

"The Court finds the prisoner in this case guilty, on his own confession, of the offence specified in the charge against him, viz., that he has made a false charge of an offence against the complainant, Kálú valad Ghásu, knowing that there were no just or lawful grounds for such charge, and that he has thereby committed an offence punishable under Sec. 211 of the Indian Penal Code, and the Court sentences the prisoner to one year's rigorous imprisonment from this date, also to pay a fine of Rupees 15, or to suffer in default one month's additional rigorous imprisonment."

1863.
REG.
v.
ARJUN.

The High Court (present FORBES and WESTROPP, JJ.) reviewed the case, and saw no cause to interfere with the finding and sentence recorded against the accused, but at the same time directed the Magistrate to be informed that the nature of the false charge should have been stated in the finding and entered in the Calendar.

REG. v. KUSHA'.

Nov. 4.

*Jurisdiction—Theft in a House—Subordinate Magistrate of 1st Class
—Ind. Pen. Code, Sec. 380.*

A First Class Subordinate Magistrate has no jurisdiction to try a charge of theft in a house under Sec. 380 of the Indian Penal Code.*

THE following reference was made by the Magistrate of the Khándesh District to the High Court:—

"I have the honour to forward a case of theft in a house tried by the First Class Subordinate Magistrate of Errondhur, under Sec. 380, of the Penal Code.

"It will be seen that the Subordinate Magistrate had no jurisdiction under this section. I have, therefore, to request the orders of the Honorable the Judges of the High Court."

The order by the High Court (present FORBES and WESTROPP, JJ.) was—

Conviction and sentence reversed, the trying Magistrate having had no jurisdiction in the case.

The Magistrate may take such further steps in relation to the case as he may think necessary.

Conviction reversed.

* *Sed vide* Act VIII. of 1866, Sec. 1.