

A. On account of the arrangement of the neck and the impression at the forward end of what appeared to be finger-nail prints.

Q. Was there any perceptible difference in the appearance of those wounds at the time you saw them at the Emergency Hospital in Annapolis, or at the bedside of the dead woman on the night of August 8th, and the time of the autopsy in Washington on August 14th? A. Practically no difference, except that the skin of the whole body was hard.

Q. That was due to what? A. To embalming.

Q. What is the general effect of embalming fluid in the preservation of the tissues of the body? A. They are to preserve and harden the tissues.

Q. Would the embalming fluid have a tendency to prevent a proper examination of the subject?

(Objected to the form of the question.)

(Objection overruled.)

A. No, sir.

CROSS-EXAMINATION.

Q. (By Mr. Brady): Doctor, if I recall your testimony taken last week some time, I think you said you saw the body of Mrs. Brandon about nine or ten o'clock, is that right? A. Between nine and ten I said.

Q. Would you be so good as to state the position of the body at the time that you saw it, just as you saw it, that is at the home? A. When I saw it, she was lying on the bed with the head to the foot of the bed. She was on her back with the left side of her head turned towards the bed one leg was straight and the other was slightly bent at the knee.

Q. You don't know that that was the position of the body when it was first seen by Mr. Brandon? A. No, sir; I don't know that; I only know what I saw at that time, Mr. Brady.

Q. You further said, I believe, that the blow on the head did you say that it caused instantaneous death? A. No sir; I did not.

Q. What did you say that blow caused? A. I didn't say that that blow caused anything.

Q. What kind of a blow was it, describe the wound? A. Why, it was a contused area on her forehead, near the hair, a little to one side of the center line, and in the center of that there was a small hole that would not admit the tip of your little finger.

Q. Was that hole round? A. It was not like you take a knife and take a piece of paper, and cut a hold out round, it was more of a mashed wound.

Q. How deep was that wound? A. How do you mean?

Q. How deep was it, did it reach the bone? A. By pressing your finger in you could feel the bone underneath it through this hole.

Q. Was there any skin between the bone and the wound, in other words, was the bone exposed? A. No, you could not see the bone through the wound.

Q. How large was the opening, the wound itself? A. I said you could not get your little finger through it.

Q. Did you say in your examination in chief that she never moved after that blow was struck? A. I don't think I did, I think it was Dr. Joyce said that.

Q. You did too? A. I say now I don't think she did.

Q. You won't say positively that she didn't move or that the body didn't move after the blow that produced that wound was struck? A. I will say that positively.

Q. No part of the body? A. I don't know, she didn't move her head after that, the reason I say that is, because there was no blood on the other side of her face at all, it all run down the left side and on the bed under her head.

Q. As I understood you to say, then, the head was on the left side? A. The face was turned towards the left, like that (indicating).

Q. The wound, how close was the wound to the pillow on the bed? A. The distance from almost the center of her forehead to the bed.

Q. I think you said that the wound was caused by some blunt instrument, did you say that? A. I don't remember whether I said it or not, but it was.

Q. It was caused by some blunt instrument? A. Yes.

Q. Could that wound have been produced or caused by her falling against the iron or brass bedstead? A. A wound of that kind could have, yes, sir.

(Mr. Green): The Doctor's answer, said a wound of that kind could have been produced by that.

Q. How near was the head from the iron part or the brass part of the bedstead? A. Well, I should say it was probably just the same distance you held your hands apart that time.

Q. About that far (indicating)? A. Yes.

Q. About ten inches or a foot? A. Just about that far, eight, ten or twelve inches, something like that.

Q. After you had gone through your testimony for a little while in the description of the body you forgot to say that when you were at the house and first saw the body that you discovered a peculiar odor, which odor you know was that right? A. Yes, sir.

Q. And after you reached the hospital, you examined the parts of Mrs. Brandon and discovered certain things, would you please state what you said, that you found there? A. I said I found this mucous between the legs from which I took two specimens and took them to Baltimore and then examined them.

Q. Did you find anything else? A. Between the legs?

Q. Yes? A. No.

Q. Did you say that from what you found there that you concluded that Mrs. Brandon had been raped before or after that blow was delivered, or after death, I believe you said, after death? A. I think I said that.

Q. Before or after, now Doctor? A. Yes, I think I said shortly before.

Q. Shortly before or after? A. Yes, I think I said that.

Q. It has been testified here by Mr. Brandon, Mrs. Burch and I think another lady and Dr. Joyce, that when the body was found that it was lying on its left side with one leg over, is that right? A. I don't know what they testified to, I only know what I saw.

Q. They said that, anyhow, lying on its side, with one leg across like that (indicating). if that be true—

(Mr. Hartman): I don't think any of the witnesses have said that the body was lying on the side.

(The Court): My recollection is that the head was on the left side.

(Mr. Brady): She was lying on her left side, that is the way I understood it.

(Note.—Testimony read.)

Q. Now, I will ask you if she was lying on her left side as described by Dr. Joyce, will you say now that she may have been assaulted after death? A. How do mean, Mr. Brady?

(Question repeated.)

A. She may have been, because the body may have been moved afterward.

Q. You say, you took two specimens or this specimen of what you found on the body to Baltimore to Dr. Litz, the reason for taking it to Dr. Litz was because of your great respect for his authority, I suppose?

(Objected to.)

(Mr. Brady): I am only asking if that was his reason.

(The Court): The objection is—if you are misquoting the testimony.

(Mr. Brady): I am asking the reason.

A. I took it to Dr. Litz because I knew he was pathologist at the University Hospital and had been for a year or two and I asked him to examine it.

Q. And on account of his ability as a pathologist? A. Yes.

Q. Now, Doctor, the mucous that was found may that not have come from the interior of the woman? A. It could have, yes, sir.

Q. After death? A. I don't think after death, no, sir.

Q. Dr. Litz said that it may have? A. It is just the difference of opinion.

Q. Mr. Brandon stated in his examination in chief that between ten and eleven o'clock the night before that he had sexual intercourse with his wife for the last time, could any of that semen have remained on the interior of Mrs. Brandon? A. Oh, yes.

Q. A woman in that condition is apt to be very free with secretion, is she not? A. Great many of them are.

Q. How long would that remain there, not being cleansed or taken out? A. That may stay in there a number of days.

Q. Now, could the specimen that you took to Baltimore to have examined have oozed from the vagina of Mrs. Brandon? A. It could have.

Q. Then, Doctor, you are not positive whether that was the semen from Mr. Brandon or not, are you? A. No, sir; I am not positive.

Q. Now, Doctor, I will ask you, in view of what you have said whether you are positive Mrs. Brandon was ravaged or raped before she died? A. No, sir; I am not positive of it.

(Mr. Brady): Now, your Honor, I want to move that all evidence of Dr. Joyce and of Dr. Litz and also of Dr. Hopkins, regarding assault or rape be stricken from the record. My object in making that motion is entirely based upon the requirements of the law in establishing corpus delicti which must be beyond a reasonable doubt. This is not a question for the jury, but a question to be determined by experienced men such as those who have made statements regarding an assault, etc.

(The Court): The woman was found dead at five o'clock there was some evidence of violence, a great deal of blood and the physicians, the first one who examined her when he came in the room, I think about nine o'clock noticed a peculiar smell as being the smell from semen of a male and he made an investigation, he found on the body of the woman a mucous discharge, that he found on the hair as well, now he took some smears of this specimen and he took that for examination to a specialist in that line, he did venture the opinion later that that was an attempt of ravage.

(Mr. Brady): Who?

(The Court): One of the physicians testified that in his judgment that there was an attempt of ravage, now the expert says that he found there male semen, he says that the specimen he had examined had been alive when the smear was taken.

(Mr. Brady): No, sir.

(The Court): No life in it when he got it, but alive at the time the smear was made, he said it didn't show that it had disintegrated. Now the objection to that is as throwing any light on this case that there was cohabitation between the husband and the wife the night before at ten or half past ten o'clock. the testimony so far, the testimony so far as admitted that after the cohabitation the wife went to bed and later in an adjoining room and remained there a little while and came back and presented a wet towel to her husband and he used it, first there was an objection to what the lady's usual custom was, now this is only a subsidiary question, it does not rule in the case, it is not alleged that by reason of rape she lost her life.

I think these are all circumstances to go to the jury. The prisoner will be entitled to all reasonable doubt. I think the evidence should stand. I have to overrule the motion.

(Exception noted.)

To which ruling of the Court the traverser by his counsel excepted and prays the Court to sign and seal this, his Twenty-first Bill of Exceptions, which is accordingly done this 23rd day of September, 1918.

FRANK I. DUNCAN. (Seal)

TRAVERSER'S TWENTY-SECOND BILL OF
EXCEPTIONS.

After the occurrence of the matters set out in the First, Second, Third, Fourth, Fifth, Sixth, Seventh, Eighth, Ninth, Tenth, Eleventh, Twelfth, Thirteenth, Fourteenth, Fifteenth, Sixteenth, Seventeenth, Eighteenth, Nineteenth, Twenty and Twenty-first Bill of Exceptions, all of which is hereby made a part hereof as fully as if the same were herein repeated at large, the witness DR. WALTON H. HOPKINS, continuing, says:

DR. WALTON H. HOPKINS, continuing, says:

Q. Now, Doctor, as I understood you to say last, was that you could not determine from that specimen that Mrs. Brandon had been ravished; is that right? A. I think I said that.

Q. Now, Doctor, then you examined the wound on the head. Was that a fracture of the skull? A. No, sir.

Q. You further said that on opening the skull that there was a quantity of blood. Did you say a great deal or a quantity of blood? A. I said a quantity of blood?

Q. About how much? A. Well, probably a quarter of a pint.

Q. How did you open the head; what instrument did you use? A. A saw.

Q. Is it a very easy matter? A. No; it is not an easy matter.

Q. Very hard; is it not? Did you say that the blood that flowed from the head on opening the skull came from the exterior of the lining of the brain? A. Between the covering of the brain and the skull.

Q. Now, in sawing through the skull would you have to cut that lining? A. Not if you are careful.

Q. Did you cut that lining? A. I don't think I did.

Q. Do you say that positively that you don't think you did? Could you be positive that you didn't? A. I said I didn't think I did cut it.

Q. You are in doubt whether you did or not? A. You heard my answer.

Q. How is that? A. You heard my answer. I said I didn't think I cut it.

Q. I say you are in doubt, then, whether you did or not; you won't say that you didn't cut it? A. I won't say positively no, but I don't think I cut it.

Q. Therefore, you can't say positively whether or not the blood came from the lining of the brain and the skull, or whether you had punctured or cut the lining, and that some portion of that blood came from the brain? A. No portion of that blood came from the brain.

Q. Why do you say that, Doctor? A. Because it didn't.

Q. Why do you say that, Doctor? A. Why do I say it?

Q. Yes. A. Because if there had been hemorrhage from the brain it would have shown in the tissue of the brain. There were no ruptures of vessels on the surface of the brain at all.

Q. Did you notice the brain whether or not you had cut the lining of the brain? A. I had to cut the lining of the brain to get the brain out.

Q. I am talking when you sawed it through? A. When I sawed it through?

Q. Yes; when you sawed through the skull? A. Did I notice what?

(Question repeated.)

A. I said I didn't think I had sawed through it.

Q. Are you positive that there was no rupture there, Doctor, in the brain? A. Yes.

Q. At Annapolis? A. I examined the brain carefully, the surface of the brain, and there was no injury to any other vessel.

Q. Then the blood that came from there was between the brain lining and the skull? A. That is what I said.

Q. The blow that caused that wound, was that of sufficient force to fracture the skull? A. The skull was not fractured, so I don't suppose it was of sufficient force.

Q. How thick was Mrs. Brandon's skull? A. I didn't measure it.

Q. What was her size? A. She was a woman that weighed, I should say, between 115 and 120 pounds, as near as I can judge. She was not a large woman.

Q. You can't give any idea of the thickness of the brain of a woman of that size, can you? A. No, sir; the average thickness, I would say.

Q. Sir? A. I suppose it was the average thickness.

Q. Was there any concussion of the brain? A. I could not see a concussion of the brain with the eye.

Q. You didn't examine it? A. It is impossible for anyone to tell if there is a concussion of the brain with the eye.

Q. Did you use a microscope? A. No, sir.

Q. Can't you tell with a microscope? A. I don't think you could.

Q. How would you tell concussion of the brain? A. By the symptoms that the patient shows.

Q. Was there any symptoms there? A. The patient was dead when I saw it; how could I tell?

Q. You could only tell when alive whether there was concussion of the brain? A. Yea.

Q. Did you examine in your autopsy, did you examine the cerebral artery? A. I looked at the base of the brain where those arteries are.

Q. How were they? A. They seemed to be in a good normal condition.

Q. You didn't make a statement at the first autopsy that the cause of death you supposed was due to a ruptured brain, of one of those cerebral arteries; are you sure of that? A. I have not said it anywhere here.

Q. Did you say it there? A. I don't know what I said; I should not think I said it because there were no injuries to those vessels.

Q. You won't deny that you said that? A. Yes, I will deny it, because I didn't say it.

Q. You deny that? A. Yes, because there was no injury to those vessels.

Q. When you were at the Emergency Hospital in the City of Annapolis, did you make the statement there that the cause of death was due to the break of one of those cerebral arteries? A. No, sir; I did not.

Q. Will you say positively whether or not that wound to the head was the cause of death? A. No, sir; I will not say positively that that was the cause of death.

Q. Will you state the causes of strangulation? A. Strangulation may be due to a number of causes.

Q. For instance, mention one? A. Something around the neck.

Q. What? A. Something around the neck will cause, if tight enough.

Q. The pressure on the neck: what portion of the neck is affected? A. What?

Q. What portion of the neck is affected? A. Strangulation is caused by some obstruction to the air going in the lungs.

Q. Would you say whether or not Mrs. Brandon was strangled to death? A. No, sir; I would not say whether or not she was strangled to death.

Q. Now, those wounds on the neck, or the marks on the neck, could they have been produced by Mrs. Brandon's own hands? A. No, sir.

Q. Are you positive of that? A. Yes.

Q. Why do you say that? A. From the position of those wounds.

Q. I noticed from the photograph there that there were a great number of scratches on either side of the neck, both sides of the neck, would you suppose that would be done with one hand or two hands? A. Both sides of the neck.

Q. Yes? A. Those wounds I say were done by two hands.

Q. This is the left side, Doctor, they look like scratches? A. They look like bruises.

Q. Those on the left side of the neck are sort of oblong, they do not look like finger print or nail print? A. Those don't (indicating); those in there do (indicating).

Q. You can't see them plain on there, the other side shows up plainer. Do those pictures show the wounds on the head?

A. That one does not but that one shows right in there, right at the edge of the hair.

Q. Then the undertaker was mistaken when he said that was the wound?

(Objected to.)

(The Court): Let him describe it.

Q. Did you say that this described the wound, right about there? A. Right about in there, close to her hair (indicating on Exhibit No. 2).

Q. These marks on the knee, and on the instep, were they fresh when you saw them? A. Yes, sir.

Q. Can you say whether or not they were a day old? A. I don't think they were, because there was no scab on them.

Q. No scab on them? A. No, sir.

Q. Could they have been caused by Mrs. Brandon's knees striking against something? A. She struck them pretty hard, would have to be struck pretty hard because the skin was broken off.

Q. Falling on the floor I mean, if she had fallen on the floor? A. It all depends on the position she fell on the floor.

Q. Now, suppose a person falling this way (indicating) forward on the floor? A. No, sir.

Q. Is that right on the knee cap or not? A. No, sir; that one on the left leg is down about there (indicating) on the outside, this one on the right leg about there (indicating) and that one about there (indicating).

(Note): Witness points out to the jury where the wounds were, on his own legs.

(Juryman): Were they on the outside?

(Witness): One on the inside and one on the outside.

Q. Was there not force applied that caused that wound from the head?

(Objected to.)

(Objection sustained.)

Q. Now, I am asking whether the blow that caused that wound was there much force from the blow that caused that wound? A. It was hard enough to break the skin and cause quite a bruising around there.

Q. Could a slipper, the heel of a slipper, have produced that blow? A. Yes.

Q. What? A. Yes.

Q. That would have produced it, did it look very much like the wound was produced by the heel of a slipper?

(Objected to.)

(Objection overruled.)

Q. Did it or not? A. It looked like it was caused by some blunt instrument.

Q. I am taking the heel of a slipper, don't it look more like a blow from the heel of a slipper than any other blunt instrument? A. The heel of a slipper could be called a blunt instrument.

Q. Didn't it look more like that? A. I don't know whether it did or not, I tried to describe the wound to you, I could not say whether the heel of the slipper or the bed post.

Q. I will ask you about your examination of the interior, was there any edema of the lungs discovered in your second autopsy? A. No, sir.

Q. Or in your first autopsy? A. I didn't examine the lungs in the first autopsy.

Q. In the second autopsy? A. No, sir.

Q. No edema there? A. No, sir.

Q. Was there any appearance of eclampsia, any indication of eclampsia? A. No, sir.

Q. Of any of the parts you saw? A. No, sir.

Q. It has been stated here that when Mrs. Brandon was found that there was a good deal of foam or froth on the mouth, what produces that?

(Mr. Green): It was not stated there was a good deal——

(The Court): Some.

A. Decomposition and the gases.

Q. Decomposition and the gases? A. Decomposition that forms the gases.

Q. Would you say that froth came there after or before death? A. I should say that froth came there after death.

Q. It may have been there before death? A. I said I thought it came after death.

Q. I say it may have been there before death? A. It may have been, anything may happen.

Q. If it was there before death what does that indicate? A. It might have indicated that the woman had been choked.

Q. Anything else? A. She might have had an epileptic convulsion.

Q. Anything else? A. I don't know, it may have been from some other thing.

Q. If she had an epileptic convulsion, was it possible for her to have fallen on that bed in that convulsion and struck her head against the iron or brass part of the bedstead and not recover? A. But she would not have been in the position she was when I saw her.

Q. It has been testified, too, that she was not in the position that you found her and which I expect to show that a great many handled that body before you saw it, or several of them? A. She had had an epileptic convulsion and fallen and struck her head or some other place, there would have been blood in more places, which there was not.

Q. You seem to be peeved, you are only a physician.

(Witness): No, I am not peeved.

(Objected to.)

(The Court): Strike out that the Doctor was peeved.

(Mr. Hartman): I think the peevishness is on the other side.

(Mr. Brady): That is my natural way.

Q. You said the head was about ten inches from the iron portion of the bed? A. Yes.

Q. If she had struck her head on that bed she would not have kept her head right where she fell, it would be perfectly natural for her to have some a little ways from it. A. If she had struck her head like that and fallen down she would probably have been on her face.

Q. Why I understood she was on the left side? A. The face was turned to the left, if she had fallen like that, when she struck her head she would have kept straight down with her face on the bed.

Q. She could have fallen side-ways? A. Yes, she could have fallen side-ways.

Q. You say the wound was towards the bed? A. I said the left side of the face was towards the bed.

Q. And the wound towards the bed? A. Yes, near the mattress.

Q. With that wound on the head what position would a person have had to stand to have delivered that blow? A. Would have had to stand over her and hit down like that (indicating).

Q. Will you say positively after your two autopsies, whether Mrs. Brandon had before death been suffering with eclampsia?

A. She had not been.

Q. You are positive of that? There were no symptoms at all of eclampsia? A. No, sir.

Q. You positively say there was no eclampsia condition? A. Yes.

Q. Now, if I stated such a person could have one of those attacks, and would come on them like a thunder bolt from the clear sky——

(Witness, Interrupting): That is what Mr. Williams says, Dr. Williams.

Q. That is true? A. Yes.

Q. If such had taken place, necessarily some lesions, certain lesions, such as to the liver or intestines or the lungs or brain would show that? A. Yes.

Q. That would be done? A. Yes, let us quote Dr. Williams right. He said lots of times nothing is shown.

Q. That she could have had a convulsion, epileptic convulsion or an epileptic fit and of your not being able to find any indications of it in your autopsy? A. She could have, yes, sir.

Q. Strangulation causes a sudden congestion, does it not? A. Yes.

Q. Where is that congestion shown? A. It would show in the face.

Q. Any indications of that in the face when you saw that body? A. No, sir.

Q. No indication at all? A. No, sir; there was no bulging of the eyes or anything like that.

Q. How about the tongue? A. No evidence of anything in the tongue at all.

Q. Was the mouth open in any way? A. I opened the mouth and looked in and there was no evidence of biting.

Q. Why did you look at the tongue? A. To see if she had had any convulsion or anything like that to see if the tongue had been bitten.

Q. When you first saw the body it dawned on you that there may have been a convulsion before she died? A. No, sir; I was looking for anything.

Q. You looked at the tongue to see if she had any convulsion or not? A. I looked at the tongue to see if the tongue was bitten.

Q. When you see a tongue bitten like that your natural conclusion is that she had a convulsion, or something like that, and bit the tongue? A.—

Q. In every convulsion they don't always bite the tongue? A. No.

Q. Don't that congestion also show in the lungs? A. Yes, it shows in the lungs.

Q. Why did you say in your examination awhile ago in chief that the lungs were perfectly normal? A. There was no congestion shown there.

Q. Now you say the congestion shows in the lungs I mean congestion from strangulation shows in the lungs and in the face, and that there was no evidence of strangulation if you don't find congestion in the face? A. No we didn't find anything.

Q. Then she didn't die from strangulation? A. No, she didn't die from strangulation, she died of shock as a result of the injury to the head—

(Objected to; motion to strike out; overruled; exception noted.)

To which ruling of the Court the traverser by his counsel excepted and prays the Court to sign and seal this his Twenty-

second Bill of Exceptions, which is accordingly done this — day of April, 1918.

(Exception refused.)

F. I. D.

TRAVERSER'S TWENTY-THIRD BILL OF EXCEPTION.

After the occurrence of the matter set out in the first, second, third, fourth, fifth, sixth, seventh, eighth, ninth, tenth, eleventh, twelfth, thirteenth, fourteenth, fifteenth, sixteenth, seventeenth, eighteenth, nineteenth, twenty, twenty-first and twenty-second bill of exceptions, all of which is hereby made a part hereof as fully as if the same were herein repeated at large, the witness DR. WALTON H. HOPKINS, continuing, says:

(Mr. Grason): Indictment don't call for death from shock.

(Mr. Green): The indictment calls for death from anything.

Q. From the conclusions I reached from your diagnosis that she didn't die directly from the wound in the head nor did she die from strangulation? A. She died from shock as the result of her injuries.

(Objection to the answer and motion to strike out; objection overruled; exception noted.)

To which ruling of the Court the traverser by his counsel excepted and prays the Court to sign and seal this, his Twenty-third bill of exceptions, which is accordingly done this 23rd day of September, 1918.

FRANK I. DUNCAN. (Seal)

Q. Now, Doctor, do you say positively that those wounds on her neck were not caused by the hand of a woman? A. I would not say positively they were not caused by the hands of a woman; all I say is they were large bruises, they were like they were made by large fingers.

Q. Now, a person, a little hand, to catch hold of a neck like that and cause those contusions and those bruises afterwards, would they not spread slightly, the bruises—spread so that you could not determine the exact size of the surface that had been pressing upon the neck? A. They had not spread any because there was a deep impression there.

Q. You won't say if the pressure had been enough to bruise it that it would not spread larger than my finger? A. If you press yourself like she would press, and live long enough afterwards there would be a big bruise there and discoloration all around.

Q. The first impression that appeared on her throat may have been exaggerated and enlarged by reason of the extension of the bruises afterwards? A. No, sir.

Q. Why, not? A. These bruises were perfectly fresh and had not extended any.

Q. I thought you said they would not extend after death? A. I didn't say that.

Q. What did you say? A. You said that.

Q. Would they extend after death? A. No.

Q. You say there was a great mark from blood on the sheet of the bed? A. Yes.

Q. You said it came from this wound on the head? A. Yes.

Q. What vessel did that come from? A. That was probably from the anterior branch of the arteries or brain.

Q. You think—you said the wound on the head bleeds very freely? A. Yes.

Q. Have you any idea how long Mrs. Brandon lived after that blow was delivered? A. No, sir; I have not.

Q. Or from the amount of blood that you spoke of? A. No, sir.

Q. How long would you suppose, in your opinion, from that blood you observed there? A. I don't know. I would not express an opinion on that because I don't know.

Q. Does that artery flow freely? A. Any wound in the scalp flows very freely.

Q. But you have not any idea how long it would take to dispose of that much blood? A. No, sir.

Q. Did you examine that room thoroughly? A. No; I didn't examine the room.

Q. I thought you said in your examination in chief that you looked around? A. I looked around, but I didn't examine it thoroughly.

Q. You don't know whether or not there was any blood on the floor? A. I didn't see any on the floor. I don't think I saw any on the floor. As I told Mr. Green in my direct examination, I would not say whether there was any there or not.

REDIRECT EXAMINATION.

Q. In your opinion, was the wound on the forehead caused by the subject falling and hitting her head on the bed? A. No, sir.

Q. In your opinion, would that mucous that you found between the legs come from the interior of the woman? A. I don't think it did, from the position I found it in.

Q. What position was that; where do you mean? A. On the legs; on the inside of each leg.

Q. If it came from the woman, where do you think, what courses do you think it would naturally have taken? A. A backward course.

Q. In your opinion, Doctor, could the mucous you found have come from the vagina from the intercourse of the husband the night before? A. If she had been walking around a lot during that morning, it could have come from the vagina—that is, some mucous could have come from the vagina.