

"WEIRD TRANSACTIONS."

KOMESAROFF INSOLVENCY.

"Not Cash—Only Headaches."

Judge Moule spent nearly five hours in the Insolvency Court yesterday in investigating the affairs of Peter Komesaroff, draper, Geelong, and elsewhere, whose affairs showed a deficiency of £5,110/18/5. Mr. Stanley Lewis and Mr. Tait appeared for the trustee (Mr. E. W. Smail), Mr. Read for S. Komesaroff (the brother of the insolvent), and Mr. Menzies and Mr. Morris for A. H. Sicree, of the A.B.Y. Manufacturing Company.

Solomon Komesaroff, draper, Smith street, Fitzroy, explained that different transactions with wholesale firms were designed to give his brother credit for eight months, instead of the usual four months.

Judge Moule.—Fraternal philanthropy. (Laughter.)

Mr. Tait.—And by the time these transactions were completed your brother's indebtedness to you had been wiped out?

The witness entered into a long explanation, when Judge Moule said that he did not desire to hear more.

Mr. Read submitted that the judge had formed a wrong impression of the witness.

Judge Moule.—Do you mean to tell me that these merchants would have entered into such arrangements if they had known the real state of affairs?

Mr. Read.—They will come and swear that they would. You have formed a wrong impression of the witness, just as I did at first.

In reply to further questions the witness

I did at first.

In reply to further questions the witness said that on July 31 his brother owed him £500. By means of purchases of goods in August and September in the name of the insolvent, that indebtedness was reduced to £490. After that the witness took up another bill, and in return received goods from Geelong.

Judge Moule.—Positively weird transactions.

On November 5, proceeded the witness, he gave his brother a promissory note for £400.

Mr. Lewis.—Have you got the cash?

Witness.—No; only headaches. (Laughter.)

The note was dishonoured, added the witness, and the bank had now issued a writ against him.

Mendel Slonim, underclothing manufacturer, Lonsdale street, after the luncheon adjournment, contradicted the evidence he had given previously, and admitted that during the luncheon interval he had discussed the matter with his brother, who had said that witness had not answered the questions to the right effect.

Later, Charles Slonim contradicted himself, and said that he desire to withdraw.

Judge Moule retorted that he would not permit that, and if it happened again he would commit the witness to prison for prevarication.

The examination was adjourned until a date to be fixed.
