

contract the property in the machine remained with the Plaintiffs.

As to the facts of the case, we do not agree with the findings arrived at by the Foreign Causes Court that the Defendant acted in good faith, because:

1) It appears from the statement of Captain Ivancich, the Plaintiffs' manager that both the Defendant and Chin Lee actually lived in the same "rong thao".

2) According to the evidence on behalf of the Defendant, from the 7th. to the 23rd. of August 1. e., within 16 days only, the machine changed hands four times and successively passed to Chin Lee, Nai San, Chin Chon and the Defendant. This is a matter of grave suspicion more especially as Nai San, whose evidence would have been of greatest interest to the Defendant was never called as witness.

3) The story given by the Defendant's witnesses at the Police Station inquiry differs from their story in Court. Chin Chon for instance said to the police authorities that he sold the machine to one Amdeng Krib. Who Amdeng Krib is and why her name was dropped later on, is not clear from the evidence adduced before the Court. In the same way Chin Chon stated to the police that he knew that Nai San obtained the machine from a