after he had been kept waiting outside the Residency gate some little time, that he returned to his house, his suspicions having been aroused that he was about to be arrested. We have it in evidence, that a rumour had been current sometime in Manipur that the accused's arrest was contemplated by the Chief Commissioner, and there is further evidence to show that the accused was well enough to attend the Regent's Durbar on the afternoon of the 23rd, and to take an active part in the attack of the 24th.
Babu Bama Churn Mukerji, second witness, states that the accused was present at the Regent’s Durbar on the afternoon of the 23rd of March held in the Palace to discuss the orders of Government. The accused states that he was not there. The second witness, Babu Bama Churn, has given his evidence throughout in a most straightforward manner and appears to have a good memory of the smallest details which happened, and his evidence on this point may be accepted. We come then to the morning of the 24th of March. It is proved by all the witnesses for the prosecution, and admitted by the accused and the witnesses for the defence, that firing between Manipuris and British soldiers commenced early on the morning of the 24th, and continued uninterruptedly all day until about 8 o’clock in the evening.

The accused pleads in extenuation that his troops were fired on first. Of his own witnesses, only the third asserts that the British fired first and this witness was, by his own admission, not in a position to make any such assertions, as he states that he was awakened by the sound of firing, and immediately ran away. Whereas, on the other hand, we have the evidence of Captain Butcher, Lieutenant Chatterton, and Havildar Dhup Chund, that the British troops did not open fire first, and both officers testified to the strict orders given to officers commanding
parties, that our troops were not to fire, unless fired on first. We are therefore justified in assuming that the first fire came from the Manipur side. The accused is proved by the evidence to have taken an active part in the attack on the Residency on the 24th. He was found at an early hour in the morning, superintending the men at the north-east gate of the ramparts, from which the Manipuris were firing on his own house then occupied by the British troops. He was found in the evening, superin-
tending the laying of a gun and the construction of an embrasure at the west wall, and he admits, being in command, ordering the "cease fire" on the evening of the 24th. It was impossible to doubt that he could, had he so wished, have stopped the fire of his troops on the British at any moment, and hoisted a flag of truce. Finally he demanded the surrender of the British troops on the night of the 24th.

The Court are unanimous in the opinion that the first count of the charge has been proved against the accused.

II. COUNT.

It is admitted that the British officers met the accused at a Durbar inside the fort on the night of the
24th March. The accused states that after expressions of regret on both sides as to the events which had occurred during the day, that he required the British troops to lay down their arms, and on this condition alone would he give them safe conduct to Kohima, and he mentioned that the Manipuri troops were so infuriated as to be quite beyond his control.

On the refusal of the Chief Commissioner to accede to the terms; the Durbar broke off. The accused left the Durbar and proceeded in the direction of Top Guard; leaving the British officers to make their way out as best they could in the opposite direction. This action, so contrary to the strict Oriental ideas of etiquette, and opposed to the usual custom in Manipur, was very expressive of anger against, and contempt for the British representatives. The crowd, already excited, and encouraged no doubt by this attitude of their Prince, at once broke out into demonstrations of violence against the officers, striking at them with spears, butts of their rifles and swords, shouting out "Kill! Kill!" One of the officers was wounded, and it was only to the exertions of Angum Mingthow that the officers were enabled to gain the shelter of the Durbar Hall steps; one of them, Mr. Grimwood, being stabbed just as he entered the gate of the compound, fell under the steps and died there. The accused, hearing the uproar,
returned and drove off the crowd. This affords every proof of the great control he possessed over his men. He then ordered Angum Mingthow to guard the officers' safety and went away, making no further efforts for their safety, although he had seen the dead body of Mr. Grimwood, for whom he claims to have entertained a strong personal friendship, lying under the steps, and must have known in what imminent danger the lives of the remainder were. He made no efforts to see the officers safe to their camp; he says he did not do this owing to the heavy firing going on at the time, but we have conclusive evidence to prove that the firing did not recommence until midnight, and the Durbar has been proved to have been held about 9 o'clock. The accused himself, further on, states that when he was met on the wall by Jatra Sing and Uzarba, there was no firing going on, and these witnesses sought him on the wall shortly after he left the Durbar-room. This excuse may therefore be dismissed as untrue. It is evident that the accused could not be doubtful of his power to conduct the officers outside the gate, had he wished to do so, for his own men had just given him an excellent proof of their obedience and of the influence he possessed over them. Even had the above excuses been valid, there was nothing to prevent his taking the officers either to the Top Guard or to the citadel, where they would have been in perfect safety. He merely told
Angum Ningthou to guard them, and went off to the ramparts to look after the troops, proving thereby that if he had not then desired to kill the officers, he intended to keep them for some ends of his own. While the accused was on the rampart, Jatra Sing and Usarba reported to him that Tongal General had given orders for the officers to be killed, but they wanted his, the accused's orders. There is some discrepancy in the evidence of the witnesses. Jatra Sing says that the accused merely said "let us go and consult the old man," but Usarba states that the accused said Tongal General's orders are not to be obeyed; and he would come and see about it. Jatra Sing was present in the Top Guard when the accused taxed the Tongal General with having ordered the death of the officers; but he did not wait for the end of the conversation. Usarba, the companion of Jatra Sing, went to the Durbar Hall, and he saw the accused pass on his way to have an interview with the Tongal General in the Top Guard, and about half an hour after, Yongkhorba came from there, and said that the General (Tongal) had ordered the British Officers to be made over to the public executioner. He then describes how the officers were taken out of the Durbar Hall, and marched to the Dragon's gate, but he did not see the execution. He then went to the Top Guard. In his examination-in-chief he says that the accused was not then there. In cross-examination, he says he was there.
Hidu, the 11th witness, confirms the evidence of Usarba, but adds that when he returned to the Top Guard, after making the officers over, he found the accused there in conversation with Tongal General; and according to this witness, the sirdar of executioners was present at the executions. The evidence of Yongkhorba, 14th witness, corroborates that of Usarba and Hidu Chaobi, and gives some further important particulars; he says, for instance, that Tongal General said to him "the Jubraj before this told you to give the sahibs over to the executioners, why have you not done it?" and further on he states, that when Tongal General said this, the accused was in the same room, apparently asleep. He says he did not see the accused in the Top Guard when he went back there, after having made the officers over to the executioners. He denies having called the executioner. The executioner, 10th witness, gives details of the execution. He says he was there by order of the Jubraj and Yongkhorba. The inference of this evidence is that the Satival, chief executioner, was not present at the execution.

The Satival, or chief executioner, 12th witness, corroborates the above and is certain that Yongkhorba called them. He also states that he was not present at the execution. The evidence of all the Manipuri witnesses bears the impress of truth up to a certain point, i.e.,
not one of them, save the executioner, will admit having seen the executions and their evidence as to what happened immediately on the executions is most unreliable. Statement of Jatra Singh, that he went away just as the accused and Tongal General were arguing as to the murder of the officers on whose behalf he had made such exertions and on whose fate he had expressed so much interest, is altogether incredible; and such a statement can only be attributed to a disinclination to repeat the conversation he had heard. The statement of the accused, that when he came back to the Top Guard, to confer with Tongal General about the latter having ordered the officers to be killed, and that after the General had given his reasons for giving such an order, that he, the accused, laid down and went to sleep, is almost beyond the bounds of credence. If he really did so, such an action would have implied nothing but consent to the murder of the officers, and that he had yielded to the arguments of the Tongal General. That the accused acquiesced then, and the second order for executioner to be sent for was the result of this acquiescence, the Court has no doubt; indeed, any other belief is impossible. The accused, according to his own account, returns to the Top Guard wrathful with a minister for having ordered British officers be put to death, he argues the case with him, and rebukes him. Yet, although the minister is next to himself the greatest person in the State, and
shown himself more than anxious to murder the officers, the accused, after a little argument, lays down. Such callousness, if he was really interested in the fate of officers, is incomprehensible. He sent none of his followers to warn the sentries on no account to give up the officers to any one without his orders; nor did he have them removed to the citadel (only distant some 50 yards) where their safety could have been assured.

If Usarba refused in the first instance to carry out the orders of the Tongal General without the distinct orders of the accused, and heard him express his disapproval and countermand the order, and when he knew that when the second order came, the accused was close to hand in the Top Guard, Usarba must have been given to understand that the result of the conference to which he had seen the accused go, is a confirmation of the original order that the officers should be put to death.

Moreover, the fact, in the first instance, that Tongal General merely ordered the sentries to kill the officers; and that in the second instance, an order was made for their delivery to the public executioners, which gave the deed a sort of legal aspect, and made it a public ceremonial; ordered by the ruling power, warrant the assumption that in the second instance a far higher power
than Tongal General had ordered the executions. The fact that neither the Tongal or any of the parties directly concerned in the execution were any way punished by the accused confirms this.

The Court is unanimous in its opinion that the second count of the charge has been clearly proved against the accused.

With reference to the third count there is no evidence to prove that the accused was present when the murders were committed. The Court finds the accused not guilty of this count.

(Sd.) ST. JOHN MICHELL, Lt.-Col., President.

PALACE, MANIPUR;  } (Sd.) R.K. RIDGEWAY, Major, Commandant, 44 G.R.
The 10th June 1891. } (Sd.) A.W. DAVIS, Depy. Comr., Naga Hills.

Finding and Sentence.

The Court finds that you, Tekendrajit Sing, are guilty of the first and second counts of the charge, that is to say, that you, on or about the 24th of March 1891, at Manipur, waged war against the Queen-Empress and
abated the murder of the Chief Commissioner of Assam, Mr. Quinton; Colonel Skene, 42nd G.R.; Lieutenant Simpson, 42nd G.R.; and of Mr. Cossins, Assistant Secretary to the Chief Commissioner of Assam. The Court finds you not guilty of the third count of the charge.

The Court directs that you, Tekendrajit Sing, alias Jubraj, alias Senapati of Manipur, be hanged by the neck until you are dead.

(Sd.) ST. JOHN MICHELL, Lt.-Col., President.

MANIPUR, 11th June 1891.

(Sd.) R.K. RIDGEWAY, Major, Commandant, 44 G.R.


The above sentence is subject to the confirmation of the Governor-General in Council, to whom the records of the trial will be forwarded.

(Sd.) ST. JOHN MICHELL, Lt.-Col., President.