

SINGULAR CHARGE OF RAPE.

A case that came before the police court, at Ballarat East, on Wednesday last, shows the small amount of credence that can sometimes be placed in the evidence given in cases of rape. From the Ballarat Star we take the following particulars:—

“ The prosecutrix, a married woman named Greaves, whose husband has lately been convicted of larceny, deposed, when examined on the previous court day, that the prisoner, a man named James Dunne, had never been on terms of intimacy with her before; but it appears that she afterwards admitted to her solicitor (Mr Lewis) that this was not true, and that the prisoner was regularly in the habit of staying with her during the night. When the case was called on for hearing again on Wednesday, Mr Lewis stated what his client had told him, and, on being called, she corroborated his statement, giving as her excuse for previously perjuring herself that she did not know very well what she was saying at the time. The case having assumed such a different phase, the prisoner was discharged, and the prosecutrix's depositions were ordered to be forwarded to the Crown law offices, so that proceedings might be taken against her for perjury, if considered advisable. The prisoner, it was said, had been previously convicted of larceny, and was considered to be a convict; and the prosecutrix's husband having been only lately convicted, it appeared the lot were six of one and half-a-dozen of the other. The only redeeming feature in the woman's conduct, and which might operate with the authorities in not prosecuting her, is the fact of admitting the falsehood before the prisoner's liberty had been further endangered.”
