

**In Re: William PlyThe Perrett**

**In Re: William PlyThe Perrett**

**SooperKanoon Citation :** [sooperkanoon.com/821176](http://sooperkanoon.com/821176)

**Court :** Chennai

**Decided On :** Feb-03-1927

**Reported in :** 105Ind.Cas.448

**Judge :** Waller and ;Madhavan Nair, JJ.

**Appellant :** In Re: William PlyThe Perrett

**Judgement :**

1. We think that the conviction is right. The evidence is clear that the furniture was entrusted to the appellant by the Official Assignee for the purpose of continuing his business and that, in breach of trust, the appellant disposes of it to various other persons. It is urged that the offences committed fell under Section 103 of the Presidency Towns Insolvency Act and that the jurisdiction of the Magistrate was thereby excluded. Assuming that the facts proved do amount to an offence under Section 103(6)(2) of the Presidency Towns Insolvency Act, which is not clear, we do not think that the Magistrate had no jurisdiction, vide Segu Balliah v. Ramasamiah 42 Ind. Cas. 608 : 6 L.W. 283 : 18 Cri. L.J. 992.

2. The sentence is not excessive. The appeal is dismissed.