

had had such communication and did know what and about whom he was expected to testify when he received such summons and before he went to Bel Air.

VI.

That said Pumphrey testified under oath at Bel Air in the case of State vs. Fisher and again in the case of State vs. Guy that two witnesses for the State, viz, the said Wein and the said Sperzel, were unworthy of belief, while in truth and in fact said witnesses were worthy of belief and said Pumphrey had made no investigation into their character and reputation, and had no knowledge thereof which would justify the testimony so given.

VII.

That said Pumphrey in order to discredit the said Sperzel and to impeach his testimony as a state's witness in the Guy case in Bel Air, did testify under oath in said case that he know that said Sperzel at one time lived in the same house in Baltimore City with certain Chinamen who were conducting a place in said house for the smoking of opium, and that said Chinamen had been arrested for this criminal offense; the said Pumphrey thereby seeking to convey the impression that the said Sperzel was an associate of the said Chinamen and a party to the criminal offence hereinbefore mentioned; that thereafter under cross examination in the said case the said Pumphrey after his attention had been called to the fact that it was his duty as a state's officer to have caused the arrest of the said Sperzel for the said offense, was compelled to admit that he did not know that the said Sperzel was living in the said house at the time the said opium joint was conducted therein, and that he did not know whether the said Sperzel had removed from the said house one year or ten years before the arrest of the Chinamen above mentioned.

VIII.

That with the assistance of said Pumphrey, Mr. M.H. Fahey, of counsel for the defense in the Bel Air cases, was enabled to procure from Captain Titus a copy of a letter of