

57. Because the Court permitted the witness Miss Dewie Hewell, over the objection of the defendant that the same was irrelevant, immaterial, incompetent, illegal and dealt with separate and distinct matters and issues from this case, to testify:

"I am now staying in the Station House. Before I came to Atlanta to testify I was in Cincinnati, Ohio, in the Home of the Good Shepherd. I worked at the Pencil Company during February and March, 1913, I quit there in March. I worked on the fourth floor and worked in the metal room, too. I have seen Mr. Frank hold his hand on Mary's shoulder. He would stand pretty close to Mary when he would talk to her, he would lean over in her face."

The Court permitted this testimony over the objection of the defendant, made as is above stated, and in doing so committed error. This was prejudicial to the defendant, because it was introduced to show an effort to be criminally intimate with Mary and inflamed and misled the jury.

58. Because the Court permitted the witness, Miss Cato, over the objection of the defendant that the same was incompetent, illegal and immaterial, to testify substantially as follows:

"I know Miss Rebecca Carson. I have seen her go twice into the private ladies' dressing room with Leo M. Frank."

The Court permitted this testimony over the objection of the defendant made as is aforesaid and in doing so committed error. The Court stated that this evidence was admitted to dispute the witness they had called.

It was wholly immaterial to the issues involved in this case whether Frank did or did not go into a private dressing room with Miss Carson. It did, however, prejudice the jury as indicating Frank's immorality with reference to women.

59. Because the Court erred in permitting the witness Maggie Griffin to testify over the objection of the defendant made when the testimony was offered that the same was immaterial, illegal, and incompetent, to testify substantially as follows:

"I have seen Miss Rebecca Carson go into the ladies' dressing room on the fourth floor with Leo M. Frank. Sometimes it was in the evening and sometimes in the morning during working hours. I saw them come in and saw them come out during working hours."

The Court permitted this testimony to go to the jury over the objection of the defendant made as is aforesaid and in doing so committed error. The Court stated that this evidence was admitted to dispute the witnesses they had called.

It was wholly immaterial to the issues involved in this case whether Frank did or did not go into a private dressing room with Miss Carson, it did, however, prejudice the jury as indicating Frank's immorality with reference to women.