



# NATIONAL ARCHIVES OF IRELAND

NAI/PLIC/1

Archives are subject to copyright and should not be copied or reproduced  
without the written permission of the Director of the National Archives

1269<sup>a</sup>

Richard H. Hamilton

REPORTED ON BY COMMITTEE

10 NOV. 1916

1269<sup>A</sup>

S U P P L E M E N T A L      R E P O R T .

Claim No. 1269 - Richard H. Hamilton.

*(do) 64 Marrowbone Lane  
cl.      call      miss the date given for 8d  
suppl to 1269      £13      £10*

I have looked up my notes in connection with this Claim, and find that I called at Claimant's residence as stated and believed I was speaking to Mrs. Hamilton, his wife, but I do not wish to contradict the Solicitors' - Messrs. Moore, Kelly & Lloyd - assertion that it was Miss Hamilton to whom I addressed my remarks.

I subsequently visited Marrowbone Lane where the property was looted from, and from the houses adjoining I procured sufficient information, which was corroborated by the police, to enable me to gauge the loss at £12.      The police record shows that Mr. Hamilton stated to them he thought he had lost about £20 worth of property.

I took up the matter to-day and went fully into it with Mr. Hamilton. He seems an honourable man, but finds it difficult to fix his mind to any one thing. For instance, he now states Item 1 of his claim should read £7, Item 2 - £14. 5. 0., and Item 3 - £11. 4. 0. Then after a few minutes he contradicts these amounts. It is really hard to get any reliable data from him. I questioned him regarding the Police report, of which I was aware, and he acknowledges that he told his Solicitors at the time of making claim that he had reported his loss to the Police. <sup>as £20.</sup> He states now that it was only within the last ten days he asked his foreman to go fully into the matter, and hence the revision in his figures. If the Committee feel disposed to make an additional grant I believe that £10 would be quite commensurate. Beyond this figure

I would not go.

*12 hour allowed  
10 min  
making  
£22 in all  
WJ*

*Cecil J. Macdonald*

1, Dawson Street, Dublin.

31st October, 1916.

MOYRE, KEILY & LLOYD,  
SOLICITORS.  
ROBERT SCHOLEFIELD.  
LEWIS F. KENNY.  
W. TALBOT PHIBBS, LL.D.  
TELEPHONE NO 843.

*Claim recommended  
to Govt. 8/9/16.*

1269  
31, MOLESWORTH STREET,  
DUBLIN.

*4.28.  
25/10/16.*

October 24th. 1916

Dear Sir -

No. 1269 -

M. H. Hamilton's Claim,

Referring to your letter of the 18th inst, we have now seen our Client with reference to it.

Mr Hamilton informs us that the Inspector did not see his wife at all; he called when Mr Hamilton was out and he saw his (Mr Hamilton's) daughter, who of course knew nothing about the matter and merely told him where the premises were situate at which the damage took place; none of the other members of Mr Hamilton's family were interviewed and none of his men who could give any information were seen on the matter, so we do not know what other inquiries your Inspector could have made -

Our Client would not press the matter only for the fact that his claim was much under the loss he suffered.

Perhaps under the circumstances you would kindly have the matter reconsidered.

Yours faithfully,

*Mr Woodruff  
for remarks. J.M. 25/10/16*  
Moore, Keily & Lloyd

J. J. Healy Esq.,  
Property Losses Association  
51. S. Stephens Green  
Dublin

18th October,

No. 1269.

R. H. Hamilton's claim.

Dear Sirs,

In reply to your letter of the 12th instant relative to the above claim, I am directed by the Committee to state that although the Inspector did not see the claimant when he called on him, he interviewed his wife and he was able to obtain sufficient information as the result of other inquiries to enable him to deal with the claim. The Committee are satisfied that the award is fair.

Yours faithfully,

Secretary.

Messrs. Moore, Keily & Lloyd,  
31 Molesworth Street.

MOORE, KEILY & LLOYD,  
SOLICITORS.  
ROBERT SCHOLEFIELD.  
LEWIS F. KENNY.  
W. TALBOT PHIBBS, LL.D.  
TELEPHONE NO 843.

1280  
1269  
31, MOLESWORTH STREET,  
DUBLIN.

October 12th. 1916

*Claim recommended  
to Govt. 8/9/16.*

*I advised. Done 22.6. 14/10/16.*  
*II advised. Herewith 13/10/16.*  
*13/10/16*

Dear Sir -

Mr. R. H. Hamilton's Claim

Mr Hamilton has called upon us with reference to the claim which  
which he sent in to your committee and in respect of which he has recently  
received a draft for £12.

The claim made was for £25 which was really very much below  
the value of the articles destroyed and as a matter of fact did not  
include a number of articles which he has since ascertained were on  
the premises and were destroyed.

He informs us that your Inspector called at his house when  
he was out, and stated he would call again, or write, but he never did  
so.

Mr Hamilton called at your Office subsequently and was  
informed that the Inspector would make an appointment with him, but he  
never did so, and, under the circumstances, we cannot understand how  
he came to the conclusion that £12 would compensate our Client for the  
damage done.

We would feel very much obliged if you would kindly have the  
matter looked into and the claim allowed on a more equitable basis.

Yours faithfully,

*Moore Keily & Lloyd*

J. J. Healy, Esq.,  
Property Losses Committee,  
51. St. Stephens Green, Dublin.