prove of the printing and publishing of this Book, entitled Notes of Cases in Points of Practice, taken in the Court of Common Pleas at Westminster, from Michaelmas Term 1732 to Hilary Term 1754, (inclufive); in Two Volumes. by Henry Barnes, one of the Secondaries of the faid Court.

3d July 1754.

J. Willes,
E. Clive,
Tho. Birch,
H. Bathurft.

N O T E S

Ø F

C A S E S

IN

Points of PRACTICE:

Taken in

The Court of Common Pleas at Westminster.

From Michaelmas Term 1732, to Hilary
Term 1754, (inclusive.)

With a TABLE containing the Names of the Cases, and an INDEX of the PRINCIPAL MATTERS.

By $H E N R \Upsilon B A R N E S$,
One of the Secondaries of the faid Court.

In Two Volumes.

VOL. H.

In the SAVOY:

Printed by HENRY LINTOT, Law-Printer to the King's most.

Excellent Majesty; for John Shuckburgh, at the Sun between the two Temple Gates, Fleetstreet, MDCCLIV.

Ą

TABLE

OF THE

Names of the CASES.

A. Page 311 BDY verfus Hopkins, Absalom v. Knight, &c. 356 Acklam and others v. Malton. 117 Acklom v. Malton. 345 Adams v. Peck, 320 39**0** Adey v. Bradley, 316 Alanson v. Watt, Alderson v. Dodding **£91** Aldrick v. Salmon, 275 Allen v. Dallyson, 27 Allen v. Boyer and others, 42 Allen v. Braithwaite, 215 Allen v. Grie, 327 Andrew v. Tutton, 354 Anonymous, I O Anonymous v. Fergulon, 246 Apperley v. Thomas, 14 369 Appleton v. Jarratt, Ascough v. Lunn, 34 À 3 Ah

Ash versus Day, Ashedowne v. Fisher, Ashedowne v. Fisher, Ashley v. Stockwell and others,	Page 299 185 302 263
Askham v. Lewis,	386
Atkings v. Taylor, Atkinion v. Fawkes,	231
Atkinfon v. Hartley alias Green,	209 255
Atkinfon v. Thompson,	2 84
Atkinson v. Dixon,	342
Atterbury v. Sweetapple,	174
Aultin v. Rofs,	234
Aylmer and others v. Roe,	194
В.	
Bagshaw v. Toogood,	* 50
Bailey v. Semple,	152 241
Baker v. Donelly,	127
Baker v. Dowding,	132
Baker v. Dowding,	268
Baker v. Barlow,	182
Baker v. Barlow,	211
Ball v. Ruffell,	366
Banks v. Bullock,	279
Barber v. Wilson,	248
Barber v. Speed,	258
Barber v. Satchwell,	265
Barlow v. Baker, Barlow v. Baker,	182
	211
Barlow v. Highmore, Barham v. Moorhouse,	339
Rarnes of Terfey The Farl of	121
Barnes v. Jersey, The Earl of, Barrowclough v. Webster,	130 126
Barry, commonly called Lord Buttevant,	
mott,	36
	Barry.

Barry, commonly called Lord Buttevant, v	
Meredith, Page	315
Barry v. Lacey and Garrick,	20
Barry v. Lacey and Garrick,	29 2
Bartlett v. Spooner,	377
Baskerville v. Chassey,	79
Bate v. Crane,	235
Bateman v. Gladman,	334
Batty v. Royden,	229
Bayley v. Houldston,	279
Baynham v. Dalrymple,	305
Bax v. Culmer,	341
Baxter v. Overton,	85
Beard alias Farmer v. Wingfield,	336
Beart v. Lowe,	172
Beaton v. Green,	233
Beaumand v. Stewart,	15
Beaumont v. Cosins, &c.	13
Beaumont v. Norman,	362
Bedford, The Duke of, v. Bray,	390
Beere v. Brooking,	256
Bell v. Pepiatt,	255
Bell v. Crossthwaite,	298
Bell v. Simpson,	349
Bennington v. Wright,	232
Benson v. The Brewers Company;	193
Benson v. Hemming,	282
Bentley v. Scott,	257
Betts v. Flemming.	274
Bevan v. Jones,	162
Bickerton v. Lewis,	22 İ
Bigbie v. Linthwaite,	323
Billers v. Bowles,	190
Billingsley v. Craven,	41
Bingham v. Gregg,	147
Bingham v. Davis,	281
A 4	Bird

The second secon	•
Bird versus Forster,	Page 17
Blackmore v. Smith,	242
Blades v. Reynolds,	94
Blake v. Flemming,	274
Blanchett v. Read,	244
Blatchford v. Honiwill,	103
Bligh v. Cope,	122
Bludwick and Wife v. Ufborne,	18
Bold v. King,	19
Boon v. Wood.	18
Bosanquet v. Littlehales,	134
Boston, The Mayor and Burgesses	of, v. Mar-
quand,	331
Boswell v. Roberts,	340
Bothwright v. Langley,	189
Bouch v. Wignall,	145
Boulton v. Poole,	118
Bowen v. Murray,	20
Bowen v. Follett,	74
Bowler v. Jenkin,	232
Bowles v. Billers and Knight,	190
Bownas v. Wilcock,	. 294
Boyer v. Allen,	42
Bradley v. Adey,	390
Braithwaite v. Allen,	245
Bray v. The Duke of Bedford,	390
Brewer v. Matthews,	277
Brewers Company v. Benson,	193
Bright v. Jackson,	126
Bright v. Gentleman,	3 3 •
Brimmer v. Marks,	15
Bristow v. Thompson,	165
Bristow v. Trappet,	2 0
Britten v. Teasdaile,	43
Britton v. Peirce,	378
Broadbent v. Wilkes	9
	Broadbent

Broadbent versus Wilkes,	Page 106
Broadbent v. Wilkes,	206
Brooking versus Beere,	256
Brookes v. Stephenson,	27
Brough v. Rayner,	62.
Broughton v. Smithson,	204
Brown v. Ibbetson,	99
Browne v. Gascoigne,	185
Browne v. Hagen,	288
Browne v. James,	297
Browne v. Hedley,	308
Brumwell v. Garnett,	138
Buckle v. Lucar,	202
Bulling v. Rogers,	226
Bullock v. Banks,	279
Bullythorpe v. Turner,	28 £
Bulstrode v. Kettle,	246
Bunton v. Studwell,	7 E
Burdus v. Saschwell,	169
Burdus v. Shorter,	178
Burgess v. Halding,	139
Burnand v. Burnand.	278
Bury v. Proctor,	357
Button v. Crabb and Clerk,	286
·	
C.	
Cade v. Kerry,	326
Calcraft v. Swan,	162
Cam v. Gardner,	182
Cambridge, University of, v. Rutter,	ľ
Cambridge, University of, v. Rutter, Carleton v. Wilkinson,	5 7
Carr v. Whitehall.	383
Castell v. Grave,	79
Cattern v. Chapman,	216
Chaffey v. Baskerville,	79
Chandler v. The Hundred of Sunning,	271
<u>.</u>	Chapman

J	•	J
Chapman versus Cattern,	1	Page 216
Chapman v. Ryall,		329
Charley v. Hedges,		218
Childs v. Prows,		310
Chishull v. Ingham,		II
Christie v. Huggins,	•	6
Clarke v. Harbin,		64
Clarke v. Incledon,		175
Clarke v. Lawndy,		17 7
Clarke v. Gorrill,		249
Clarke v. Goodtitle,		370
Clarke v. Sheppard,		385
Claxton v. Hyde,		63
Clerk v. Langley,		22
Clerke v. Pitcairne,		100
Clixby v. Dinas,		² 74
Coates's Cafe,		301
Cockfedge v. Richwood,		37
Cocksedge v. Moyle,		373
Cokayn v. Launder,		35
Cokayne v. Otway,		56
Coles v. Haden,		36
Colli v. Dalrymple.		209
Colfworthy v. Potter,		341
Comings v. Hooper,		84.
Cook v. Shone, &c.		4
Cook v. Detchick,		219
Cook v. Poole,		308
Cook v. Shone,	ě.	385
Cooke v. Fylon,		116
Cooke v. Litson,		392
Cooper v. Turner,	,	171
Cope v. Bligh,		122
Corish v. Kennedy,		384
Cosens v. Etherington,		272
Cosens v. Stannynought,		36 6
		Cofins

Cosins versus Beaumont,	Page 13
Coulthrust v. Poor,	7 7
Courtney v. Selman,	350
Crabb and Clerk v. Button,	286
Cracroft v. Willoughby,	184
Crane v. Bate,	235
Craven v. Billingsley,	41
Cremor v. Dent,	121
Crick v. Grubb,	348
Cross v. Skipwith,	355
Crossthwaite v. Bell,	298
Cullum v. Lloyd,	271
Culme v. Dingle,	314
Culmer v. Bax,	341
Cuthbertson v. Shields.	133
_	
D.	
Dale v. Robinson,	261
Dalling v. Matchett,	53
Dallyfon v. Allen,	27
Dalrymple v. Colli,	209
Dalrymple v. Baynham,	303
Dapp v. Woodman,	249
Darker v. Edwards,	240
Davids v. Wilson,	16
Davies v. Leckie,	71
Davies v. Jones,	120
Davis v. Skyllins.	188
Davis v. Bingham,	281
Davis v. Jones,	288
Davis v. Prince,	346
Davis v. Jordan,	387
Daw v. Vile,	250
Dawson v. Sykes,	170
Dawson v. Draper,	309
Day v. Ash,	299 Do-
g cha	. Day

Day versus Samson,	Page	353
Dean v. Unwin,		220
Dearsley v. Pay,		295
Deighton v. Forster,		156
Delaval v. Machin,		51
D elaval v Machin,		224
Dennis v. Fletcher,		387
Dent v. Cremer,		12 I
De Revose v. Hayman,		173
Dethick v. Cooke,		219
Digge v. Price,		248
Dinas v. Clixby,		274
Dingle v. Culme,		314
Dixon v. Goodman,		324
Dixon v. Atkinfon,		342
Dobson v. Stephens.		376
Dodding v. Alderson,	*-	29 Í
Dodgson v. Wood,		225
Doe v. Thomas,		151
Doe v. Roe,		153
Doe v. Roe, in Ejectment,		160
Doe, on the Demise of Cholmondley	, v.	Roe,
	-	365
Donelly v. Baker,		129
Dormer v. Gregory,		127
Dowding v. Baker,		132
Dowding v. Baker,		268
Downes v. Shaft,		99
Draper v. Dawson, Driver v. Scrutton,		309
Driver v. Scrutton,		13
Dryden v. Langley,		22
Duchworth v. Tunstall,		150
Dunn v. Hull,		270
	<u>.</u> 3	285
Dunning v. Roe,		244
Dutour v. Ecollier,		98
		\mathbf{E} .

E.

Eames versus Jew,	Page 222
Eames v. Jew,	236
East v. Witton,	24
East Redford, Burgesses and Bailiss of,	v. Lang-
ley,	328
Easter 16 Geo. 2.	5 5
Easter 22 Geo. 2.	81
Eaton v. Southby,	16 6
Ecollier v. Dutour,	98
Edwards v. Darker,	240
Ellis v. Wall,	192
Elton v. Manwairing,	60
Elton v. Thomas,	6 p -
Engier v. Morris,	213
Ereskine v. Holland,	o 3
Etherington v. Cosens,	272
Evans v. George,	28
Evening v. Spearman,	80
Everest v. Sansum,	39 0
Everett v. Price,	32 I
Every v. Tynte,	54
F.	
Fairfax, Thomas, Esquire, Vouchee,	24
Famworth v. Smith,	260
Farmer v. Nesbitt,	144
Farfide v. Hayley,	168
Fawson v. Goodright,	1 5 0 ,
Fawkes v. Atkinson,	209
Fenn v. Marriott,	152
Fenton v. Margerum,	257
Ferguson v. Anonymous,	246
Fieldhouse v. Lannie,	280
Finch v. Wilson,	135
	Fisher

A lavie of the Names of the	Cajes.
Fisher versus Ashdowne,	Page 165
Fisher v. Ashdowne,	302
Fisher v. Kitchingman,	230
Fisher v. Kitchingman,	355
Fitch, qui tam, v. Nunn,	38 1
Fisch, who as well, v. Nunn,	384
Fitzwilliams v. Bishop of Hereford,	181
Fitzwilliams v. Bishop of Hereford,	268
Fleming v. Betts and Blake,	. 274
Fleet v. Stannard,	312
Fletcher v. Maddock,	299
Fletcher v. Dennis,	387
Flower v. Herbert,	292
Flower v. Herbert,	392
Folkett v. Trill, &c.	74
Ford and Ford v. Odam,	206
Foster v. Kirkley,	27
Foster v. Deighton,	156
Foot v. Hume,	330
Fowke v. Horabin, &c.	329
Fowler v. Wadcock,	198
Fowlis v. Grosvenor,	82
Francia v. Lumbosa de Mattos,	¥79
Francis v. Taylor,	67
Frank v. Richardson,	3 58
Freind v. Hope,	32
French v. Manby,	262
Frost v. Whadcock,	351
Fuller v. Swan,	228
Furnis v. Hallom,	140
Fyson v. Cooke,	116,
G.	
Gale v. Whitehead,	91
Gale v. Whitehead,	223
Gardiner v. Lawford,	74

	9	9
Gardiner versus Cam,		Page 182
Gardiner v. Goodall, Garforth v. Laycock,		199
Garforth v. Laycock,		38
Garmston v. Tracey,		320
Garnett v. Read,		55
Garnett v. Brumwell,		138
Garnett v. Harrison,		473
Garrick and Lacey v. Barry,		20
Garth v. Green,		93
Garth v. Wait,		197
Garway v. Stephens,		16
Gascoigne v. Browne,		185
Gent v. M'Allom,		332
Gentleman v. Bright,		33 1
Gibbs v. Tupigny de Maile,		322
Gilbert v. Gilbert,		207
Gladman v. Scott,		52
Gladman v. Bateman,		334
Glass v. Fiffin,		124
Goddard & al' v. Ballard,		² 75
Goodall v. Gardiner,		199
Goodenough v. Lamb,		290
Goodman v. Dixon,		325
Goodright v. Vice, Goodright v. Fawson,		146
Goodright v. Fawion,		150
Goodtitle v. Lowe, Goodtitle v. Thrustout,		102
Goodtitle v. Thrustout,		148
Goodtitle v. Notitle,		155 212
Goodtitle v. Clarke,		
Gorrill v. Clarke,		370 249
Gorton v. Thomlinson,		² 47
Gostelow v. Wright,		5.7
Goswell v. Hunt,		83 83
Gott v. Vavasor,		136
Grave v. Castell,		79
		Green

J		,
Green versus Garth,	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	Page 93
Green v. Littleton,		337
Green alias Smith, v. The Ma	yor of the F	Borough
of Leicester,	•	39 1
Green v. Beaton,		233
Greene v. Hobbs,		222
Greenfield v. Southerton,		205
Greenhow v. Ilsey,		112
Greenwood v. Richardson,		12
Greenwood, on Behalf of,		303
Gregg v. Bingham,		147
Gregg v. Smith,		380
Gregory v. Dormer,		127
Greffingham v. Treherne,		59
Grey v. Lockwood,		106
Grie v. Allen,		327
Grosvenor v. Hand, one, &c.	ı	344
Grove v. Kettle,		54
Grub v. Crick,		348
Gun v. Yates,		122
Guy v. Wilkinson,		25 I
H.		
Haddock v. Howard,		285
Haden v. Coles,		36
Hagan v. Browne,		288
Halding v. Burgess,		139
Hall v. Morfe,		208
Hall v. Lane,		276
Hall v. Douglass,		36a
Hallett v. Hellier,		232
Hallom v. Furnis,		140
Halton v. Holmes,		297
Hammond v. Stewart,		27
Hanbury v. Heathcock,		176
Hand v. Grosvenor,		344
I	3	Hankey
w. 4		

22 20000 07 000 2000000 07 000	o conjust
Hankey versus Smith,	Page 354
Harbin v. Clarke,	64.
Hardcastle v. Hutchinson,	85
Harman v. Dunn,	285
Harper v. Sherrard,	112
Harrison v. Littleton,	76
Harrison v. Speight,	286
Harrison v. Potter,	25
Harrison v. Morris,	270
Harrison v. Garnett,	273
Harrison v. Whaley,	293
Harrow v. Nash,	247
Hart v. Whitlocke,	35 9
Hartley alias Green v. Atkinson,	² 5 5
Harvey v. Parker,	318
Haryes v. Walker,	235
Havelock v. Tashburn,	239
Hawes v. Wetherall,	2 I I
Hawkes v. White,	316
Hawkes v. Holt junior,	338
Hawkins v. Valentine,	336
Hawys v. Rix,	37,5
Hayley v. Farside,	168
Haymam v. Jones,	39
Hayman v. De Revose,	173
Hayward v. Wells,	3 ⁸ 7
Hayward v. Ogier,	333
Heathcock v. Hanbury,	176
Heaton, on the Behalf of,	33
Hedges v. West,	174
Hedley v. Browne,	308
Heeley v. Hewson,	259
Hellier v. Hallett,	23
Hemming v. Benson,	282
Herbert v . Flower,	292
Herbert v. Flower,	293
Vol. II. a	Hereford

	9
Hereford, Bishop of, versus Rutter, Hereford, Bishop of, v. Rutter, Hereford, Bishop of, v. Fitzwilliams,	Page 1
Hereford, Bishop of, v. Rutter,	276
Hereford, Bishop of, v. Fitzwilliams,	181
Hereford, Bishop of, v. Fitzwilliams,	268
Heron v. Holland,	382
Hester v. Hall,	241
Hewson v. Heeley,	2 59
Hicks v. Young,	371
Highham, in the Treasury,	181
Highmore v. Barlow,	339
Hill v. Wadmore,	304
Hobbs v. Greene,	222
Hodges v. Charley,	218
Holdfast v. Jackson,	107
Holland v. Erskine,	80
Holland v. Heron,	382
Holme v. Halton,	297
Holt junior v. Hawkes,	338
Honiton v. Blatchford,	102
Hooper v. Comings,	84
Hope v. Freind,	32
Hopkins v. Purfer,	27
Hopkins v. Knap,	202
Hopkins v. Abdy,	316
Horabin v. Fowke,	3
Horton v. Scarrall,	227
Horton v. Turner,	104
Houghton v. Walnouth,	22
Houldston v. Bayley,	279
Howard v. Radbourne,	102
Howard v. Haddock,	285
Huggins v. Christie,	6
Hughes v. Roberts,	2 91
Hulls v. Merefield,	19
Hulls v. Merefield,	292
Hume v. Foot,	330
en e	Humes

Humes versus Wallace,	Page 187
Hunt v. Goswell,	83
Hussey v. Ray,	87
Hutchinson v. Hardcastle,	85
Hutt v. Dun,	270
Hyde v. Claxton,	63
,	
I.	
Jackman v. Mould,	51
Jackson v. Knight,	67
Jackson v. Holdfast,	107
Jackson v. Bright,	126
Jackson v. Warwick,	294
James v. Browne,	297
Jarratt v. Appleton and Love,	369
Ibbetson v. Browne,	99
Jenkin v. Bowler,	238
Jenkins v. Malland,	68
Jeremain v. Ridley,	389
Jersey, Earl of, v. Barnes and	
brien,	130
Jew v. Emes,	236
Ilsley v. Greenhow,	112
Incledon v. Clarke,	175
Ingham v. Chishull, &c.	11
Jones v. Hayman,	39
Jones v. Davies,	102
Jones v. Bevan,	162
Jones v. Stephenson,	254
Jones v. Davis,	288
Jones v. Sandys,	379
Johnson v. Johnson,	243
Jordan v. Davis,	387
Julian v. Shobrooke,	95
Judge v. Torr,	
	302
	302 K.

K.

Kemp versus The Hundred of St	afford and
Tickhill,	Page 366
Kennedy v. Corish,	384
Kerry v. Cade,	326
Kettle v. Grove,	54
Kettleby v. Woodcock,	56
King v. Lever,	28
King v. The Archbishop of York,	282
Kirkley v. Foster,	2
Kitchingman v. Fisher,	230
Kitchingman v. Fisher,	35 5
Kittle v. Bulftrode,	246
Knapp v. Hopkins,	202
Knight v. Jackson,	67
Knight v. Remy,	82
Knight v. Bowles,	190
Knight v. Absolom,	356
Kynaston v. Wynne;	13
L.	
Lacey and Garrick v. Barry,	20
Lacy v. Lock,	274
Lacy v. Barry,	292
Lafortune v. Wilson,	87
Lamb v. Goodenough,	290
Landon v. Pickering,	163
Lane v. Hall,	276
Langley v. Dryden,	22
Langley v. Bothwright,	189
Langley v. The Bailiffs and Burgesses	of East-
Redford,	328
Lannie v. Fieldhouse,	280
	Launder

	,
Launder versus Cokayne,	Page 35
Lawes v. Saichwell,	6 i
Lawndy v. Clarke,	177
Lawrence v. Playford,	. 279
Laycock v. Garfooth,	38
Laycock v. Smith,	239
Layford v. Gardiner,	74
Lee v. Oldham,	221
Lee v. Walker, &c.	245
Leeds, The Duke of, v. Vevers,	208
Leeke v. Leighton, Baronet,	315
Leekie v. Davies,	71
Leicester, The Mayor of, v. Green,	39 1
Leighton v. Leeke,	315
Lever v. King.	28
Lewis v. Newton,	6 r
Lewis v. Askham,	386
Linthwaite v. Bigbie,	323
Lifter v. Wainhouse,	66
Litfon v. Cooke,	392
Littleton v. Hanson,	76
Littleton v. Greene,	33 7
Lloyd v. Cullum,	271
Lock v. Lacy,	274
Lockwood v. Grey,	106
Lodge v. Smith,	287
Loggin v. Rawlins and Pullen,	2 I
Lomax v. The Bilhop of London,	118
Lombe v. Lombe,	176
London, The Bishop of, v. Lomax,	118
Long v. Wagstaffe,	200
Longman v. Rogers,	200
Love v. Jarrett,	369
Low v. Beart,	172
Lowe v. Goodtitle,	102
Lowe v. Lowe,	102
a 3	Lowe

Lowe versus Peacock,	Page 234
Lucas v. Buckle,	202
Lucas v. Marsh,	361
Lunbrosa de Mattos v. Francia,	179
Lunn v. Afcough,	34
Lutwidge v. Norton,	88
Lytton v. Rolle,	277
M.	
Machin v. Delaval,	31, 224
Maddock v. Fletcher,	299
Mallard v. Jenkins,	6a
Mallon v. Gent,	332
Malton v. Acklam,	117
Maltom v. Acklom,	345
Manley v. French,	262
Manning v. Williams,	58
Manwaring v. Elton,	60
Manwaring v. Thomas,	60
Margerum v. Fenton,	2 ₅ 7
Marks, by Brimmer her next Friend,	15
Marlow v. Weekes,	36 0
Marriott v. Fenn,	152
Marsh v. Lucas,	36 0
Martin v. Ridge,	166
Martin ex parte,	180
Martin v. Russel,	217
Martin v. Ballard,	275
Mason v. Obrien, Esquire, Earl of	Inchiquin,
*	334
Masters v. Ruck,	5
Matchett v. Dalling,	53
Matthews v. Brewer,	² 77
Maurice v. Engier,	213
Mayo v. Weaver,	90
	Mayor
	-

Mayor of the Borough of Leicester,	versus Green
alias Smith,	Page 391
Mead v. Robinson,	359
Mecheil v. Vale,	230
Mee v. Orion,	158
Meredith v. Barry, commonly called	Lord Butte-
vant,	315
Merefield v. Hulls,	19, 292
Meriton v. Stevens,	164
Mich. 18 Geo. 2.	309
Milbourne v. Reade,	108
Miller v. Parsons,	242
Mitchell v. Younghusband,	111
Moffat v. Ogle,	107, 253
Molloy v. Petit,	179
Moody's Cafe,	33
Moore v. Prynne,	313
Moorhouse v. Barham,	121
Morris v. Harrison,	270
Morfe v. Hall,	208
Mosey v. Pitfield,	296
Mould v. Jackman,	<i>5</i> I
Moyfe v. Cockfedge,	373
Murray v. Bowen,	20
37	
N.	
Nash v. Harrow,	247
Needham v. Whetham,	403
Newton v. Lewis,	6 1
Noke v. Ingham and Chishull,	11
Norman v. Beaumont,	36 2
Northern v. Oliver,	205
Norton v. Lutwidge,	88
Notitle v. Goodtitle,	212
Nunn v. Fitch, qui tam,	381, 384
Nurkins v. Wilkin,	73
301.7.1. a.4	O

Ο.

Obeden versus Wright,	Page 332
Obrien, Esquire, Earl of Inchiquin,	
•	334
O'Bryen, Lady Mary, v. The Earl	of Jersey,
	130
Ogier, qui tam, v. Hayward,	332
Ogle v. Moffat,	107, 253
Okes v. Stiles,	148
Oliver v. Northern,	205
Orion v. Mee,	158
Otway v. Cokayne,	56
Overton v. Stone,	9
Overton v. Baxter,	85
Ouldham v. Lee,	221
-	
P.	
Palmer v. Williams,	JOI
Palmer v. Bond,	352
Parker v. Harvey,	318
Paris v. Stroud,	72
Parsons v. White,	312
Peacocke v. Lowe,	254
Peck v. Adams,	320
Peirce v. Saunders,	228
Peirce v. Britton,	378
Penrice v. Penrice,	191
Pennington v. Welch,	319
Penvold v. Thomlinson,	287
Pepiatt, one, &c. v. Bell,	255
Percival v. Thrustout,	149
Peronet v. Smith,	322
Petit v. Molloy,	179
Phillips v. Smith,	284
	Philmore

	•
Philmore versus Sir William Stanhope,	Page 340,
	341
Pickering v. Landon, Pickering v. Thomson,	163
Pickering v. Thomson,	167
Pindar v. Steele,	272
Pitcairne v. Clerk, in Prohibition,	100
Pitt v. Wortley,	338, 33 9
Playford v. Lawrence, Poole v. Boulton,	279
Poole v. Boulton,	118
Pool v. Cook,	308
Potter v. Harrison,	25
Potter v. Colfworthy,	341
Powell v. Seaber, Powell v. Rolles,	66
Powell v. Rolles,	141
Pratt v. Tribe,	65
Preston, on the Demise of, v.	, in Eject-
ment,	ī 5 7
Preston v. Prinnell,	278
Price v. Street,	84
Price v. Diggs,	248
Price v. Diggs, Price v. Everett,	321
Priddle v. Skurray,	10
Prince v. Davis,	346
Prinnell v. Preston.	278
Proctor v. Bury, Proffer v. Wilcox,	357
Proffer v. Wilcox.	72
Prows v. Child,	310
Prynne v. Moore,	313
Purser v. Hopkins,	27
-	-/
Q.	
Quare impedit,	118
R,	
Radburn v. Howard,	102
Randal v. Tarrant,	23
Randle v. Wair,	214
•	Rash

==	_
	ige 36
Rawlins v. Loggin,	2 I
Rawlinfon v. Stone, 161	
Ray v. Hussey,	87
Ray v. Dearsley,	295
Read v. Garnett,	5 5
Read v. Sparrow,	193
Reade v. Milbourne,	108
Redford, the Bailiffs and Burgesses of, v.	
ley,	328
Reed v. Blanchett,	244
Remy v. Knight,	82
Reyner v. Brough.	62
Reynoldson v. Blades,	94
Richardson v. Greenwood.	12
Richardson v. Walker,	386
Richwood v. Cockfedge,	37
Rickaby v. Wilson,	388
Ridge v. Martin,	166
Ridley v. Wilson,	337
Ridley v. Jeremain,	389
Ring v. Bold,	19
Rithton v. Turton,	219
Rix v. Hawys,	375
Roberts v. Hughes,	291
Roberts v. Boswell,	340
Robinson v. Dale,	261
Robinson v. Scoffin,	128
Robinson v. Mead,	359
Roe v. Pearson,	81
Roe v. Doe, on the Demise of Stephenson,	153
Roe v. Doe, on the Demise of Hyde,	154
Roe v. Doe, on the Demise of Stone,	160
Roe v. Aylmer,	194
Roe, on the Demise of Hutching, v. Du	nning.
	244
2	Roe

Roe versus Whitehead,	Page 348
Rogers v. Longman,	200
Rogers v. Bulling,	. 226
Rolle v. Lytton,	27 7
Roquett v. Roquett,	324
Ross v. Yeoman,	231
Ross v. Austin,	234
Rowles v. Powell,	141
Rowson v. Williamson,	167
Royden v. Batty,	229
Ruck v. Masters,	5
Rutter v. The Bishop of Hereford,	1, 276
Ruffell v. Martin,	217
Ruffell v. Ball,	366
Ryall v. Chapman,	329
-	•
S,	
Salmon v. Aldrich,	² 75
Samfon v. Day,	<i>35</i> 3
Sander v. Spincks,	89
Sanders v. Peirce,	228
Sandys v. Spivey,	306
Sandys v. Spooner,	379
Sansum v. Everest,	39 0
Satchwell v. Burdus,	1 78
Satchwell v. Barber,	2 65
Saville v. Wiltshire,	139, 212
Scarrall v. Horton,	227
Scoffin v. Robinfon	, 128
Scott v. Gladman,	52
Scott v. Bentley,	² 5 7
Scrutton on the Demise of, v. Driver,	13
Seaber v. Powell,	66
Selman v. Courtney,	350
Semple v. Bailey,	241
Shaft v. Downes,	99
	Sharpe

3	y
Sharpe versus Sharpe,	Page 135
Sharpe v. Wilcox,	217
Shepard v. Randal,	234
Shepard v. Clarke,	385
Sherrard v. Harper,	112
Shields v. Cuthbertson,	133
Simpson v. Bell,	349
Shobrook v. Julian,	95
Shone v. Cook,	45, 385
Short v. King,	157
Shorter v. Burdus,	178
Skipwith v. Cross,	355
Skurry v. Priddle,	353 10
Skyllins v. Davis,	188
Slaser v. Trim,	39
Smales v. Waite,	111 29
Smith v. Smithson,	70
Smith v. Gregg,	380
Smith v. Phripp,	171
Smith v. Tidmarsh,	232
Smith v. Laycock,	239
Smith v. Blackmore,	242
Smith v. Farnworth,	260
Smith v. Lodge,	287
Smith v. Peronet,	322
Smith v. Hankey,	354
Smithson v. Smith,	70
Southby v. Eaton,	166
Sparrow v. Reade,	193
Spearman v. Evening,	80
Speed v. Barber,	258
Speight v. Harrison,	286
Spencer v. Thomlinfon,	143
Spinckes v. Sanders,	89
Spivey v. Sandys,	306
Spooner v. Barlett,	377
	· Spurrell
	- Parici

	•	
Spurrell versus Webb,	Page	196
Stafford v. Thompson,		2 37
Stafford, the Hundred of, v. Kemp,		36 6
Stanhope, Sir William, v. Philmore,	340,	
Stannard v. Fleet,	•	312
Stanynought, one, &c. v, and se	ven ot	
		172
Stanynought v. Cosins,		367
Stapleton v. Baron de Stark,		96
Steele v. Pindar,		272
Stephenson v. Brookes,		26
Stevens v. Garway,		16
Stevens v. Meriton,		164
Stevens v. Dobson,		376
Stewart v. Hammond,		274
Stiles v. Oakes,		148
Stockwell v. Ashley,		263
Stone v. Overton,	,	9
Stone v. Rawlinson,		161
Street v. Price,		84
Stroud v. Paris,		72
Stuart v. Beaumand,		15
Studwell v. Bunton,		71
Sugar, qui tam, v. Webster,		253
Sunning, the Hundred of, v. Chandle	r,	37I
Sutton v. Waddilove,		250
Swan v. Calcraft,		162
Swan v. Fuller,		228
Swarbeck v. Wheeler,		81
Sweetapple v. Atterbury,		174
Swinley v. Woodhouse,		214
Sykes v. Dawson,		170

Т.

Talton versus Waldron,	Page 28
Tayler v. Wittall,	285
Taylor v. Atkins,	231
Teafdale v. Britten,	43
Terrill v. Milton,	252
Thomas v. Manwaring,	60
Thomas v. Apperley,	14
Thomas v. Doe,	151
Thomlinson v. Gorton,	247
Thomlinson v. Penvold,	287
Thomlinfon v. Spencer	143
Thompkins v. Woodley,	305
Thomson v. Pickering,	167
Thompson v. Rash,	36
Thompson v. Bristow,	165
Thompson v. Stafford,	237
Thompson v. Atkinson,	284
Thrustout v. Woodyear,	103
Thrustout v. Goodiitle,	148, 155
Thrustout v. Percival,	149
Thorn v. Wrey,	364
Thornhill v. Tunnard,	273
Tidmarsh v. Smith,	232
Tiffin v. Glass,	124
Towne v. Walker,	245
Tracey v. Preston,	78
Trappett v. Bristow,	280
Treherne v. Greffingham,	59
Treherne v. Wells,	270
Treeweeke v. Wright,	342
Tribe v. Pratt,	65
Trill v. Follett,	74
	Trim

Trim versus Slater,	Page 39
Trinity 17 & 18 Geo. 2.	135
Trinity 18 & 19 Geo. 2.	160
Tunnard v. Thornhill,	² 73
Tunstall v. Duckworth,	150
Tupipney de Mailey v. Gibbs,	322
Turner v. Cowper,	171
Turner v. Pigg,	183
Turner v, Bullythorpe, Turner v. Horton,	281
Turner v. Horton,	104
Turton v. Rishton,	219
Tutton v. Andrews,	354
Tynte v. Every,	54
•	
U.	
Valentine v. Hawkins,	336
Vane v. Mechell,	230
Vavasor v. Gott,	136
Vevers v. The Duke of Leeds,	208
Vice v. Goodright,	146
Vile v. Daw,	250
Vilmott v. Barry,	36
Unwin v. Deane,	220
Ufborne v. Bludwick,	18
W.	
	2.40
Waddilove v. Sutton,	250
Wade v. Wadman,	142
Wadman v. Wade,	142
Wadmore v. Hill,	304 200
Wagstaff v. Long,	66
Wainhouse v. Lister,	
Wait v. Garth,	19 7
Waite v. Smales,	Waldron
	V AIGEOIL

Waldron versus Talton,	Page 28
Walker v. Towne,	245
Walker v. Haryes,	325
Walker v. Richardson,	386
Wall v. Ellis,	192
Wallace v. Humes,	187
Walnouth v. Houghton,	229
Ware v. The Weavers Company,	2 66
Warwick v. Jackson,	2 94
Watson v. Tilney,	237
Watt v. Alanfon,	316
Weat v. Parker,	262
Weaver v. Mayo,	90
Weavers Company v. Ware,	266
Webb v. Spurrell,	196
Webster v. Barrowclough,	126
Webster v. Sugar, qui tam,	2 53
Weddall v. Witton,	24
Welch v. Pennington,	319
Wells v. Treherne,	270
Wells v. Hayward,	387
West v. Hedges,	174
Whadcock v. Frost,	351
Whadcock v. Fowler,	198
Whaley v. Harrison,	293
Wheeler v. Marlow,	360
Wheeler v. Swarbrook,	81
Whetham v. Needham,	40
White v. Hawkes,	316
White v. Whithall,	261
White v. Dunster,	259
White v. Parsons,	312
Whitehall v. Carr,	383
Whitehead v. Gale,	91, 223
Whitehead v. Roe,	348
	Whitelock

· .	•	•
Whitelock versus Hart,	•	Page 359
Whitfield v. Whitfield	•	97
Wignall v. Bouch,		145
Wilcock v. Bownas;		294
Wilcox v. Proffer,		72
Wilcox v. Sharpe,		217
Wilkes v. Broadbent;		9
Wilkin v. Nutkins,		73
Wilkinson v. Guy,		251
Wilkinson v. Carleton,) }	57
Wilks v. Broadbent,		106, 206
Williams v. Hill,		289
Williams v. Palmer,		101
Williams v. Manning,	:	58
Williamson v. Rownso	n _{š:}	167
Willoughby v. Vincent	,	35
Willoughby v. Cracraft	, i	184
Wilson v. Ridley,		337
Wilson v. Rickabey,		388
Wilson v. Davids,		16
Wilson v. Lafortune,		87
Wilson v. Barber,		248
Wiltshire v. Saville,		139, 212
Wingfield v. Beard,		336
Winkworth v. Wyat,		26
Withall v. White,	•	261
Wittall v. Taylor,		285
Witton v. East,		24
Witton v. Weddall,		24
Woeden v. Sanders,		37 <i>5</i>
Wood v. Dodson,		225
Woodcock v. Kettleby		56
Woodhouse v. Swinley	,	183, 214
Woodley v. Tompkins	5 ₉	3°5
Woodman v. Dapp,		249
Vol. II.	b	Woodyear

Woodyear versus Thrustout, Wortley v. Pitt, Wrey v. Thorn, Wright v. Treeweeke, Wright v. Gostelow, Wright v. Bennington, Wyatt v. Winkworth, Wynne v. Kynaston,		Page 338,	103 339 364 347 57 233 26
Y. Yate v. Swaine, Yeoman v. Ross, Younghusband v. Mitchell, York, the Archbishop of, v.	King,		189 231 111 282

Α

TABLE

OF THE

HEADS

Contained in the

SECOND VOLUME.

↑ CTIONS Real,	Page 1
Amendments,	3
Attachment,	27
Attornies and Warrants of Attorny,	33
Award, Submission, &c.	53
Bail, Bail-Bonds, &c.	56
Costs and Bills of Costs,	98
Damages,	129
Deaf and Dumb Persons,	130
Demurrer and other Special Argument	s, 132
Discontinuance,	145
Ejectments,	146
Error,	161
	Execu-

A TABLE of the Heads.

Executions, Page	162
Fine,	176
Habeas Corpus et Procedendo,	177
Imparlance,	181
Inquiry,	187
Inspection of Court-Rolls and Books,	194
Judgments,	196
Mony, Goods, &c. brought into Court,	227
Notice and Countermand,	237
Nonpros, Nonfuit, &c.	248
Outlawry,	258
Oyer,	265
Pleadings and Time to plead,	268
Prisoners,	299
Process, Service thereof, Rules, &r.	325
Prohibition,	345
Replevin,	346
Scire facias,	347
Supersedeas,	348
Trials, Verdict, &c.	350
Venue and Venire facias,	384

Actions Real.

Rutter against The Bishop of Hereford and the University of Cambridge. Trin. 16 Geo. 2.

In Quare
Impedit.

Commission to examine touching secret Trusts for Papists, according to the Statute 12 Ann. to Commissioners in the Country, and directed the Prothonotary to strike Commissioners Names, and settle the Interrogatories. Hayward for Plaintiss; Birch for Defendant.

Vol. II.

B

Foster

Foster against Kirkley. Trin. 26 & 27
Geo. 2.

In Dower. THE Tenant after appearing to the Grand Cape, returnable the third Return of this Term, obtained a Rule, on Poole's Motion, to shew Cause why he should not have an Imparlance; which was discharged on hearing Draper for the Demandants. In Dower unde nichil habet, or any other real Action, Imparlance is not to be given; Essoins are sufficient Delay; real Actions are not within any of the Rules of Court concerning Imparlances.

Fowke against Horabin and others. Trin. 13 & 14 Geo. 2.

AFTER a Verdict found for the Plaintiff, feveral Objections were made in Arrest of Judgment: The principal were, That tho' the Action was Trespass upon the Case, the Jurata at the Foot of the Record of Ni. pri. was in Trespass only. That instead of faying, unless the Chief Justice should come before on the 12th of July, it was faid, unless he should come before the 12th of July. That two of the Defendants being Sheriff of Middlesex, the Ve. fa. was awarded to the Coroners, but by the Jurata the Writ was alledged to be delivered to the Sheriff to be executed. That the Writ of Ve. fa. instead of being made returnable in Court, was made returnable before the Chief Justice. And that the Declaration recited an Original against James Brooke and others, and counted against the said John Brooke. As to the first Objection, the Court held it to be help'd by the Statute of Jeofails. As to the fecond Objection, by the Writ of Ha. cor. Jur. the Day of Trial was rightly appointed, and the Jurata is amendable by the Writ. As to the third Objection, The Ve. fa. appeared to be returned B 2

4

returned by the Coroners, and the Jurata is only wrong by Misprision of the Clerk. The Return of the Ve. fa. tho' defective, is within the Statutes of Amendment. And as to the last Objection, the Word John in the Declaration must be rejected, and then the Count will stand against the said Brooke, which must be the James Brooke before mentioned. The feveral necessary Amendments were ordered, and thereupon the Rule to stay the Entry of Final Judgment was discharged, and the Plaintiff's Attorny, who had made fo many gross Blunders, was ordered to pay Costs. Prime and Draper for Defendants; Wynne and Agar for Plaintiff. Vide Waldo against Harrison. Trin 7 & 8 G. 2.

Cook against Shone and others.

Defendants, Surveyors, &c. for building Westminster Bridge, for taking away and destroying Plaintiff's Timber, to the Value of 500 l. and by the Act of Parliament for building the said Bridge, Plaintiff is confined to bring his Action within six Months, and to lay it in Middlesex. By Mistake of Gillman, Plaintiff's former Attorny, who now absconds, the Action was laid in London instead of Middlesex; and the Mistake was not discovered till after Plea pleaded and Issue joined. The Fact appeared to be committed

on 22d August 1739, and the Action to be commenced within the fix Months. Plaintiff now moved for Leave to change the Venue from London to Middlesex; which was ordered, upon Payment of Costs. If the Amendment could not be made, Plaintiff must lose his Remedy; he is now too late to bring a new Action. In an Action upon a Penal Statute the Court probably would not interpose, but in the Case of a Remedial Law, the Amendment must be made. Skinner for Plaintiff; Prime for Desendant. 3 Lev. 347. Bearcroft against The Hundred of Burnham.

Masters against Ruck.

In Error. THE Teste of a Writ of Certiorari, by Mistake, was made in the 13th Year of our [Lord] instead of our [Reign]. Upon a Motion for Leave to amend the same, it was doubted whether the Court had Power to amend fuch a Writ, or not. In order to support the Amendment, Prime for Plaintiff cited the Statutes of Amendment, 8 H. 6. c. 8. and 14 Ed. 3. c. 6. and the Case of Brooke and others against Cooper, in B. R. Trin. 6 G. 2. to shew that the Teste of a Writ of Inquiry out of Term was amended; and an Anonymous Cafe 3 Ventris 171. as to different Sorts of Amendments; and Blackmore's Case in the 8th Report. Draper for Defendant infifted, that B 3

this was fuch a Writ as could not be amended; and he cited the Case of Heath against Paget, I Lev. 2. to shew, that no Original Writ can be amended, and to shew that the Teste of a Writ of Error is not amendable, he cited the Statute 5 G. c. 13. But Prime by Reply argued, that this is not an Original but a Judicial Writ, therefore amendable by all the Statutes of Amendment. The Court doubted; and pending their Consideration, in Trinity Term 1740, the Amendment, by Consent of the Parties, was ordered, on Payment of Costs.

Christie against Huggins.

HIS was an Action brought by Plain-tiff against Defendant for suffering Sir Alexander Anstruther to escape out of his Custody, when Warden of the Fleet; and Issue was joined in Trinity Term 11 G. and Plaintiff having by his Declaration, among other . Things, shewn, that Sir Alexander was removed from the King's Bench by Ha. cor. tested 26th June 10 G. being the last Day of Trinity Term, returnable immediate. before Mr. Justice Dormer, and by that Judge committed to the Fleet, It was (as Plaintiff thought) requisite to prove a Copy of the Entry of such Ha. cor. upon the Roll, with the Return thereto, and the Commitment of Sir Alexander thereon, at the Trial of the Cause. Therefore a Motion was made, Easter 12 G.

12 G. 2. on Plaintiff's Behalf, that such a Roll might be filed; and a Rule was granted to shew Cause.

On Defendant's Behalf it was also moved, that the Roll on which the Issue between the Parties had been enter'd, might be taken out of the Bundle of Rolls in the Treasury, and vacated, and that the Clerk of the Treasury might be restrained from receiving any Roll in this Cause, without Leave of the Court. And a Rule Nifi was granted, upon Affidavits that feveral Searches had been made at different Times in the Treasury for that Roll, and that it was not then filed; and it likewife appeared, that a Caution had been given to the Treasury-Keeper against receiving this Roll. The Clerk of the Treasury and Treasury-Keeper were directed to attend, to - inform the Court what the Practice is concerning the bringing in and filing of Rolls in the Treasury, and how the said Issue Roll came into the Bundle.

Upon Cause being shewn against the above Rules, in Trinity Term 1740, as to the Issue Roll it appeared, that the Clerk of the Essoins had made two different Files of the fame Numbers of Trinity Term, and that neither the Clerk of the Treasury or Treasury-Keeper knew any thing of that Roll coming into the Treasury; consequently that it was in the Bundle when the Search had been made by Defendant: But as there was no Appre-

8

Apprehension of there being two different Files of the fame Numbers, this Roll was not found for want of fearching that File, (where it really was) but the other. And as to the other Roll, it appeared that the Entry produced, which Plaintiff wanted to file, was made upon a Roll of Michaelmas Term 10 G. 2. that being the Term in which it was alledged Mr. Justice Dormer had delivered the Writ, &c. into Court to be recorded; and that an Entry had been made of the Ha. cor. Return and Commitment, upon a Roll of Trinity Term, when the Writ was tested, and that the same was filed among the Rolls of that Term, which the Court thought was an Entry of the proper Term: But fuch Entry not agreeing exactly with the Ha. cor. and it not shewing that Mr. Justice Dormer had on the first Day of Michaelmas Term delivered the Writ, &c. into Court, to be inrolled, the Court therefore discharged both the Rules to shew Cause, and ordered that the Entry of the Writ of Ha. cor. &c. upon the Roll of Trinity Term should be amended, by inserting (cameram suam situat' in le Serjeants Inn in le Chancery Lane London) those being the Words omitted in the Entry which were in the Writ; and that the following Words should be inserted at the Conclusion of such Entry, (viz.) Quam quidem Commissionem idem Justic' Robertus Dormer Ar' postea scilt' vicesimo tertio die Octobris

bris Anno regni dicti Domini Regis nunc undecimo per manus suas proprias deliberavit hic in Cur' de recordo irrotuland' ac irrotulat', &c. Skinner and Prime for Desendant; Agar and Draper for Plaintiff.

Stone against Overton. Hil. 14 G. 2.

RULE to shew Cause why a new Record of Ni. pri. and Ha. cor. Jur. should not be made out and returned by the Associate, agreeable to his Minutes taken at the Trial, the old Record having been lost, made absolute. It was objected for Desendant, that the Names of the twelve Jurors who were sworn can't now be known, (the Associate not having kept any Entry of their Names) so as to make a new Return. But the Objection was over-ruled; the Jurors are not now named in the Return of the Record of Ni. pri. or in the Final Judgment, nor were they before the late Ballotting Act, unless in Case of a Tales. Draper for Plaintiff; Gapper for Desendant.

Broadbent against Wilkes. Easter 14 Geo. 2.

Efendant mistook a Fact, and set out a Custom wrong; he applied to Mr. Justice Parker for Leave to amend, but Plaintiff not consenting, the Judge made no Order.

Order. Plaintiff figned Judgment, and before Enquiry executed, Defendant gave Notice of Motion: Defence was made on the Enquiry. Per Cur': Let the Judgment and Enquiry be fet aside, and let the Plea be amended on Payment of Costs, and Defendant's bringing 15 l. Damages, found by the Inquisition, into Court. Bootle for Defendant; Draper for Plaintiff.

Priddle against Skurray and others. Trin. 14 & 15 Geo. 2.

R. Justice Fortescue Aland made an Order that Plaintiff should have Leave to amend his Declaration, in the Particulars to the Order annexed. Defendants moved to discharge the Order upon the Face of it for Precedent Sake. Particulars are the Substance of the Order, and ought to be inserted in the Body of it. Of that Opinion were the Court, and the Rule to shew Cause why the Order should not be discharged, was made absolute. Belsield for Defendants; Burnet for Plaintiff.

Anonymus. Hil. 14 Geo. 2.

PER Cur': In an Action on a Penal Statute, Defendant cannot plead doubly. This Case is not within the Statute for the Amendment of the Law.

Ingham

Ingham against Chishull and Noke. Easter 17 Geo. 2.

HIS was a joint Action on feveral Af-fumptions. Chishull pleaded Bankruptcy. Noke pleaded a former Recovery for the fame Demand. After Judgment against Noke on Nul tiel Record. Plaintiff confessed Chispull's Plea to be true, and entered a Nolle profegui as to him, pursuant to the Statute 7 Ann. Plaintiff made out his Writ of Enquiry in the same Manner as if the interlocutory Judgment had been against both Defendants, but by the Inquisition, Damages were found against Noke only. Defendant Noke moved to set aside the Writ of Enquiry and Inquisition, and obtained a Rule to shew Cause; pending which Rule, Plaintiff moved to amend the Writ, by striking out Chishull's Name after the Taliter processum fuit; and the Rule for the Amendment was made absolute, without Opposition. After which Amendment the Writ tallied with the Inquifition, and the Defendant's Rule was difcharged. Draper for Plaintiff; Skinner for Defendant Noke.

Greenwood

Greenwood against Richardson, one, &c. Mich. 19 Geo. 2.

THE Bill was, by Mistake, entitled I Trin. 19 Geo. 2. instead of 19 & 20. Defendant moved to stay Proceedings, and had a Rule to shew Cause; which Rule was discharged, and the Title of the Bill ordered to be amended, on Payment of Costs. Plaintiff alledged, that the Statute of Limitations would take Place if he was put to file a new Bill. But the Court paid no Regard to that. Clarke against Cotton, one, &c. Mich. 6 Geo. 2. was quoted, where the Bill was amended from producit sectam to petit Remedium; producit sectam fignifies no more than that Evidence is ready, petit Remedium feems unnecessary. The Court have a different Controul over Original Writs iffued out of Chancery, and Original Bills filed here. This Vitium Clerici, or Nescience of the Clerk of the Court, is amendable by his Instructions, and by the Entry of the Bill in the Prothonotary's Book of Trin. 19 & 20. An Original out of Chancery is amendable by the Cursitor's Instructions. This Case is not fimilar to a Declaration in Ejectment; the Title thereof is not amendable, there being nothing to amend by. Hayward for Plaintiff; Draper for Defendant.

Beaumont

Beaumont against Cosin, one, &c. Hil. 19 Geo. 2.

RULE to shew Cause on Plaintiff's Application, why Declaration should not be amended, by inserting in the Memorandum the true Day of proclaiming, viz. 28th November, (instead of 23d October, which was before the Cause of Action.) Rule absolute, on Payment of Costs. Defendant to have Time to plead de novo, pleading in Bar. Bootle for Plaintiff; Agar for Defendant.

Driver, on the Demise of Scrutton, against Scrutton and others. His 18 Geo. 2.

In Ejectment. R ULE to shew Cause why the Demise should not be amended in Point of Time discharged. This is never done without Consent. Willes for Plaintiff; Prime for Defendant.

Wynne, Esq; and Kynaston, Esq; Demandants, Thomas, Gent. Tenant, Apperly, Dr. of Physick, and Alathea his Wife, Vouchees, by Attorny. Hil. 18 Geo. 2.

RIT of Entry returnable Quinden.

Paschae. Tested ad Abril 100 Survey. VV Paschæ, Tested 2d April, last Summons returnable Crastino Ascensionis Domini, being 16th May; the Dedimus Potestatem to take the Vouchees Warrant of Attorny bore Teste 25th April, and the Mittimus 18th May. The Recovery was arraigned at Bar 5th May. Mrs. Apperly the Wife, a Vouchee, died 10th May, fix Days before the Return of the Summons. A Writ of Error being brought, and the Death of the Vouchee before the Return of the Summons, affigned for Error in Fact, Application was made to this Court to amend the Teste and Return of the Writ of Entry, and a Rule to shew Cause. The Court, after hearing Council on both Sides, and Confideration, was of Opinion, That all Amendments must be considered with Rules of Law, and there must be fomething to amend by. In this Case, the Vouchees by Law could not appear till the Return of the Summons; and the Power of Attorny given by Alathea to appear at that Day, was revoked by her Death in the intermediate

termediate Time. By Statute 3 H. 6. c. 12. Original Writs amendable if wrong by Misprision of the Clerk, or where there is any thing to amend by. Here is no Misprision of the Clerk; the Writ is made agreeable to his Instructions, and nothing to amend by. The Amendment prayed, is to amend in the first Instance. The Rule discharged. Willes al. for Doctor Apperly and Demandants and Tenant; Skinner & al. for Wynne, Esq; and his Wise, entitled to the Estate in Remainder.

Beaumand against Stuart, a Prisoner. Hilary 20 Geo. 2.

RULE absolute, giving Plaintiff Leave to deliver a new Issue properly entitled; in the Title of the Issue already delivered, the Word (George) was omitted, it stood thus, Hilary Term 20th King the Second. Wynne for Plaintiff; Bootle for Defendant.

Marks, Spinster, by Brimmer her next Friend. Trin. 21 Geo. 2.

Plaintiff's next Friend sworn to be a material Witness for Plaintiff, who was now of full Age: Plaintiff moved for Leave to strike out Brimmer.

Davids

Davids, Spinster, against Wilson. Hil. 21 Geo. 2.

RULE to shew Cause why final Judgment on Verdict should not be amended in particularibus, after Writ of Error and Record transcribed, but the Transcript not carried into the King's Bench. The Amendments were, to insert the Words

agreeable to the standing Form used by the Clerks of the Judgments; some other little Mistakes, which were Vitium Clerici; and to make a Juryman's Name Marshall instead of Marshell by the Panel, &c. to make the Record consistent; on reading Postea, Ha. cor. and Panel. Skinner for Plaintist; Belsield and Poole for Desendant.

Garway against Stevens. Easter 21 Geo. 2.

Plaintiff moved to add a new Count to his Declaration, which was of last Michaelmas Term, on Payment of Costs. Defendant objected, that by the Course of the Court a Count cannot be added after the second Term; which was agreed to be the Practice: But as Plaintiff might discontinue, and to save the Trouble of a new Action, the Rule for the Amendment was made absolute, on Payment of Costs of Plea and Application.

tion, and Defendant having Leave to plead de novo. Bootle for Defendant; Skinner for Plaintiff.

Bird, Executor of Smith against Foster the younger. Trin. 21 & 22 G. 2.

In Assumption Description in London, and declared with a Profert of Letters Testamentary from the Bishop's Court at Durham, obtained a Rule to shew Cause why he should not amend the Declaration, by laying the Venue in Northumberland instead of London. On thewing Cause, the Court discharged the Rule, it not being usual to amend the Venue at Plaintiff's Instance, unless where the Action by Act of Parliament is confined to a particular County, (fuch as the Westminster Bridge Act, &c.) and Plaintiff by Mistake lays it in another County: Simple Contract Debts follow the Person of the Debtor, Specialties are Affets where found. In this Cafe, the Amendment prayed feems to be to make good an Administration, which probably is void in Law. Bootle and Wynne for Defendant; Prime for Plaintiff.

Vol. II. C Bludwick

Bludwick and Wife, Executors, against Usborne, Executor. Same Term.

Public to shew Cause why Desendant should not have Leave to add to some Pleas already pleaded, by Leave of the Court, two new Pleas, discharged. The Question was Matter of Title, and the Cause to be tried at the Sitting after Term. Desendant had Time to apply last Term, he is under no Surprize: Plaintiffs can't now be prepared to answer new Matter. Bootle and Poole for Desendant; Prime and Draper for Plaintiffs.

Wood against Boon, Esq; having Privilege of Parliament. Mich. 22
Geo. 2.

by adding Pledges to profecute, and a Memorandum making the Declaration agreeable to the Bill on Record, on Payment of Costs. Rule to shew Cause, which was afterwards made absolute.

Ring, Demandant; Bold, Tenant; Harrington, Vouchee. East. 22 G. 2.

ILLES for the Vouchee moved to amend the Recovery, by striking out It is adjudged, and inserting, It is Confidered. Granted absolutely; the Amendment prayed relating to the Act of the Court in giving their Judgment.

Merefield against Hulls. Trin. 24 G. 2.

Abeas Corpus cum Causa to remove Defendant to the Fleet, was made returnable before Lord Chief Justice at his Chambers, and Defendant was committed by the late Mr. Justice Fortescue Aland: Motion by Agar, to amend the Ha. cor. by making it returnable before the Judge by whom the Prisoner was committed. But per Cur: The Amendment prayed is unnecessary. The Commitment is warranted by the Practice, and is similar to the Ha. cor. Act, 32 Car. 2. In the Absence of the Chief Justice, the other Judge had the same Power.

Lacy and Garrick against Barry.
Easter 24 Geo. 2.

In Debt, for a Penalty in Articles of Agreement.

Efendant moved for Leave to amend his Plea, and for Over of the Articles, after Demurrer to the Plea, Joinder and Argument, and farther Day appointed. On shewing Cause, the Matter of Oyer was given up, as not prayed within Time, and as to it the Rule was discharged; but the Amendments tending to state Facts necessary to bring the Construction of an Act of Parliament, and the true Merits of the Case, before the Court, the Rule as to them was made absolute, on Payment of Costs. Amendments to be made within three Days; and if Plaintiffs demur again, Defendant to ioin in Demurrer immediately. Prime and Bootle for Defendant; Willes and Poole for Plaintiffs.

Murry against Bowen. Easter 24 G. 2.

Eclaration of Hilary last delivered the Evening before the Essoign Day of this Term, with an Imparlance. Defendant's Attorny, by Mistake, entered a Special Imparlance as for a Plea in Abatement, and then pleaded

pleaded a Tender, to which Plaintiff demurred. Defendant moved, and obtained a Rule to shew Cause why he should not amend his Plea, by leaving out the Special Imparlance, and pleading as of last Term. On shewing Cause, it was urged on Plaintiff's Part, that in Abatement there can be no Amendment: But the Declaration having been delivered so late, (the last Minute) and Pleas of Tender being in Bar, and such as ought to be favoured, the Rule was made absolute, on Payment of Costs. *Poole* for Defendant; *Bootle* for Plaintiff.

Loggin, Demandant; Rawlins, Tenant; · Pullen and his Wife, Vouchees.

was ordered to be amended, by putting the Word (Trul) the Name of a Vill, into its proper Place, according to the Deed of Uses. Trul had, by Mistake, been put into the Recovery as an Advowson, not as a Vill where Lands lay. It was objected against this Amendment, 1st, That the Estate was in Trustees at the Time of the Recovery, and consequently the Trustees not being Parties, there is no good Tenant to the Pracipe. 2dly, That the Lands are of Customary Tenure, Part of the Manor of Taunton-Dean, 3dly, That the Parties who suffered the Recovery were Volunteers, not to be considered

as claiming under a Family Settlement, or as Purchasers for a valuable Consideration. 4thly, That Pullen's Wife is dead, and a Recovery can't now be fuffered to divest those in Remainder. The Court will not enter into the Question, Whether or no, in Equity, Recoveries of Trust Estates bar legal Remainders, or into the other Objections; when the Recovery is amended, Valeat quantum, &c. The Intention of the Parties is the Foundation for the Amendment. The Transaction appears to be fair, and without Fraud or Collufion. The Principle upon which the Court goes, is the Statute 8 Hen. 6. to amend the Misprission of the Clerk. A Pracipe is the Cursitor's Instruction for an Original Writ; a Deed of Uses is the Clerk's Instruction for a Recovery: This Pracipe and this Deed are the Things to amend by. Mrs. Pullen being dead, an Amendment is the only Remedy left. Prime and Poole for Pullen; Willes for Lord Middleton and his Lady; Belfield for Ready and his Wife, Claimants in Remainder.

Dryden, Clerk, against Langley. Trinity 24 & 25 Geo. 2.

In Replevin. Efendant had avowed for a Quit-Rent, and Issue was joined last Easter Term; Defendant moved, and obtained Rule this Term to shew Cause why

why he should not amend, by adding three Avowries for Quit-Rent payable at different Times, on Payment of Costs; which Rule (Plaintiff refusing to consent that Defendant might give the Matter in Evidence on the present Issue) was made absolute; Desendant rejoining Gratis, and taking short Notice of Trial. Draper for the Avowant; Belsield for Plaintiff.

Tarrant, Demandant; Randal, Tenant; Sheppard, Esq; and another, Vouchees. Mich. 25 Geo. 2.

THE Recovery was ordered to be amended, by striking out the Word Adjudged, and inserting instead thereof the Word Considered, in the giving of Judgment by the Court. Prime for Demandant, Tenant and Vouchees.

Witton, Esq; Demandant; East, Gent, and Weddell, Gent. Tenants; Thomas Fairfax, Esquire, Vouchee; of Lands in Clementhorpe in the County of the City of York: Recovery of Easter 9th William 3d, Roll 195. Winford's Office. Entry returnable Cro. Pur. Summons returnable Mens. Pasch. Seisin returnable indilate.

Poole, on the Part of Elizabeth Fairfax Heir of the Vouchee, ordered the Prayer
of Seisin to be amended, and the Return of
the Writ of Seisin to be perfected by the
Clerk of the Return-Office, the proper Officer who makes the Return. This Writ was
rightly directed to the Sheriffs of the City of
York, but not returned in the Name of any
Sheriff, tho a mistaken Return in the singular, instead of the plural Number, was indorsed on the Writ: The Prayer of Seisin,
and Return of the said Writ, were ordered
to be first amended, and then the Roll and
Exemplification accordingly. The particular
Amendments were as follow; 1st, To amend

the Prayer of the Writ of Seisin, by striking out (Com.) and inserting (Givit.); to amend the Return of the Writ of Seisin, by striking out (mihi) and inserting (nobis); by striking out (feci) and inserting (fecimus); by striking out (feci) and inserting (infraspecificat.) and by adding the two Sherists Names; to amend the Entry of the Return of the Writ of Seisin, by striking out the Words (Thomas Pulleyne, Armiger, then Sherist of the County of York) and inserting (Ric'us Wood & Sam. Buxton, then Sherists of the City of York); by striking out (fife) and inserting (ipsi); by striking out (fibi) and inserting (eis); and by striking out (fecit) and inserting (fecerunt.)

Harrison, Chamberlain of London, against Potter. Mich. 26 Geo. 2.

POOLE for Lord-Mayor, Aldermen and Sheriffs of London, moved to amend their Return of Defendant's Writ of Ha. cor. cum causa. The Substance of the Return was the Action between the said Parties, in Debt, for the Penalty of a By-Law, brought against Defendant for employing a Foreigner, (no Freeman of the City,) and the Custom to make By-Laws; but the Custom to employ Freemen, and not Foreigners, within the

the City, was omitted; which last mentioned Custom Poole prayed might be inserted in the Return. Draper for Desendant, submitted whether the Return was amendable, or not; especially, as another Rule touching the granting of a Procedendo was pending. Rule absolute to amend the Return.

Attach=

Attachment.

Stephenson against Brookes. Trin.
13 & 14 Geo. 2.

[Wyat against Winkworth, Easter 1 Geo. 2. B. R. Hammond against Stewart, Mich. 8 G. B. R. Hopkins against Purser, Trin. 2 & 3 Geo. 2. B. R. Dallyson against Allen, Mich. 10 Geo. in Scaccario.]

Laintiff had obtained a Rule for one Hall of King ston upon Hull, an Officer of the Customs, to shew Cause why an Attachment should not be iffued against him, for not attending at Guildhall, London, to give Evidence, after having been ferved with a Subpana; Plaintiff having been nonfuited by Reason thereof. It appeared, that five Guineas were tendered Hall for his Expences, but he being a fat unweildy Man, and not able to travel on Horseback, infisted upon ten Guineas, and offered, upon Receipt thereof, to undertake the Journey by Coach. Cur': There is not any Precedent produced of a Rule of this Court for such an Attachment, but the Party aggrieved has always here been put to his Action upon the Stat. 5 Eliz. cap. q. Where sufficient Amends are tendered, and a Witness obstinately refuses to attend,

28 Attachment.

Bench have, and there would be great Reafon for this Court to interpose. The Sum tendered must be according to the Countenance and Calling of the Witness: Five Guineas were not sufficient, and Hall had not Assurance that the Residue would be paid; if, after Hall's Arrival at London, Plaintiss had not thought sit to examine him, the Court would not have ordered Payment of more Money. Ten Guineas do not seem to be an unreasonable Demand. The Rule was discharged. Draper for Hall; Prime for Plaintiss.

George against Evans. Easter 16 G. 2.

A Dministrator of Defendant demands of Plaintiff Costs accrued in Defendant Intestate's Life-time, shewing Letters of Administration. An Attachment granted for Nonpayment. Skinner for Plaintiff; Bootle for Defendant's Administrator.

The King against Lever, High Bailiss of Westminster, on the Prosecution of Isaac Tallon against Waldron. Easter 16 Geo. 2.

A N Attachment of Contempt issued forth against Desendant, for not bringing Waldron's Body into Court, pursuant to a peremp-

peremptory Rule; and Defendant having been examined upon Interrogatories, it was referred to the Prothonotary (as usual) to examine whether he had cleared himself of the Contempt, or not. The Prothonotary reported the Matter specially; and the Fact appeared to the Court to be, That Waldron being confined in the Gatehouse Prison, Westminster, for a Criminal Matter, was, by Leave of a Judge, charged there with a Bailable Action, in the following Manner: A Capias ad respondendum was directed to the Sheriff of Middlesex, who made a Mandate to the High Bailiff of Westminster, and Defendant was charged in Custody therewith, and afterwards escaped from the Keeper of the Gatehouse, which is the Prison for the Liberty of Westminster, to which Prison the High Bailiss is obliged to carry his Prifoners within twentyfour Hours after Arrest. The High Bailiff being called upon for a Return of the Mandate, returned Cepi Corpus, and that Waldron remained in the Custody of the Keeper of the Gatehouse. Both the Chief Bailiff and the Keeper of the Gatehouse are appointed by, and hold their Places under, the Dean and Chapter of Westminster, and both give Security to the Dean and Chapter; but the Keeper gives no Security to the High Bailiff. The Court were of Opinion, that the High Bailiff had cleared himself of the Contempt, and ordered the Attachment to be discharged. The High

Attachment.

20

High Bailiff did every Thing in his Power to fecure the Prisoner, and ought not to be criminally punished. Respondent Superior extends to Civil Matters only. The Prosecutor may bring his Action for the Escape. Draper and Ketelbey for the Prosecutor; Bootle for Defendant.

Vaughan, one, &c. against Sawyer.
Trin. 19 & 20 Geo. 2.

RULE made for an Attachment of Contempt against the Bailiss of the Liberty of Holderness in the County of York, for not returning a Mandate made by the Sheriss, on an Attachment of Privilege, pursuant to a peremptory Rule to return the same, within fix Days after Notice, without any Return of a Mandavi Ballivo, antecedent to the said peremptory Rule; on an Affidavit of Service of that Rule, and an Affidavit of service of the Sheriss's Office, after the Expiration of the six Days, and that the Mandate was not returned; all the Officers present reporting this to be the Practice. Bootle for Plaintiss.

Richardson against Bailey. Mich.' 23 Geo. 2.

HE Under-Sheriff of Hampshire shut himself up, and could not be personally served with a Rule to return the Writ of Capias ad respondendum. Rule that leaving a Copy at his House shall be good Service. Poole for Plaintiff.

Brodie against Tickell. Hil. 24 Geo. 2:

AFTER a Nonsuit, Motion by Plaintiff against John Gray, Esq; for an Attachment for not attending as a Witness at the Sittings at Nisi prius. It did not appear that a Subpæna was perfonally ferved; but Notice by Receipt of a Subpæna Ticket was admitted by Mr. Gray, who on Plaintiff's Application, before the Subpana Ticket left at his Lodgings, had informed Plaintiff that he knew nothing of the Matter in Question between the Parties, and could not give any Testimony for Plaintiff's Advantage. Gray for this Reason, in his Affidavit, endeavoured to excuse his Non-attendance, and faid, that he would have attended the Trial notwithstanding he could not give any material Evidence, had he not been hindered by other urgent Business. The Court enlarged the Rule for Mr. Gray to shew Cause

32 Attachment.

why an Attachment, till after a new Trial had; and declared, that in some Cases they will grant Attachments against Witnesses for not attending Trials, the hitherto the same has not been done. *Prime* for Plaintiff; Willes for Gray.

Friend against Hope. Trin. 25 & 26 Geo. 2.

Plaintiff obtained a Rule for John Hunt, an Officer to the Sheriff of Middlesex, to shew Cause why an Attachment should not be issued against him, for not attending the Trial at Niss prius as a Witness on Plaintiff's Part, for Want whereof, Plaintiff made Affidavit that his Damages were lessen'd 16 l. But on shewing Cause, the Subpana to testify did not appear to have been regularly served; for which Reason the Rule was discharged without Costs. Willes for Plaintiff; Prime for Hunt.

Attornies, Warrants of Attorny.

On Behalf of Heaton, an Attorny. Mich. 14 Geo. 2.

THE Court, after hearing Council for Heaton, and for the Deputy-Lieutenancy who opposed his Motion, made the Rule absolute for a Writ of Privilege, to excuse Heaton from serving in the Trained-Bands of the City of London, the Service being personal.

Mr. John Moody's Cafe. Trin. 16 Geo. 2.

In the Treasury Chamber 22d June, Mr. John Moody of Havant in the County of Southampton had heen, at his own Instance, struck out of the Roll of Attornies, and was put into the Commission of the Peace, and made a Commissioner of the Land-Tax. He now moved upon an Affidavit (setting forth his Reasons) to be restored to his Privilege; which was granted, he consenting to take no Advantage of any Action pending, if such there be.

Vol. II. D Lunn,

Lunn, an Attorny, against Ascough, an Attorny. Mich. 16 Geo. 2.

Efendant being indebted to Sir John Wray by Promissory Note, Sir John left the Note with Lunn, to put it in Suit; Lunn contrived to bring the Action in his own Name, as Indorfee, and arrested Afcough by Attachment of Privilege, and held him to Bail, upon an old Notion, that Privilege cannot be pleaded against Privilege of equal Nature, The Attachment was a Non omittas, without an Attachment to warrant it. Per Cur': Attornies Privilege is for the Sake of the Suitors; one Attorny is not to fue another of the same Court by Process, but ought to do it by Bill. An Attorny of the King's Bench ought to fue an Attorny of this Court by Bill, and an Attorny of this Court ought to fue an Attorny of the King's Bench in like Manner. Plaintiff's Privilege ought not to draw Defendant into another Court. Radcliffe against Bailey, Mich. 14. Geo. 2. in B. R. the same Determination. Plaintiff and Defendant were both Attornies of that Court: (But not as to an Attorny of one Court fuing an Attorny of another-Court.)

Vincent against Willoughby, an Attorny. Easter 17 Geo. 2.

Defendant by another Person, Plaintiff sued him by Bill, as having Privilege of an Attorny. Defendant moved to set aside the second Fore-judger, insisting that his Privilege was suspended by the first; and Plaintiff ought to have sued him by Original in the common Way. Rule to shew Cause made absolute, without Opposition. Eyre for Defendant.

Launder, an Attorny, against Cokayn. Trin. 17 & 18 Geo. 2.

ELD per Cur', That an Attorny of this Court may, for a Debt bona fide (but not a Note colourably indorsed without Consideration) sue an Attorny of the King's Bench by Attachment of Privilege, and the King's Bench Attorny would not be intitled to Privilege. But where the Attornies Plaintiff and Defendant are both of the same Court, the Proceeding must be by Bill, and not by Attachment, Defendant being intitled to Privilege.

Vilmott against Barry, Esq; commonly called Lord Buttevant. Maguire against The Same. Mich. 20 Geo. 2.

by Defendant when in Custody, in the Presence of Mr. Periam, an Attorny of the Court of King's Bench, declared by the Court to be sufficient, though Periam was not an Attorny of this Court. Other Matters were complained of, and the Rule to shew Cause why the Judgment should not be set aside, &c. was enlarged till next Term. Skinner and Willes for Defendant; Prime for Plaintiff.

Thompson, one, &c. against Rash, one, &c. Hilary 20 Geo. 2.

HE Plaintiff and Defendant being both Attornies of this Court, the Proceedings by Attachment of Privilege were stay'd. Prime for Defendant; Skinner for Plaintiff.

Coles, Executor, against Haden. Easter 20 Geo. 2.

Otion for Leave to enter Judgment at the Suit of Coles, the Executor, on a Warrant of Attorny, the Words whereof extended tended to enter Judgment at the Suit of Coles the Testator, his Heirs, Executors or Administrators; the Court made a Rule to shew Cause, which was afterwards made absolute, on Assidavit of Service, (no Cause being shewn). Bootle for Coles, Executor. The Serjeant quoted a Case in Salkeld, where a Warrant of Attorny to enter Judgment was given to a Feme Sole, and she having married before the Judgment entered, the Court gave Leave to enter Judgment at the Suit of the Husband and Wife.

Cockfedge, one, &c. against Rickwood.

Bjected for the Plaintiff, That the Affidavits ex parte Def'tis were fworn before J. C. and A. F. as Commissioners who were at that Time sworn to be Clerks or Agents to Rajh, Defendant's Attorny. The general Rule extends only to Attornies themselves; those Commissioners are not sworn to be Agents in this Cause. The Objection was over-ruled. It was said, but not sworn, that they were menial Servants, which the Court seemed to think would have been a sufficient Objection. Prime and Willes for Plaintiff; Skinner for Defendant.

Laycock, who survived Kitching, against Garforth. Easter 21 Geo. 2.

RIME moved, on the common Affidavit, for Leave to enter Judgment at the Suit of Laycock the surviving Plaintiff, by Vertue of an old Warrant of Attorney to enter Judgment at the Suit of the two, and quoted a Treasury Rule made sub silentio, in the like Case, Still against Still, Mich. 11 Geo. 2. The Court's Opinion was, That the Power ought to be strictly pursued; and that a Power to enter Judgment at the Suit of two Persons, doth not extend to the Survivor. The Interest of the Surviving Plaintiff cannot be purfued against the Authority. The Thing prayed is Festinum Remedium, which cannot be granted contrary to the Agreement of the Parties. The original Debt will remain as before the Warrant of Attorny given. Had the Application been made last Hilary Term, the Judgment would have related to a Time when both Plaintiffs were alive, and then perhaps the Court might have given Leave to enter Judgment at the Suit of the two. The Motion was denied. Act 8 & 9 W. 3. out of the Case.

Jones against Hayman. Trin. 21 & 22 Geo. 2.

Rolls of Attornies and Solicitors, carried on Proceedings in his own Name, alledging that he was still a Solicitor, and acting in the Name of one Vaughan, an Attorny, pursuant to a pretended written Authority; but not being able to verify these Pretensions, Rules were made absolute to set aside the Proceedings, with Costs. Wynne for Defendant; Willes for Plaintiff.

Trim against Slater. Trin. 22 & 23 Geo. 2.

to for an Order to tax Mr. Butler's Bill, late Attorny for Defendant; the Bill, amounting to little more than 3 l. had been paid in Parcels, some Part four Years ago, the last about twelve Months: Both the Judges resused to order a Taxation. Desendant moved that the Bill might be taxed, without disclosing what had passed before, and had a Rule to shew Cause, which was now discharged, with Costs. The Act of Parliament directing Taxation of Attornies Bills, supposes them unpaid; this appears to have been paid long ago. After Application

to one Judge, (unless he had been doubtful) no Application ought to have been made to another Judge; after the Opinion of two Judges, neither of whom doubted, or directed a Motion, the Application to the Court wrong. Agar for Defendant; Wynne for Butler.

Whetham, Esq; Assignee, against Needham and Atkins. Trin. 24 G. 2.

Dward Owen, Plaintiff's Attorny, now a Prisoner in the Fleet under Process of Contempt from the Court of Chancery, having commenced this Action on the Bail-Bond, affigned fince his Imprisonment, Defendants moved to fet aside the Proceedings, with Costs, as contrary to the Statute Geo. 2. making void the same; and obtained a Rule to shew Cause: But it appearing that the Original Action was commenced before Owen's Imprisonment, and there being an Exception in the Statute as to carrying on Proceedings before commenced; the Court taking this under the Statute for Amendment of the Law, 4 & 5 Q. Anno, to be a Continuance of the Original Suit incorporated to make it effectual, discharged the Rule. Willes for Plaintiff and Owen; Wynne for Defendant.

Craven against Billingsley. Mich. 24
Geo. 2.

N Complaint of one of Defendant's Bail, of his having been made liable to pay Plaintiff's Debt and Costs, by a Profecution on the Bail-Bond, through the Mifconduct of Mr. Skinner, an Attorny employed for Defendant, who had put in Bail in the Court of King's Bench, instead of this Court; and it not being controverted by Skinner's Council, for want of proper Instructions, that he was an Attorny of this Court, a Rule was made absolute upon him to reimburse the Bail; but it afterwards appearing that Skinner was not an Attorny of this Court, and that he never acted by himfelf, or in the Name of another Attorny, in any one Instance in this Cause in this Court, the Rule was discharged. Prime and Poole for Skinner; Hayward for the Bail.

November 16th 1750. Declared by all the Judges in the Treasury-Chamber, That if a Warrant of Attorny to enter Judgment be above a Year old and under ten Years old, Leave to enter Judgment may be given by a Treasury Rule; but if the Warrant be above ten Years old, the Court must be moved for Leave to enter Judgment. If the Warrant be under twenty Years old, the common Affidavit

fidavit of due Execution of the Warrant, that the Defendant is unpaid, and Parties living, is sufficient for an absolute Rule; but if the Warrant be above twenty Years old, the Rule must be to shew Cause, and served on Defendant.

On the Part of Boyer and others, against John Allen, an Attorny. Easter 24 Geo. 2.

A Complaint having been laid before the Court against Allen, shewing that he had imposed on the Judge who ordered him to be admitted, by swearing to a Service of five Years to an Attorny of Newcastle under Lyne, Com. Staff. as an articled Clerk, tho' (as suggested) he never lived at Newcastle, but constantly refided at Loughborough, Com. Leic. where he was an Under-Schoolmaster, and Collector of the Window-Light Duty; a Rule was made for Allen to shew Cause why he should not be struck off the Roll of On shewing Cause, the Complaint was fully answered. It appeared, that though Allen resided sometimes at Newcastle and fometimes at Loughborough, he was during his whole Clerkship constantly employ'd and instructed by his Master. The Rule discharged, with Costs. Hayward, Bootle and Poole for Allen; Prime, Willes and Belfield for Boyer and others.

Britten

Britten, who as well, &c. against Teasdaile. Trin. 24 & 25 Geo. 2.

HIS was an Action brought on a Penal Statute (13th Elizabeth) against Defendant, for entring a fraudulent Judgment; and the Suit being by Original and Capias ad respondendum. Defendant, who was an Attorny of this Court, rectus in Curia, moved to stay the Proceedings, infisting that he ought to be fued by Bill. On shewing Cause it was urged, That this was a Profecution for the Crown; and that Defendant, if intitled to Privilege, may plead it. But per Cur': These Qui tam Actions are never confidered as the King's Caufes. In Profecutions at the Suit of the Crown, Defendants, tho' acquitted, can have no Costs; but in Actions Qui tam 'tis otherwise. The proceeding by Original is irregular. Rule absolute to stay Proceedings. Prime for Defendant; Willes and Agar for Plaintiff.

Todd against Todd. Trin. 25 & 26 Geo. 2.

In Banco Regis. R Ichard Todd executed a Warrant of Attorny, dated 8 May 1746, to confess Judgment to John Todd the Elder and John Todd the Younger. On the Warrant of Attorny, an Agree-

Agreement was indorfed, reciting that John Todd the Elder and John Todd the Younger had entered into a Bond for the Payment of a certain Sum of Money to W. S. whichwas the proper Debt of Richard Todd; it was therefore agreed, that the Judgment should be a Security and Indemnity to John Todd the Elder and John Todd the Younger, against all Costs, Charges and Damages which they might sustain, on Account of the Bond which they had entered into.

John Todd the Elder died in the Year 1748, and by his Will made John Todd the Younger his Executor; Motion was made by Mr. Williams to enter up Judgment at the Suit of the surviving Plaintiff. The Court doubted whether it could be done, and directed him to inquire if there was any Instance where the like Motion had been granted; and if not, to speak to it as a Point of Law; which he afterwards did: And submitted, That the Difficulties which occurred in the present Case were,

1st, That bare Authorities must, by the Rules of Law, be strictly pursued; which could not be done in the present Case, the Warrant of Attorny being to appear to an Action to be commenced by two Persons, to receive a Declaration at the Suit of two Persons, and to confess a Judgment in such Actions; which would not empower the Attorny to appear to an Action commenced by

one

one Person only, and to receive a Declaration at the Suit of one only, and to confess Judgment in such Action.

2dly, That by the Death of one of the Plaintiffs the Authority is determined.

In answer to which, he submitted,

If, That where a Contract is made with two Persons, and one dies, the Survivor shall have the Benefit of it. In the present Case, John Todd the Younger is intitled to the Benefit of this Agreement, as Survivor.

2dly, If a Joint Action is brought by two Perfons, and one dies before Interlocutory Judgment, if the Cause of Action survives, the Action is not abated, but the Surviving Plaintiff may proceed against the Desendant.

This is in Case of Adversary Actions, and it will hold a fortiori in Amicable Actions, founded upon the Agreement of the Parties.

3dly, That in the Execution of a Power of Attorny, it is sufficient and good if it be executed in Substance, and according to the Intention of the Parties, though not strictly and exactly according to the Letter. Feosfment on Consideration to re-enseoff the Husband and Wise and the Heirs of their Bodies; Feossee makes a Gift in Tail accordingly, and a Letter of Attorny to make Livery; before Livery made the Husband dies, yet the Attorny may make Livery to the Widow, and she shall take an Estate in Tail according to the Gift. Moor 280.

Feoffment

46 Attornies, &c.

Feoffment of two Acres, one of them is before demised for Years; a Letter of Attorny to make Livery of Seisin of those two Acres, without saying, or any Part thereof, the Attorny may make Livery of Seisin of that Acre only which is in Possession, and that will be good. *Moor* 280.

Co. Lit. 52. A Letter of Attorny to deliver Seisin to two, the Attorny may make Livery to one, in the Absence of the other. In the present Case, the Attorny may execute this Warrant in Substance, and agreeable to the Intent of the Parties: the Intent of the Parties was, that this Judgment should be a Security. By the Death of Todd the Elder. Todd the Younger becomes liable alone to the Payment of the whole Money due upon the Bond; he therefore ought to have the whole Benefit of the Indemnity. It never could have been the Intent of the Parties, that the Security should become a Nullity, upon an Event which made the Surviving Plaintiff liable alone to the Payment of the whole Mony due upon the Bond.

4thly, That if an Attorny is empowered to do an Act to two jointly, and the Benefit of that Act, when done, will furvive, if one dies, the Act shall be done to the Survivor.

Perkins, Title Feoffment, Sect. 192. If a Letter of Attorny be made to make Livery of Seisin unto two, and one of them dies

before

before Livery of Scisin made, and the Attorny makes Livery of Scisin, according unto the Deed, unto the other Feosfee who is living, it is good to him for all the Land. In the present Case, the Attorny is empowered to do an Act to two, the Benefit of which Act, if done, would have survived; and therefore the Attorny may execute that Power to the Survivor. This Case likewise shews, that the Death of one of the Persons to whose Benefit the Power is to be executed, is not, in Point of Law, a Revocation of the Authority.

sthly, That supposing, by the Event which has happened, this Warrant of Attorny is determined, or cannot be executed agreeable to the strict Rules of the Common Law; but in the present Case, it is submitted, That Proceedings upon Warrants of Attorny to confess Judgment, are to be considered as Proceedings sounded upon the Agreement of the Parties, and the Judgment is to be considered as a common Security: That in Cases of this Sort, the Court exercises an Equitable Jurisdiction, in order to prevent the Party from being deseated of his Security, either by Fraud, by Accident, or Neglect.

A Power of Attorny is in its Nature revocable, though declared in the Instrument to be irrevocable. 8 Coke 82. Vinior's Case. But in the Case of a Warrant of Attorny to confess Judgment, though the Party revokes it, yet the Court will permit the Judgment to be entered. Odes and Woodward, Ld. Raymond 849.

A Power of Attorny determines by the Death of the Party who gives it, yet in Cafes of this Sort, the Court permits the Attorny to execute the Power after the Death of the Party. Andrews and Shewell, Raym. 18. The Defendant gave a Warrant of Attorny to A. B. to confess Judgment in Debt to the Plaintiff, by Non fum informatus; Warrant of Attorny given at eight o' Clock in the Morning, and at ten o' Clock Defendent died: Judgment was afterwards figned. Defendants prayed to set aside this Judgment, but refolved, it was well obtained, it being for a just Debt. If a Warrant of Attorny is given in Easter Vacation, to confess a Judgment as of the next Trinity Term, and Defendant dies in Trinity Term, yet the Judgment may be entered up at any Time before the Effoin Day of Michaelmas Term. Salk. 87. Comberbatch 212. By the Practice of the Court, a Warrant of Attorny before the Essoin Day, to enter up Judgment as of the preceding Term, is good; yet there, the Judgment is confidered as of the preceding Term, at which Time there was an Authority existing. Where a Judgment is confessed upon Terms, the Court will fee those Terms. performed. Per Holt, C. J. Salk. 400. 1 Shower 91. If a Woman gives a Warrant

rant of Attorny to confess Judgment, and then marries, you may file a Bill against Husband and Wife, and enter up Judgment against both, by the Practice of the Court. Ruled upon Motion. In this Case, the Marriage of the Woman was, in Point of Law, a Revocation of the Power; as where a Feme Sole submits to refer Matters to Arbitration, and afterwards marries, this is a Revocation of the Submission. I Roll. Abr. 331.

Warrant of Attorny was given to confess a Judgment to a Feme Sole, who afterwards married; in this Case, the Court made a Rule to enter up Judgment notwithstanding

the Marriage. Salk. 117.

These two last Cases are liable to all the

Objections with the present.

Submitted, That if a Warrant of Attorny was given to confess Judgment to two Executors, and one dies, the Judgment may be

entered up for the Survivor.

Still against Still, Mich. 11 Geo. 2. Notes of Cases in Points of Practice in C.P. fol. 35. Defendant gave a Warrant of Attorny to enter Judgment at the Suit of Plaintiff John Still, and one Susanna Still since dead; the Judges in the Treasury gave Leave to enter Judgment at the Suit of the surviving Plaintiff: But admitted, that in a subsequent Case that Court was of a different Opinion.

Easter 21 Geo. 2. Laycock against Garforth. Motion by Serj. Prime to enter up Vol. II. E Judgment Judgment upon an old Warrant of Attorny, at the Suit of the furviving Plaintiff, upon the Authority of the Case of Still and Still; the Court denied the Rule, and were of Opinion, That the Power ought to be strictly pursued; and that a Power to enter Judgment at the Suit of two Persons, doth not extend to the Survivor. The Thing prayed is festinum Remedium, which cannot be granted contrary to the Agreement of the Parties. The original Debt will remain as before the Warrant of Attorny given. The Motion was denied, and said to be not within the Statute 8 & 9 W. 3.

That the first Reason in this Case was contrary to the Doctrine laid down in the several Authorities in Moor, Co. Littleton, Salkeld, Shower and Perkins. That this cannot be against the Agreement of the Parties, for the Reasons before given. That the third Reason will not hold in the present Case, for this Judgment was only to be an Indemnity. That if the Plaintiff fails in the present Application, he is intirely without Remedy at Law.

The Court took Time to consider. Afterwards Lord Chief Justice declared the Opinion of the Court, That a Rule should be granted; and said, that the Benefit of this Agreement survived to the present Plaintiff; and that the Authority in 1 Shower 91. was a stronger Case than the present.

Mould

Mould against Jackman. Trinity
24 & 25 Geo. 2.

Plaintiff moved in the Treasury, producing the common Affidavit, for Leave to enter Judgment on an old Warrant of Attorny, not expressing any Term or Time. Rule made to shew Cause, and afterwards absolute, on Affidavit of Service; no Cause being offered to the contrary.

Machin against Delaval. Hil. 26 G. 2.

IT being found by Verdict, on Trial of a feigned Issue directed by the Court, That the Warrant of Attorny to enter Judgment was given in Consequence of an Usurious Contract; the Court ordered the Judgment to be set aside, and said Warrant of Attorny, and the Bond whereon said Judgment was entered, to be delivered up, and Plaintist to pay Costs of Application. *Prime* and *Willes* for Defendant; *Poole* for Plaintist.

Gladwin against Scott. Easter 26 G. 2.

French deceased, gave a joint Bond to Plaintiff for Payment of 127 l. and Interest, and a Warrant of Attorny to enter Judgment against me, not us, though executed by two. Willes for Plaintiff moved, on the common Affidavit, for Leave to enter Judgment against Scott the Survivor. He quoted a Case in Banco Regis, Todd against Todd, where Leave was given to enter Judgment at the Suit of a surviving Plaintiff. Rule to shew Cause; which was afterwards made absolute, on Affidavits of Service, no Cause being shewn to the contrary.

N. B. The Case quoted is herein before

inserted under this Title, p. 43.

Award, Submission, &c.

Dalling against Matchett. Mich. 14 Geo. 2.

MATTERS in Difference were, by Consent of Parties, referred to three Arbitrators, fo as they, or any two of them, make an Award, &c. and an Award having been made by two in Plaintiff's Favour, Defendant moved to fet it aside; objecting, that two had not a Jurisdiction without the third; and obtained a Rule to shew Cause. shewing Cause it appeared, that the third Arbitrator had sufficient Notice of the Meetings of the other two, and might have been present if he would. Per Cur': 'Tis agreed by both Sides, that if the third had met, two might have made an Award; two have a Jurisdiction, but must meet pursuant to Rules If the third had been present, his Reasons might have altered the Opinion of the other two; he is not therefore to be excluded by Fraud; nor are the two to act, without the third's having an Opportunity to be present; but where the third has sufficient Notice, as in this Case, and will not attend, the Meeting of the two is regular, and their Authority sufficient. The Rule discharged. Skinner and Prime for Plaintiff; Belfield and Urlin for Defendant.

 E_3

Kettle

54 Award, Submission, &c.

Kettle against Grove, Heir, &c. Easter 15 Geo. 2.

On Bond. A T the Affizes Plaintiff had a Verdict for his Security, and Matters in Difference were referred to Arbitrators by Rule, who made an Award within the Time limited, whereby Defendant was ordered to pay Plaintiff 300 l. The Rule of Affize was made a Rule of Court. And Plaintiff electing to proceed upon the Verdict, and not by Attachment of Contempt for Non-performance of the Award, moved for Leave to enter Judgment, and take out Execution for the Money awarded; and a Rule was made to shew Cause, and afterwards absolute, on Affidavit of Service.

Note; The Court thought this a proper Application; and that Plaintiff had not a Right to enter Judgment without Leave of

the Court. Birch for Plaintiff.

Tynte against Every.

A Rhitrators awarded Costs of Suit and of the Reference, to be taxed per Prothonotary. The Court ordered Costs to be taxed to the Time of the Reference, but not after. Gapper for Desendant; Draper for Plaintiff.

Award, Submission, &c. 55

Easter 16 Geo. 2.

PON the Motion of Serjeant Birch, the Court made a Rule that A. B. a subscribing Witness to an Arbitration-Bond, should shew Cause why he should not make an Affidavit touching the Execution of that Bond; and upon an Affidavit of Service, the Rule was made absolute.

Note; This is the only Case wherein the Court interposed in this Manner.

Read against Garnett, an Attorny. Trin. 17 & 18 Geo. 2.

Reference, by Rule, to three of the Jurors; Award in Plaintiff's Favour. Rule obtained by Plaintiff for Defendant to shew Cause why Postea should not be delivered to Plaintiff, to take out Execution for the Money awarded. Objection by Defendant, That no Affidavit was produced of the due Execution of the Award, or of a Demand of the Money; which the Court held to be as necessary as if the Motion had been for an Attachment for Nonpayment of Money. The Rule was discharged. Skinner for Plaintiff; Willes for Defendant.

E 4

Ball,

Bail, Bail-Bonds, &c.

Otway against Cokayne. Trin. 13 & 14 Geo. 2.

FTER Plaintiff had been delayed of Trial, Defendant justified Bail, and obtained a Judge's Order to stay Proceedings on the Bail-Bond, upon Payment of Costs, &c. and confenting that the Bail-Bond should stand as Plaintiff's Security. Plaintiff recovered Judgment in the Original Action, and then renewed his Proceedings, and declared on the Bail-Bond. Defendant pleaded Comperuit ad diem; which Plea the Court ordered to be fet aside, and gave Plaintiff Leave to enter Judgment on the Bail-Bond immediately, but stayed Execution It is always intended, and ought in Week. these Cases to be expressed, That Judgment be given, and Execution only stayed. Bootle for Plaintiff; Agar for Defendant.

Kettelby against Woodcock. 31st October, In Treasury, Mich. 14 G. 2.

A Greement in Writing to deliver a certain Quantity of Goods within a certain Time, at the Price of 300 l. or in Default thereof, that Defendant would forfeit and

pay to Plaintiff 100 l. Action brought for the Penalty; and upon the Question of, Bail or No Bail? The Judges were of Opinion that Defendant ought to be held to Bail.

Gostelow against Wright.

PLaintiff brought an Action upon the Case against Defendant, who appeared, and Plaintiff recovered Judgment, and then brought Debt on the Judgment, and held Defendant to Bail, and recovered a fecond Judgment, After a Ca. sa. returned against the Principal, and before the Return of the Writ in an Action of Debt upon the Recognizance against the Bail in the second Action, the Court was moved to stay Proceedings on the Recognizance, pending a Writ of Error brought to reverse the first Judgment; and upon the Bail's confenting to give Judgment in the Actions brought against them, the Rule obtained to stay Proceedings was made absolute. Burnett for the Bail; Wynne for Plaintiff.

Carleton against Wilkinson.

Efendant was outlawed by Special Original, and upon reversing the Outlawry, put in Bail with Condition, as usual, to appear to a new Original, to be filed within two Terms. Plaintiff proceeded to Judgment, and Defendant brought a Writ of Error; a Motion

Motion was made on Behalf of the Bail, to discharge their Recognizance, no Original having been filed within two Terms; and a Rule made to shew Cause; which was discharged: The Bail may plead as they shall be advised. Skinner for Plaintiff; Agar for Defendant.

Manning against Williams.

HIS was an Action brought on a Bottomree-Bond, and the Question was, Bail, or No Bail? Two Affidavits for Bail had been made by Alderman Willimott; the first was. That the Alderman believed Defendant was indebted to Plaintiff, &c. which was held insufficient. Where the Affidavit is made by a third Person, it must be positive, unless in the Case of an Executor, &c. where Belief is sufficient. The Alderman, by Leave of the Court, made a fecond Affidavit, That Defendant was indebted to Plaintiff, &c. if the Ship Suffex be not unavoidably loft: The Ship was agreed to be lost, and Affidavits were read on both Sides, controverting the Fact, whether the Lofs was unavoidable, or not. Per Cur': The second Affidavit of the Alderman is prima facie sufficient; otherwise there could be no Bail on Bottomree-Bonds; but the Affidavits ex parte defendentis turn the Balance: The Alderman is supported by two Persons, who swear the Ship

Ship might have been faved; but for the Defendant, eleven Persons swear the Loss was unavoidable. Rule absolute for Common Appearance. Skinner and Belsield for Plaintiff; Prime and Burnett for Defendant.

Treherne against Gressingham. Mich. 15 Geo. 2.

DLaintiff, after having recovered Judgment in Ejectment against the Casual Ejector by Default, brought this Action for mesne Profits, wherein he had obtained a Judge's Order to hold Defendant to Bail; and, by Mistake, made his Ac etiam in Trespass upon the Case, instead of Trespass only, as it ought, to have been. Defendant moved for a Common Appearance; and it was infifted on Plaintiff's Behalf, that Defendant having put in Bail before a Judge to the Ac etiam in Case, was now too late to apply. After some Debate, Plaintiff accepted a Common Appearance. It was observed (per Cur') that these Actions for mesne Profits, (which are grown very fashionable) tend to create double Expence. Why should not Plaintiff be ready at the Trial of the Ejectment to prove his Damages, which may be recovered in that Action, without bringing a fecond for mesne Profits. The true Rule as to the Time from which mesne Profits are to be recovered, seems to be where Judgment is against the Casual Ejector, Ejector, from the Time of the Delivery of Declarations to the Tenants in Possession, or from the Time of an actual Demand of Possession proved, where Judgment is against the Tenants in Possession (or the Landlord defending in their Stead) from the Ouster admitted by the Common Consent Rule; but in neither Case from the Demise, which may be laid back at Plaintiff's Pleasure. Urlin for Desendant; Birch for Plaintiff.

Elton against Manwaring; Thomas against The Same. In Monmouth-shire.

Tuesday 3d November, Skinner moved to justify Bail for Desendant, who was in Custody, upon the usual Assidavit; and upon an Assidavit of Notice of the Justification served on Saturday last, Birch for Plaintiss objected to the Shortness of the Notice, and that Plaintiss had not sufficient Time to inquire after the Bail. But per Cur: Two Days Notice of Justification is the general Rule in all Cases, and the Bail must be allowed.

Satchwell against Lawes.

Proceedings on Bail-Bonds stayed for Want of Notice of Exception against the Bail put in before a Judge, given in Writing to Defendant's Attorny. An Exception had been entered in the Filacer's Book, and verbal Notice thereof given to Defendant, but this is not sufficient; 'tis necessary not only to enter an Exception in the Bail-Book, but also to give Notice in Writing to Defendant's Attorny. Willes for Defendant; Skinner for Plaintiff.

Newton against Lewis.

BAIL on an Ac etiam, Capias ad respondendum, and Surrender of the Defendant by his Bail before the Return of the Writ, were held to be irregular, and set aside. Non est inventus may be returned, and then the Bail goes for nothing. If a Cepi Corpus be returned, Defendant, at the Return, is supposed to be in Custody of the Court, and then, if bailed, to be delivered to his Bail; and there can be no Surrender 'till after that Time. It has been held a Contempt, in Banco Regis, for the Bail below to become Bail above, and render the Principal before the Return of the Writ. But although Defendant is to be remedied with Respect to his Bail.

Bail, Plaintiff must not be prejudiced; the Return of the Writ is now passed. Let Defendant be brought into Court by Habeas Corpus, and the Bail, being present, shall have Leave to render him de novo; which was done accordingly. Prime for Plaintiff; Wynne for the Bail.

Rayner against Brough. Easter 15 Geo. 2.

RULE to shew Cause why a Common Appearance should not be accepted for Defendant, who had been arrested in the County Palatine of Durham; and the Sum fworn due being under 201. made ablosute. For Plaintiff it was urged, that the Statute 11 & 12 W. 3. requiring no Sheriff to hold to Bail in Counties Palatine, on Process out of Westminster-Hall under 20 l. was vertually repealed by the Statute 12 Geo. 2. c. 29. which requires Bail in all Cases where Affidavit shall be made that the Cause of Action amounts to 10 l. the latter being a general Law, and extending throughout Great Britain (Scotland only excepted.) Per Cur': Affirmative Words, without Negative, are not fufficient to repeal a former Law; the Nature of the Case, and the Intent of the Legislature, are to be considered. Both the Statutes have the same Title, viz. To prevent vexatious Arrests, and both were made

in Favour of the Liberty of the Subject; they may stand together. In County Palatine 20 1. must still be sworn due to require Bail. By a Rule of this Court, Michaelmas 1654, Bail is required for 20 1. and for no less: And though a Practice was introduced in Chief Justice North's Time to hold to Bail for 10 1. (History of the Common Pleas, fol. 37.) yet the old Rule remains undischarged. Skinner for Desendant; Belsield for Plaintiff.

Claxton, Assignee of the Sheriff, against Hyde and his Bail.

Efendant moved, that the Exception J against the Bail in the Original Action might be struck out, and the Bail recorded, that he might verify his Plea of Comperuit ad Diem; infifting, that the same Bail being put in before a Judge who were Bail to the Sheriff, and Plaintiff having taken an Affignment of the Bail-Bond, had thereby waived his Exception, and the Bail above were become absolute. A Rule was made to shew Cause. Cases quoted for Defendant, Grofvenor against Soames, 6 Mo. Hampson against Sower, Easter 1729; Haman against Bennett, Hill. 12 Geo. 2. in B. R. Hambly against Dowbarty, Cases in C. B. fol. 61. Walsh against Haddock, Hil. 2 Geo. 2. on shewing Cause, it was urged for the Plaintiff, that the Practice of this Court is fettled

fettled by the Rule of Trin. 3 & 4 Geo. 21 Unless Bail be perfected, (that is justified in Court) within four Days after Exception, Plaintiff may proceed on Bail-Bond, by the Rule of Mich. 6 Geo. 2. Plaintiff may except against the Bail above, though the same as to the Sheriff; and Ormond against Griffith, Hil. 7 Geo. 2. is a Case in Point. Notes of Cases, fol. 51. Per Cur': Let the Rule be discharged. As the Practice of this Court stands at present, Plaintiff is regular to proceed upon the Bail-Bond. The Affignment doth not admit the Sufficiency of the Bail. The Sheriff may be insufficient, and then, if Plaintiff cannot proceed on the Bail-Bond, he has no Remedy. Skinner, Willes and Draper, for Defendant; Prime and Agar for Plaintiff.

Clarke against Harbin. Hil. 16 G. 2.

returnable immediate, was lodged at the Palace Court, to remove a Plaint from thence into this Court; and nothing further was done till 20th November last Term, when Plaintiff served Defendant with a Rule to put in Bail. Defendant insisted, that Plaintiff should have served such Rule within two Terms after the Ha. cor. brought, and was now too late. The Court held, That if Defendant had put in Bail upon his Ha. cor. without

without staying to be forwarded by a Rule for Bail, and Plaintiff had not declared within two Terms after Bail put in, the Cause would have been out of Court, but the Rule for Bail is not limited to any particular Time. Rule to shew Cause why Proceedings should not be stayed, was discharged. Birch for Plaintiff; Agar for Defendant.

Tribe and others, Assignees, &c. a Bankrupt's Effects, against Pratt. Hil. 16 Geo. 2.

NE of the Plaintiffs, in order to hold Defendant to Bail, made an Affidavit that Defendant was indebted to Plaintiffs 1300 L as appeared by an Account under the Bankrupt's Hand. Defendant objected to this Affidavit, that the Account referred to by it, was not annexed or produced; that as the Bankrupt was living, and under the Power of the Affignees, he ought to have made the Affidavit; that Plaintiff who makes Affidavit, does not swear he believes the Sum to be due; that this Case differs widely from that where Plaintiff is an Executor or Administrator, who (Testator, &c. being dead) can only swear to Debts as they appear from Securities or Books of Account. The Court thought a positive Affidavit of the Debt necessary, unless it had appeared that the Bankrupt refused to make the same. And the VOL. II. F Rule Rule was made absolute for a Common Appearance. *Prime* for Defendant; *Skinner* for Plaintiff.

Seaber against Powell. East. 16 Geo. 2.

on the Bail-Bond should not be stayed ULE to shew Cause why Proceedings on Payment of Costs, discharged, Plaintiff having been delayed of Trial, and Defendant and his Bail refusing to consent that the Bail-Bond should stand for Plaintiff's Security. Defendant infifted, that Plaintiff not having declared de bene esse, had delayed himself; but the Writ in the Original Action being returnable last Term, that Objection will not hold. Declarations de bene esse are necessary to take the Advantage of the Term, if the Writ be of the first or second Return, where Defendant is to plead without Imparlance, but not otherwise. Prime for Plaintiff: Agar for Defendant.

Lister against Wainhouse. Trin. 16 & 17 Geo. 2.

Laintiff excepted against the Bail, and for Want of a Justification in Time, proceeded upon the Bail-Bond. A Declaration was delivered in the Original Action, after the Time for putting in Bail expired, as a Declaration de bene esse. Defendant moved

to stay Proceedings on the Bail-Bond; infisting, that this Declaration must be looked upon as delivered in Chief, and consequently as a Waver of the Exception; and that the Demand of a Plea confirms it. The Court over-ruled the first Objection, as to the Declaration, but held the Demand of a Plea to be a Waver of the Exception; 'tis admitting Desendant to be in Court, and in a Condition to plead. Rule absolute to stay Proceedings on the Bail-Bond. Prime for Plaintist; Bootle for Desendant. Justice Burnett solus in Cur.

Jackson against Knight.

AFTER final Judgment, Defendant put in and justified Bail, and obtained a Rule to shew Cause why a Supersedeas should not iffue to discharge him out of Custody. The Court discharged the Rule. After final Judgment 'tis too late to put in Bail; the Recognizance of Bail plainly imports that it must be entered into before Defendant be condemned in the Action.

Francis against Taylor. Hil. 17 Geo. 2.

A Bail-Bond taken upon a Capias ad refpondendum fued out of this Court, was affigned by the Sheriff to Plaintiff; and Bail above not being put in within the limited F₂ Time

Time, Plaintiff's Attorny, for the Sake of ferving the Bail with Process within last Term, put the Bail-Bond in Suit in the Court of King's Bench, where his Writ was returnable on the quarto die post (the last general Return in this Court within last Term The Court thought being then expired.) this Proceeding unwarrantable. By an old Rule, Attornies of this Court are ordered not to bring Actions in other Courts; and the Act of Parliament directing the Affignment of Bail-Bonds, gives the Court, after fuch Bonds are put in Suit, an equitable Jurisdiction to stay Proceedings, and to let a Defendant in to try the Merits of the Original Action, upon reasonable Terms; which Jurisdiction cannot be exercised, unless the Original Action, and the Proceedings upon the Bail-Bond, were in the same Court. The Rule to fet afide the Proceedings upon the Bail-Bond was made absolute, with Costs, by Confent of Plaintiff and his Attorny. Skinner for Defendant; Prime for Plaintiff and his Attorny.

Malland against Jenkins.

O a Sci. facias on a Recognizance of Bail on a Writ of Error, not fetting forth the Condition of the Recognizance, Defendant pleaded Nul tiel Record, and Iffue being joined thereon, Defendant infifted,

That the Record of the Recognizance, with a Condition subjoined, was not a Verification of the Recognizance, without Condition set forth in the Scire facias; That the Condition is Part of the Recognizance itself, and doth not operate by Way of Defeazance. Mr. Warden (an Affistant to the Clerk of the Errors) reported, That this Scire facias is made out by the Errors, and not by the Plaintiff's Attorny; That he has known the Office fixteen Years, and the Scire facias has always been as in this Cafe, without fetting forth the Condition of the Recognizance; That the Condition of the Recognizance in Error is not incorporated, as it is in a Recognizance of Bail on a Capias ad respondendum, but is subscribed by Way of Defeazance. The Court held the Scire facias good, and gave Judgment for the Plaintiff on the Issue of No fuch Record. The Recognizance and Condition, in this Case, are two distinct Records.

Books and Cases quoted by the Counsel: Lilly's Ent. 557. Officina Brevium 262, 269, 284. Perry against Collins, Trin. 10 & 11 Geo. 2. Cross against Porter, Mich. 11 Geo. 2. Agar for Plaintiff; Hayward for Desendant.

Smithson, Baronet, Assignee, &c. against Thomas Smith, Gent. an Attorny. Easter 17 Geo. 2.

7 Illiam Smith, Gent. Defendant in the Original Action was fued by the Addition of Clerk, and entered into a Bail-Bond by that Addition. Bail above was put in within due Time for William Smith, Gent. who was arrested by the Name and Addition of William Smith, Clerk; and Plaintiff having excepted against the Bail, they justified in Court; Plaintiff declared de bene esse in the Original Action, and Defendant pleaded in Abatement within Time. Plaintiff took the Plea out of the Office, stayed Proceedings near twelve Months, and then filed a Bill as Assignee of the Sheriff, against Thomas Smith, Gent. an Attorny, one of the Bail in the Bail Bond; infifting, that Defendant in the Original Action was estopped from pleading in Abatement; that the Bail put in as above, is no Bail for William Smith, Clerk; and that Defendant ought to be left to his · Plea of comperuit ad diem. The Court thought the Application by Motion proper; and that the original Defendant was not estopped from pleading in Abatement by the Bail-Bond, which must prout the Writ. That the Manner he purfued of putting in Bail, is the constant regular Method, and the only Way

Way to fave the Advantage of pleading in Abatement. Rule absolute to stay Proceedings, with Costs. Willes and Bootle for Plaintiff; Prime for Defendant.

Davies, Executor, against Leckie. Mich. 18 Geo. 2.

THIS was an Action of Debt brought on a Judgment recovered in the Palace Court. Defendant moved for a Common Appearance; infifting, that as Bail was filed in the Action wherein Judgment had been obtained in the Palace Court, no Bail ought to be required in this Action. The Court refused to order a Common Appearance, Plaintiff having no Bail in this Court before.

Studwell against Bunton. Hil. 18 Geo. 2.

DEfendant being a Seaman, in actual Seravice of the King, was arrested, and held to Bail in the Palace Court; he removed the Action by Ha. corpus, and was discharged by this Court on a Common Appearance fecundum Stat. 1 Geo. 2. cap. 14. the Debt being under 20 l. Plaintiff objected, that Defendant had absented two Days after his Time of Leave given. But the Court held, that the Service continues whilst Defendant's

fendant's Name remains in the Ship Books. Draper for Defendant; Skinner for Plaintiff.

Wilcox against Prosser and others. Easter 18 Geo. 2.

RULE absolute to quash two Writs of Sci. facias returned Nibil against Bail, who had rendered the Principal after Judgment. The Ca. sa. against the Principal, and the first Sci. fa. bearing Teste on one and the same Day, viz. 23d October last. Willes for Defendant; Birch for Plaintiff.

Paris against Stroud and his Wife.

Defendants, or one of them, are indebted for Board, Clothes, Jewels, &c. provided for the Wife; Defendant the Husband, an Infant, moved for a Common Appearance. The Court held, that if an Infant marries a Woman of full Age, (as in this Case) he is liable to her Debts; but thought Plaintiff's Affidavit not sufficiently certain. Plaintiff had Leave to make a new Affidavit, and explain what was due before Defendant the Wise was of Age, and what after; and whether the Debt, or any Part, became due before the Marriage, or after. Plaintiff made a new Affidavit accordingly; and the Sum for

for which Bail was to be given was moderated at a Judge's Chamber. Skinner and Willes for Defendant; Draper for Plaintiff.

Nutkins, Executor, against Wilkin. Hil. 19 Geo. 2.

JUdgment in Action on Bail-Bond, figned two Days after Plaintiff's Death, and the Suit thereby abated; Plaintiff gave Defendant Time to plead, and died before that Time expired. Now the Bail-Bond was put in Suit by the Executor of the late Plaintiff deceased, and Defendant applied to stay Proceedings. The Capias in the Original Action was returnable Tres Mich. and Plaintiff might have had Judgment in his Life-time, if Defendant had not made Default, by not putting in Bail above. Proceedings stayed in the Original Action, and on the Bail-Bond, on Payment of 43 l. agreed to be the Debt and Costs in the Original Action and in this Action. No Costs in the first Action on Bail-Bond, wherein there was no Default by Defendant. Prime and Draper for Plaintiff; Hayward for Defendant.

Lawford against Gardiner and his Wife. Easter 19 Geo. 2.

Dot H Defendants arrested for a Debt due from the Wise dum sola; Bail above put in for both, and both rendered to the Fleet in Discharge of Bail. Motion to discharge the Wise, detained by mesne Process, not in Execution. If the Wise had been arrested before the Husband, she must have been discharged on common Appearance; after the Husband is arrested she cannot be taken into Custody again. Case of Liberty. Rule absolute to discharge the Wise by Supersedeas, on entering common Appearance. Mr. Justice Burnett contra. Birch for Defendant the Wise; Leeds for Plaintiff.

Follett against Trill and Bowen, Bail for Powell Mich. 20 Geo. 2.

Plaintiff recovered Judgment in the original Action brought in this Court, and laid in the County of Surry. Bail had been taken before a Judge, and after Judgment and Ca. fa. returned against the Principal, Non est inventus; Sci. fa.'s against the Bail on the Recognizance were brought in Surry, and after two Nichils returned, Execution was awarded, and the Goods of the Bail taken per Fi. fa. Objected by the Bail, that the

the Sci. fa. ought to have been brought in the County of Middlesex, and not elsewhere; the Caption appearing by the Record of the Recognizance to be before the Chief Justice and his Brethren, in Court, as the Entry always is of a Bail on Cepi Corpus taken before a Judge at his Chambers. Rule to shew Cause why the Award of Execution and Fi. fa. should not be set aside, with Costs. The Court, after hearing Counsel on both Sides, held the Objection good, and made the Role absolute, without Costs. Where the Caption of the Recognizance appears to be in another County, and is afterwards inrolled in Middlesex, (as in some other Cases) the Sci. fc. may be in either County; but where the Caption appears by the Record to be in Middlesex, the Sci. fa. must be in Middlesex alfo, and not elsewhere. A Sci. fa. to revive a Judgment is a Continuance of the Suit, and must be brought in that County where the original Action is laid. A Sci. fa. against Bail is the first Proceeding. Allen 12. Mod. Cases in Law and Equity 290. Lutw. 1282, 1287. Dalton against Teasdale, in this Court, Easter 2 Geo. 2. 2 Salk. 564.

N. B. Several of the Filacers attended, and reported the Practice as the Court held it to be; and that Filacer by whom the Bail-piece is filed, and who enters the Record of the Recognizance on his Roll, makes out the first Sci. fa. into Middlesex, or other proper County, as the

Case

Case requires; the second Sci. fa. (when necessary) is signed by the Prothonotary. Willes for Defendant; Bootle for Plaintiff.

Fuit tenus Hil. 44 Eliz. per 4 Just. q'
Sci. fa. sup. Recogn. p't issuer al Vic. del
lieu ou le Caption fuit. Et q' n'est ascun
necessity q' il issera al Vic. Midd. ou est
inrole proviso q' le Entrie soit fait accord't. Vide simile sup. Recogn. capt. coram
J. Dyer apud Castrum Lincoln. Hil. 6 Eliz.
Rot. 1887. Pasch. 35 H. 6. Rot. 37. C. B.
Suff. Recogn. to pay Money to one, taken by
Prysot, C. J. at St. Edmond's Bury. Offic.
Brev. fo. 17. & fo. 316. Hob. 195.

Littleton, Executor, against Hanson. Mich. 20 Geo. 2.

Execution, no Bail being put in, or Writ of Error brought by Defendant; and the Action being in Debt on Bond, conditioned only for Payment of Money, according to the true Intent and Meaning of an Indenture, and not Performance of Covenants; also Rule to shew Cause. Upon shewing Cause, Lucas against Armstrong, Mich. 12 Geo. 2. was quoted. And the Court held, That by the Statute 3 Jac. cap. 8. Bail was required

required. If the Bond had been generally for Performance of Covenants in an Indenture, and the only Covenant in that Indenture for Payment of Money, Bail must be given on Writ of Error. Time was given to Defendant to put in Bail. Hayward for Plaintiff.

Poor against Coulthurst. Hilary 20 Geo. 2.

Efendant, who had been arrested by a Testat' Capias from London into Devonshire, returnable the first of last Term, now perfected Bail, and moved to stay Proceedings on the Bail-Bond, on Payment of Costs; infisting, that as no Declaration in the original Action had been delivered de bene elle, Plaintiff had not lost a Trial, and therefore the Bail-Bond ought not to stand as a Security. The Court held, That as Plaintiff might have tried his Cause last Term without a Declaration de bene effe, he has been delayed of Trial. Rule, by Consent, to stay Proceedings on Bail-Bond on Payment of Costs, Pleading the General Issue, and Taking short Notice of Trial at the Sitting after Term; Bail-Bond to stand as a Security, and whenever that is the Case, it is understood that Plaintiff may at Pleasure sign Judgments · Bail, &c.

in the Actions on the Bail-Bond. Bootle for Defendant; Prime for Plaintiff.

Peeston against Tracy, Esq; 4th Febr.

Efendant arrested last Term, but no Bail-Bond taken; the Sheriff being called on, returned a Cepi Corpus; and being ferved with a peremptory Rule to bring in the Body, Bail was yesterday perfected in Court; the Rule to bring in the Body discharged.

Note; The Time for bringing in the Body being expired, and Plaintiff intitled to move for an Attachment before the Bail perfected, the Sheriff was ordered to pay the Costs of the Application against him. Hayward.

Baskerville

Baskerville, Esquire, against Chassey. Easter 20 Geo. 2.

In Error. Bjected to one of the Bail, that he was a Palace Court Officer; but over-ruled, and the Bail allowed. The Rule of this Court to prevent Sheriffs Officers, and other Persons concerned in the Execution of Process, from being Bail, extends only to Process of this Court, whereon Defendants having been bailed by the Officers who arrested them, were greatly imposed on and abused. (Absente Capitali Jastic'.) Agar for Plaintiff in Error; Hayward for Defendant in Error.

Castell against Grave, one, &c. on a Bail-Bond. Mich. 21 Geo. 2.

THE Court ordered all Proceedings to be stayed; it appearing, that the Defendant in the original Action died before Judgment could have been obtained thereon against him. Bootle for Defendant; for Plaintiff.

Evening against Spoarman. Mich. 22 Geo. 2.

Efendant was arrested 26th May 1747, and gave a Bail-Bond, but died without putting in Bail above. Plaintiff lay still till twelve Months after the Arrest, and then took an Assignment of and put the Bail-Bond in Suit. The Bail moved to stay Proceedings, and obtained a Rule to shew Cause, which was now discharged; it appearing, that if Defendant had put in Bail in Time, he lived long enough for Plaintiss to have proceeded to Trial, and to have had Judgment and Execution in his Life-time. Poole for the Bail; Bootle for the Plaintiss.

Holland, an Attorny, against Ereskine. Same Term.

RULE to shew Cause why a Common Appearance should not be accepted for Defendant, as a Feme Covert, discharged. Where the Marriage is clearly made out, the Court will order a Common Appearance; but in this Case, Defendant appears to have acted as a Feme Sole for twelve Years, which makes the Matter doubtful. *Prime* for Defendant; *Bootle* and *Poole* for Plaintiff.

Easter 22 Geo. 2.

THE Producing a Duplicate of Defendant's Discharge as a Fugitive, held sufficient; and Affidavits on Plaintiff's Part, to shew that Desendant was not abroad beyond the Seas 1st January 1747, refused to be read. This should have been objected at the Sessions: It may be pleaded, but cannot be entered into on the Question of, Bail or No Bail? Rule made in the Treasury for a Common Appearance.

Swarbreck against Wheeler. Mich. 23 Geo. 2.

A Ffidavit for Bail made by a third Perfon, That Defendant was indebted to Plaintiff 500 l. and upwards, as appears by a stated Account, attested by the Consul at Oporto. Objected to by Defendant as insufficient; but the Defect being supplied by a subsequent Assidavit of Defendant's Acknowledging the stated Account, Rule to shew Cause why a Common Appearance, was discharged. Prime for Defendant; Willes for Plaintiff.

Vol. II.

G

Knight

Knight against Remy.

Efendant having produced his Certificate as a Bankrupt, allowed and confirmed, moved for a Common Appearance in this Action, which was Debt on Bond for Payment of Mony by Installments, fome of which were not payable till after the Bankruptcy; and the Question was, Whether this be a Debt discharged by the Certificate, or not? After the first Default of Payment, the Bond is forseited, and the Penalty is the Debt in Law. The Court will not enter nicely into the Matter on Bail or No Bail. Rule for Common Appearance. Prime for Desendant; Willes for Plaintiff.

Fowlis, Esquire against Grasvenor. Hilary 23 Geo. 2.

HE Capias ad respondendum was returnable 15 Mart. last. 4th Dec. Bail was put in before a Judge. 7th Dec. Plaintiff excepted against the Bail, and 15th Dec. put the Bail-Bond in Suit for Want of a Justification within four Days after Exception, before a Judge at his Chambers, or Time obtained to perfect Bail; insisting, that though the Exception was in Time of Vecation, Defendant ought to have done every Thing in his Power towards perfecting the Bail. The

Court held, That a Justification before a Judge is no Justification, but by Plaintiff's Consent. That by the General Rule of Court, requiring Bail to be perfected within four Days after Exception, must be meant the next four Days in Term. The Bail in this Case were justified in Court the second Day of this Term. The fair Way would be to give Notice of a Justification in Court within four Days after Exception, but 'tis not requisite, two Days Notice is sufficient. Rule absolute to stay Proceedings on Bail-Bond, without Costs. Prime for Defendant; Leeds for Plaintiff.

Goswell, one, &c. against Hunt. Easter 23 Geo. 2.

Judge, Plaintiff gave Notice of an Exception against them, (but did not enter his Exception on the Bail-Piece) and for Want of a Justification in Court, served the Sheriff with a peremptory Rule to bring in the Desendant's Body within six Days, for Want whereof Plaintiff moved for an Attachment against him. The Court held, That an Exception in Writing on the Bail-Piece, and Notice thereof to Desendant's Attorny, are both necessary; and that for Want of the former, the Bail (which had stood more than twenty Days without an Exceptio

Exception entered) was become absolute, and ordered Proceedings against the Sheriff to be stayed. Willes for Plaintiff.

Hooper against Comings.

HE Bail, who resided in the Country, entered into Recognizance before Mr. Justice Birch in Town, and being excepted against, sent up an Assidavit of Sufficiency. They were permitted to justify by that Assidavit, without attending personally. No Opposition made on Plaintiff's Part. Poole for Desendant.

Price and another against Street.

Plaintiff served Cooper, late Sheriff, with peremptory Rule to bring Defendant's Body into Court within six Days; whereupon Defendant put in Bail, and justified de bene esse before a Judge, and for want of an Exception within twenty Days, the Bail became absolute. Plaintiff insisted, that tho no Exception was taken, yet the Bail ought to have been persected by Justification in Court (which is Bringing in the Body) within the six Days limited by the Rule: but the Court held otherwise. Rule on late Sheriff to shew Cause why Attachment, discharged. Bootle for late Sheriff; Willes for Plaintiff.

Baxter against Overton. Hil. 24 Geo. 2.

Defendant produced a Duplicate of his Discharge as an insolvent Debtor, and after having put in Bail before a Judge, moved in the Treasury to be discharged on entering a Common Appearance; which, upon hearing the Attornies on both Sides, was granted, and the Bail-Piece ordered to be vacated. Defendant being confidered as in Custody of his Bail, and his Person being by the Statute to be discharged.

Hutchinson against Hardcastle. Easter 24 Geo. 2.

7 RIT returnable last Michaelmas Term; Bail was taken before a Commissioner in the Country; Notice thereof given to Plaintiff's Attorny there, and the Bail-Piece transmitted to London to Defendant's Agent; he incautiously filed it with the Filazer, (who as incautiously received it, without first being allowed by a Judge. Plaintiff lay by till after last Assizes, and then took an Affignment of, and put the Bail-Bond in Suit. The Court ordered the Filazer to attend a Judge for his Allocatur; gave Plaintiff Leave to except against the Bail, if he thought fit, and stayed Proceed-G 3

ings on the Bail-Bond upon Payment of Costs. Plaintiff's Council urged, that he had been delayed, and lost a Trial; but such Delay is through his own Laches; he might have put the Bail-Bond in Suit much earlier than he did. *Prime* and *Willes* for Desendant; *Bootle* for Plaintiff.

Roe, on the Demise of Fenwick, and others, against Pearson, in Eject-ment in Error. Easter 24 Geo. 2.

A Otion to stay Proceedings by Defendant in Error for Want of better Bail, Plaintiff in Error having entered into Recognizance, pursuant to the Statute 16 & 17 Car. 2. in the Value of two Years meine Profits only, and double Costs. Objected. That by the Practice of this Court. the Recognizance ought to be in the Value of two Years and a Half meine Profits. though in the King's Bench two Years Value is sufficient. The Statute leaves the Sum to the Discretion of the Court, and gives a Writ of Enquiry as to mesne Profits and Damages. The Court thought two Years Value a reasonable Suna, and stayed Proceedings on the Judgment pending the Writ of Error; made a general Rule, that for the future these Recognizances shall be taken in the Value of two Years Profits and double Costs. Bootle for Defendant: Poole for Plaintiff in Error. Ray

Ray and others against Hussey.

PULE made absolute (on Affidavits of Service, no Cause being shewn to the contrary) for Leave to enter an Exoneretur on the Recognizance of Bail. Defendant, pending the Action having become a Bankrupt, and obtained his Certificate allowed and confirmed. Bootle for Desendant.

N. B. This had been done in the King's Bench; 'tis a new Practice, introduced to discharge the Bail in a summary Way, without putting them to the Trouble and Charge of surrendering the Principal, as formerly; though by the Bankrupt Act 5 Geo. 2. Power is given to a Judge to order the Bankrupt, after such Surrender, to be discharged.

Wilson and others against Lasortune. Trin. 24 & 25 Geo. 2.

Plaintiff, after a Ca. fa. returned against the Principal, filed a Bill in an Action of Debt on the Recognizance against Wall, an Attorny, one of the Bail first put in, (though after Exception two other Bail justified in Court) and sued out Process against C. D. another of the Bail, on whom the Process was served two Days only before the Return, (though four Days are requisite.)

G 4. On

On Motion of Bootle for Wall and C. D. the Court made a Rule for Plaintiff to shew Cause why Proceedings against Wall and C.D. should not be stayed. On shewing Cause, the Court held, in answer to an Objection of Plaintiff's Counsel, that the Affidavit was properly intitled in this the Original Action. That the proceeding against Wall as an Attorny, by Bill, of which he complained, was not irregular; but that other Bail having justified, he was discharged. Rule absolute to stay Proceedings against C. D. because he was not ferved with the Writ in time; and against Wall, because other Bail had justified as aforesaid. And the Court ordered Wall's Name to be struck out of the Bail-Piece, and the Entry of the Recognizance to be amended accordingly, and gave Wall his Costs. Willes for Plaintiff.

Norton against Lutwidge. Mich. 25 Geo. 2.

Otion by Defendant for a Common Appearance, on producing a Duplicate of his Discharge at the Sessions of the Peace, under the late Statute, as a Fugitive for Debt. Plaintiff objected, that Desendant was an Irishman, and instead of slying from his native Country, sled to Ireland, as mentioned in the Duplicate; and that Ireland is not within the Words of the Statute, ('Foreign Parts.')

Parts)'. The Court did not think it neceffary to give an Opinion whether Defendant was within the Statute, or not; or whether, on the Face of the Duplicate, the Sessions had exceeded their Jurisdiction. The Quarter-Sessions is to determine as to immediate Liberty, afterwards the Court, or a Judge, are to discharge Desendant on producing his Duplicate. Plaintiss may put the Point on Trial, but Desendant must not remain in winculis till the Determination. Rule absolute for a Common Appearance. Wynne for Desendant; Willes for Plaintiss.

Sanders, Esquire, late Sheriff, against Spincks. Mich. 25 Geo. 2.

ham, the original Plaintiff, against Sibrell the original Defendant; soon after which Sibrell became a Bankrupt, and obtained his Certificate allowed and confirmed: Notwithstanding which, the Bail-Bond was lately put in Suit, in the Sheriff's Name, against Spincks the present Defendant, one of the Bail, and on his Application a Rule was made to shew Cause, and afterwards absolute, to stay the Proceedings. Draper for Defendant; Bootle for Plaintiff.

Mayo against Weaver. Easter 25 Geo. 2.

ULE was obtained by Defendant to Thew Cause why Plaintiff should not strike out the Exception entered against the Bail, in order that Defendant might render himself in their Discharge; Defendant insisting, that as Plaintiff had not marked his Declaration to be delivered de bene esse, he had accepted the Bail: But it appearing, that by a Judge's Order ten Days Time had been given Defendant to perfect Bail, Plaintiff to declare without Prejudice, Defendant to rejoin gratis, and to take Notice of Trial for the last Sitting within last Michaelmas Term; in Consequence of which Order Issue was joined, the Cause entered, made a Remanet, and tried at the Sitting after last Michaelmas Term, when Plaintiff had a Verdict: The Rule was discharged. Defendant should have perfected his Bail in time, (which he has not done) and then might have rendered if he had thought fit. Willes and Agar for Defendant; Prime for Plaintiff.

Whitehead, Administrator of Reeveley, against Gale, Bail for Stewart. Hil. 25 Geo. 2.

Udgment was entered against the principal Defendant, at the Suit of Plaintiff's Intestate, in Michaelmas Term 1741, after a Writ of Enquiry executed in the Vacation preceding. In 1748 the principal Defendant retired to Bruges in Flanders. In Hilary Term 1748 the Judgment was revived by Plaintiff, by one Scire facias returned Nichil babet; and in Easter Term following a Capias ad Satisfaciendum was returned Non est inventus; soon after which the principal Defendant died abroad; a Capias ad respondendum on the Recognizance was fued out against Gale, one of the Bail, returnable 8 Hilary 1750, and he applied to stay Proceedings, because by the Intestate's and Plaintiff's Delay of proceeding against the Bail till after the Death of the Principal, Gale was prevented from furrendering the Principal Defendant to the Fleet in Discharge of his Bail, which he would have done, had the Bail been recently proceeded against in the Principal's Life-time. After this Matter fully debated by Counfel, and Confideration had, the Court determined, That they could not relieve the Bail on Motion. A Render of the Principal after a Capias ad Satisfaciendum returned, is not a good Plea, and no Instance can be shewn that any of the Courts of Westminster have relieved Bail on Motion, where the Principal died after a Ca. sa. returned. Though by the Rules and Practice of the Court, Indulgence has been given to Bail to render the Principal till the quarto die post of the first Scire facias, if returned Scire feci; or the Alias Scire facias, if returned Nichil habet; or the quarto die post of a Capias ad respondendum on the Recognizance, served four Days before the Return. Yet this extends only to Cases where the Principal can be rendered, and not to Cases where by his Death a Render is become impossible. The Recognizance is absolutely forfeited immediately after a Ca. sa. returned; and if the Principal dies afterwards, before a Render, the Bail are fixed; the deferring of the Render till after the Return of the Ca. fa. is at the Risque and Peril of the Bail; they ought to render at the Return, tho where the Principal is to be had, and is rendered afterwards, within the Time allowed by the Practice of the Court, yet the Bail have first been guilty of a Default; where the Principal is not to be had, the Bail must fuffer; the Enlargement of the Time is Indulgence only where Plaintiff can be put in the same Condition by a Render, as if it had been at the Return of the Ca. sa. but where

a Render cannot be made, the Election of the Bail is over, 'tis not in the Power of the Court to relieve, though Favour of Bail is Favour of Liberty; and 'tis probable this Court may make a general Rule to speed Plaintiffs, that Bail for the future know when they are discharged; vide Cro. Jac. 91. Williams against Vaughan. Same Book 165. Timperly against Coleman. 1 Salk. 101. 6 Mod. 132. Rule of Court 1654. 1 Roll's Abr. 336. 2 Ld. Raymond 1452. Barry against Perry. 1 Sir Wm. Jones 29. Sparrow against Southgate. Mich. 1 Geo. 2. King against Yates. Rule to shew Cause why Proceedings should not be stayed, discharged. Prime for Defendant; Willes and Poole for Plaintiff.

Garth against Green. Trin. 25 & 26 Geo. 2.

RULE to shew Cause why Recognizance of Bail should not be discharged, Plaintiff not being intitled to Bail by the Course of the Court, in this Action of Debt on Judgment, because Bail was given in the Original Action. The Rule was made absolute, no Cause shewn to the contrary. Prime for Defendant.

Reynoldson against Blades, (Covenant broken) in the Treasury. Easter 26 Geo. 2.

DLaintiff made an Affidavit, That Defendant entered into an Agreement with him in Writing, and covenanted to pay him 3151. for the Purchase of Land; that Plaintiff has been always ready to convey the E-state on Payment of the Purchase-Money, but Defendant refuses to pay and to take the Estate, whereby Plaintiff swears himself damnified 40 l. Common Appearance or-dered. No previous Application to a Judge. Damages uncertain. Old Cases, Fleetwood against Poictier, &c. are not to be followed. Where Damages can be reduced to a Certainty, as in Covenant for Payment of Mony, or where a Tenant covenants with his Landlord to pay a certain Sum for every Acre of Land he plows up, or the like, Plaintiff is intitled to Bail, otherwise not, especially without Judge's Order previous. 'Tis not reasonable that Defendant should be held to Bail for fuch Damages as Plaintiff fancies he has sustained, and is pleased to swear to.

Julian against Shobrooke, Mich. 27 Geo. 2.

Motion on Behalf of Defendant's Bail, for Leave to make out a new Bailpiece, the old one, taken before a Commiffioner in the Country, not being to be found on the Filazer's File, on Affidavit of Mr. Limbrey, Defendant's Agent, of its having been allowed and filed in May 1751, by his late Clerk deceased, as appeared by the Clerk's Account; and, as Limbrey believed, Defendant had been some Days in Custody of his Bail, but could not be furrendered for want of the Bail-piece. Defendant refused to confent to the filing of a new Bail-piece, or the Bail's entering into a new Recognizance, infifting that the Bail (who were prefent in Court) had Effects of his in their Hands sufficient to satisfie Plaintiff's Demands; which the Bail (examined on Oath by the Court) having denied, and it appearing that they originally became Bail for Defendant at his Request, the Court gave them Leave to put in Bail de novo; which they did, and furrendered Defendant to the Fleet Prison in their Discharge. Willes for the Bail: Poole for the Defendant.

Stapleton against The Baron de Stark. Hilary 27 Geo. 2. 1754.

PLaintiff made an Affidavit for Bail, That Defendant was indebted to her 1000 l. and upwards, for Money lent; whereupon Defendant having been arrested, moved to be discharged on entering a Common Appearance, shewing the Court by Affidavit, That Defendant had given promifory Notes for the Plaintiff's whole Demand, some of which were become due and payable, and those Notes had been put in Suit in the Court of King's Bench, by Action still pending; that the Residue of the Debt for which this Action was brought, is fecured by Notes not due or payable. Plaintiff's Counsel admitted the Fact, but produced an Affidavit from Plaintiff, shewing, that she had good Reafon to think the Defendant would fuddenly leave the Kingdom, and therefore she caused him to be arrested for the Residue of her Debt for Mony lent, which she was advised she might do, though she had Defendant's Note for it, her original Debt for Mony lent not being extinguished, as it might have been had she taken a Bond, or higher Secu-The Court thought the Matter improper to be discussed on this Motion. Rule to shew Cause why Common Appearance, discharged. 4

charged. Willes and Draper for Defendant; Prime for Plaintiff.

Whitfield against Whitfield.

THIS Action was brought (as appeared by Plaintiff's Affidavit) on Defendant's Bond to indemnify Plaintiff against Securities which he had entered into for Defendant, but Plaintiff fwore to no certain Dampnification, nor to his being arrested on any of these Securities, though Actions had been brought thereon against him, and he was obliged to abfcond. The Court declared, that to hold to Bail in Actions on Bonds to fave harmless, &c. as well as in Actions of Covenant, Plaintiff must swear positively and certainly how, and for how much, he is dampnified; the Court cannot take it by Implication. Rule absolute for a Common Appearance. Willes for Defendant: Poole for Plaintiff.

Costs and Bills of Costs.

Ecollier against Dutour. Trin. 13 & 14 Geo. 2.

Obnson, Defendant's late Attorny, delivered Defendant a Bill of Costs amounting to 5 l. 4 s. 2 d. and accepted 4 l. 14 s. 6 d. in full Satisfaction; the Bill was afterwards taxed, and upon Taxation, 19 s. were taken off, and 4 l. 5 s. 2 d. allowed. Defendant obtained a Rule for Johnson to shew Cause why he should not pay the Costs of Taxation, infifting, that more than a fixth Part of his Bill had been disallowed. But the Court confidered the Sum accepted by Johnfon in full of his Bill, as his Demand, and the Sum of qs. 4d. which appeared to be the Deduction therefrom not amounting to a fixth Part, the Rule was discharged, upon Repayment of 9 s. 4 d. overpaid. Draper for Johnson; Urlin for Defendant.

Downes, Administrator, against Shaft.

In Trover. THE Conversion was laid to be in the Life-time of Plaintiff's Intestate; Defendant had a Verdict, and moved for Costs, which were denied. Bootle for Defendant; Wynne for Plaintiff.

Ibbotson against Browne. Easter 11 Geo. 2.

Clausum fregit; Defendant pleaded a Justification, Plaintiff made a new Assignment, whereto Defendant pleaded Not guilty; and Plaintiff having recovered a Verdict with Damages under 40 s. and the Judge who tried the Cause not having certified as required per Statute 22 & 23 Car. 2. the Question was, Whether Plaintiff ought to have full Costs, or Not? Per Cur': Here is no Special Pleading; the new Assignment is only to ascertain the Place. Plaintiff can have no more Costs than Damages. Bootle for Plaintiff; Prime for Defendant.

Creake, Administratrix, and Creake, Administrator of Creake, against Pitcairne, Clerk, in Prohibition. Trin. 13 & 14 Geo. 2.

A Writ of Prohibition having been granted in Michaelmas Term 1738, on the Plaintiffs Motion, and Plaintiffs not having proved their Suggestion to be true within fix Months, pursuant to the Statute of 2 & 3 Edw. 6. Defendant moved in Hilary Term 1739. that a Writ of Consultation might be awarded for Defendant, Plaintiffs not proving their Suggestion to be true within the Time limited by the Statute; and that Plaintiffs might, according to the Direction of fuch Statute, pay to Defendant double Costs; and a Rule was granted to shew Cause. After several Motions, it was now doubted, whether the Plaintiffs, being Administrators, ought to pay Costs: But the Court seemed to think that Defendant was intitled of Course to a Writ of Consultation. Sed Cur' advifare as to both Points.

Palmer against Williams, Clerk. Mich. 15 Geo. 2.

Efendant, after seven Years Litigation, obtained a Sentence in the Spiritual Court against Plaintiff for Petty Tithes of Gooseberries and Strawberries, of the Value of 7 d. three farthings per Ann. Plaintiff applied for a Prohibition; and for the Information of the Court, a feigned Issue was directed, to try whether the Plot of Ground where these Gooseberries, &c. grew, was Parcel of an ancient Orchard, or not. Fact being found in Plaintiff's Favour, a Prohibition was granted; and a Question arose, Whether Plaintiff should have any, and what Costs? Per Cur': Plaintiff must have his Costs of the feigned Issue. As to Costs of the Spiritual Court, (where Plaintiff has been unjustly vexed) they are not in our Power to give. Since the Statute giving Costs of Suit in Prohibition after Judgment, Costs commence from the Suggestion, which is taken to be the Commencement of the Suit, in lieu of an Original Writ of Prohibition. Draper for Plaintiff; Prime and Wynne for Defendant.

Howard, Executor, against Radburn. Hil. 15 Geo. 2.

Of Nonsuit, pursuant to late Act of Parliament. But per Cur': Plaintiff being an Executor, is not subject to Costs; if a Nonsuit had happened at the Assizes, Plaintiff would not have been liable to Costs.

Goodtitle, on the Demile of Clewlow and his Wife, against Lowe and Lowe, in Ejectment; Lowe against Lowe and another, in Case. Trin. 16 Geo. 2.

RULE obtained on the Motion of Clew-low, upon Affidavit of Lowe's Informancy, to shew Cause why the Costs recovered by Clewlow, in one of these Actions, should not be set off against the Costs recovered by Lowe in the other Action. Wase, Attorny for Lowe, shewed for Cause, that the Parties in the two Causes were different; and that by this Means Clewlow, who was in good Circumstances, would be discharged, and Wase would have no Remedy for his Costs, Lowe being insolvent. The Rule was discharged. Skinner for Wase; Birch for Clevelow

Clewlow. The Court denied to set Costs against Costs. Ford against Miles, et econtra, Easter Term 1739.

Honiwill against Blatchford. (Title Nonpros, Uc.)

Efendant moved for Judgment, as in Case of Nonsuit, pursuant to the Statute, for Want of Plaintiff's trying the Issue according to the Course of the Court, after a Treasury Rule obtained by Desendant against Plaintiff for Costs, for not proceeding to Trial according to Notice, and Costs taxed thereon. Per Cur': Desendant shall not take both Remedies, but one only, at his Election; he hath made Choice of the one, and cannot now have the other. No Rule. Belsield for Desendant; Gapper for Plaintiff.

Thrustout, on the Demise of Jenkinfon, against Woodyear, Esq; and his Wife, Hoole, Allison and Hardwick, in Ejectment. Hil. 16 Geo. 2.

Verdict against all the Defendants except Hoole, who was found Not guilty; Plaintiff's Costs were taxed upon the Postea, and also Defendant Hoole's (at three Pounds.) Hoole applied to the Court, and obtained a H 4 Rule

104 **Costs**, &c.

Rule to shew Cause why he should not be allowed a third Part of Defendant's common Costs, and all his extraordinary Costs: But upon shewing Cause, it appearing that the Allowance of Costs was just, and that the Motion was a mere Contrivance to charge Plaintiff's Lessor with extraordinary Costs, which were accrewed on Account of all the Defendants, and not on the particular Account of Hoole only, though the main Question was determined in Plaintiff's Favour, and though Hoole was Tenant to Defendant Woodyear, and indempnified by him. The Rule was discharged with Costs. for for Plaintiff. Hoole.

Turner against Horton. Easter 16 Geo. 2.

I HIS was an Action for several Sets of slanderous Words spoken by Defendant of Plaintiff in his Trade of a Baker, (viz.) Turner will break before Christmas; and I will lay a Wager of it; and such like; and laid Special Damage, viz. that Charles Hedges resused to deal with him upon Credit. Plaintiff obtained a Verdict, Damages Twopence. And the Question was, Whether Plaintiff should have more Costs than Damages, under the Statute 2: Jac. cap. 15. sect. 6? Per Cur': Plaintiff can have no more Costs than Damages; the true Distinction

tion is, that where the Words are actionable in themselves, without the Special Damage, that is a Case within the Act of Parliament, and Plaintiff can have no more Costs than Damages. But where the Words are not actionable in themselves, but the Action is maintainable only with Respect to the Special Damage, then 'tis a Cafe at large, and out of the Statute; and Plaintiff, if he recovers any Damage, will be entitled to full Costs. Where the Words are actionable, (as in this Case) the Special Damages are to be confidered merely by way of Aggravation, and no Notice ought to be taken of them in the Verdict, which must be generally, Guilty or Not guilty. The Verdict was for Plaintiff on the first and fourth Sets of Words only, but that makes no Alteration, the Words, in this Case, being all equally actionable, as spoken of Plaintiff in the Way of his Trade. Where the Words are not actionable. there the Special Damages are the Jett of the Action; and if the Jury find Defendant Guilty of speaking the Words, and acquit him as to the Special Damages, the Verdict ought to be so taken.

Grey, Administrator, against Lockwood, in Trover. Trin. 16 & 17 Geo. 2.

HE Conversion being in the Time of the Administrator, the Action might have been maintained by Plaintiff in his own Right; and after Judgment for Defendant, the Court held that Plaintiff must pay Costs.

Broadbent against Wilks, in Trespass.

Hough the Trespass was confessed by the Plea, Plaintiff replied, and Issue being joined, on the Trial a Verdict was found for Defendant. Afterwards the Court gave Judgment for Plaintiff, notwithstanding the Verdict, and a Writ of Enquiry of Damages having been executed, the Question was, What Costs should be allowed Plaintiff on siguing final Judgment? The Court directed the Prothonatory to allow Plaintiff all the Costs in the Cause, except the Costs of the Trial. Prime for Plaintiff; Bootle for Defendant.

Ogle, Executor, against Moffatt. Mich. 17 Geo. 2.

RULE for Plaintiff to pay Costs for not proceeding to Trial at last Northumber-land Assizes, according to Notice, discharged. It appearing that the Cause was entered with the Marshal, that one material Witness was served with a Subpæna, and could not attend, and another was disabled by a Fall from his Horse. Plaintiff hath made no wilful Default; if he had, he must have paid Costs, though he sues as Executor. Prime for Plaintiff; Bootle for Defendant.

Holdfast, on the Demise of Hattersley, an Infant, against Jackson. Trinity 17 & 18 Geo. 2.

AFTER a former Ejectment brought in Banco Regis, a Case made, Argument thereon, and a Determination in savour of Desendant, and Desendant's Costs taxed, a new Ejectment was brought in this Court; Desendant obtained a Rule to shew Cause why Proceedings should not be stayed till aster Payment of Costs in the sormer Ejectment, which was made absolute. The Courts of Westminster-Hall pay the same Regard one for another, and consider a sormer Ejectment

jectment in another Court as they do a former Ejectment in the same Court. Salk. 255. Anonymous. Doe ex dim' Duchess of Hamilton against Hatherley 14 Geo. 2. in B. R. The same Practice in Scaccario. Bootle for Defendant; Skinner for Plaintiff.

Milbourn against Reade. Trin. 17 & 18 Geo. 2.

Eclaration in Trespass, for assaulting, beating and wounding Plaintiff, at the Parish of (A.) and also for obstructing him in getting Coals, and for taking and carrying away Coals of Plaintiff, and spoiling other his Coals there, and for breaking and pulling down a Standard and Roller of Plaintiff's, and taking and carrying away other Goods and Chattels of Plaintiff's there. Plea Not guilty. On Trial Defendant found Guilty of all the Premisses, except taking and carrying away the Goods and Chattels; Damages 5 s. Costs 5 s. and as to taking and carrying away faid Goods and Chattels, Not guilty. No Certificate by the Judge that the Affault and Battery was fufficiently proved, or that the Freehold or Title of Land came chiefly in Question, secundum Stat' 22 & 23 Car. 2. cap. 9. sect. 136. and for Want thereof, after Prothonotary had taxed Plaintiff full Costs, Defendant obtained a Rule to shew Cause why faid Taxation should not be set aside; which

which Rule, after hearing Counfel on both

Sides, was discharged by the Court.

Held, agreeably to the uniform Determinations of the Courts at Westminster, almost ever fince said Stat' 22 & 23 Car. 2. That no Action is comprehended within that Statute but of Trespass Quare clausum fregit, and of Assault and Battery; in all other perfonal Actions, a Plaintiff who recovers Damages, though under 40 s. (except Actions for scandalous Words, which are governed by a particular Law) is intitled to full Costs by the Statute of Gloucester, without the Aid of a Certificate under faid Stat' Car. 2. unless deprived of that Benefit by a Certificate according to the Statute 43 Eliz. cap. 6. feet. 2. Lord Chief Justice Willes paid no Regard to the Spoliation or Asportation of Chattels; he quoted Venn against Phillips, Salk. 208, Thompson against Berry, C. B. Pasch. 7 Geo. 2. Mr. Justice Abney was of the same Opinion. Mr. Justice Burnett differed in that Respect; he apprehended one Part of this Verdict (the Assault and Battery) to be within, and the other Part (the Trefpass as to the Spoliation of personal Chattels) to be out of faid Stat. Car. 2. but as Plaintiff might have brought separate Actions, and possibly have recovered full Costs in each for the Assault and Battery, with a Certificate, and for the Spoliation of Chattels, without a Certificate, he is, by joining both together, less

less vexatious to Defendant. Plaintiff is intitled to Costs in this Action, as he would have been in a feparate Action for the Spoliation or Asportation of Chattels only. In this Case, as the Trespass is laid generally at the Parish of (A.) and not in any particular Close of Plaintiff, the Title of Land could not come in Question. Lately against Fry, Comyns Rep. 19, 20. Action for breaking Plaintiff's Close, and cutting and carrying away his Corn there, Defendant found Guilty of breaking the Close, and cutting the Corn, but as to the carrying away Not guilty; Damages under 40 s. no Certificate. The Court refused to give full Costs for Want of a Certificate, because the Trespass found was within the Statute; but after feveral Debates. the Court inclined to be of Opinion to have given full Costs, if besides breaking the Close and cutting the Corn, Defendant had also been found Guilty of carrying away the Corn, which would have made that Case parallel to the present; for then the Jury would have found one Trespass within the Statute, and another Trespass out of the Statute. Wynne for Defendant; Draper and Bootle for Plaintiff.

Mitchell, Widow, against Younghufband. Mich. 18 Geo. 2.

ACTION for Words (Special Damage laid, by which Plaintiff loft her Marriage.) General Verdict for Plaintiff, Damages Two-pence. Rule absolute, that Plaintiff should have full Costs, the Words themselves not being actionable, but only as they are coupled with the Special Damage. Bootle for Plaintiff; Prime for Defendant.

Waite against Smales, ex parte Exec' Def'. Hil. 18 Geo. 2.

RIT of Enquiry by Consent, directed to be executed before a Judge at the Affizes, not entered with the Marshal. After the other Business done, there was Time to execute this Writ; Plaintiff had given Notice of executing it on a particular Day, during the Affizes at York; Defendant's Executors applied for Costs, which were denied. Plaintiff is not in fault. This Case is not with the Rule concerning Records of Nist prius. The Judge herein is no more than an Affistant to the Sheriff, to whom the Writ is directed. The Notice ought to have been general; Notice for a particular Day is void. Skinner and Bootle for the Executors.

Harper against Sherrard. Hilary 20 Geo. 2.

Efendant having pleaded his Discharge under the insolvent Debtors Act, and having obtained Judgment, was intitled to treble Costs under the Statute; the Question was, From what Time such Costs ought to be computed? A Rule by Consent was entered into, that the Desendant should have treble Costs from the Time of his Plea. Draper for Desendant; Bootle for Plaintiff.

Greenhow against Ilsley and others. Easter 21 Geo. 2.

THE Plaintiff declared, that he was possessed of and in an ancient Messuage and divers Acres of Land cum pertin', in Sandburst Com' Berks, and by Reason thereof he had, and of Right ought to have, Common of Pasture for all his commonable Cattle levant and couchant upon his said Messuage and Lands, in a certain Common or Waste called Sandburst Common, every Year at all Times of the Year, except upon and from the 10th of June until and upon the 10th of July, but Desendants, to hinder and deprive him of his said Common of Pasture, cut and dug Turs, (viz.) 100 Cart Loads of Turves in twenty Acres of the

Soil of that Common, and took and carried away the Turves there cut and dug, whereby the Plaintiff could not have and enjoy his Common of Pasture in so large, ample and beneficial Manner as he ought to have done, but lost the greatest Part thereof. He also declared in like Manner with Respect to Common of Turbary.

Defendants Pleas. The Defendants, by Leave of the Court, plead three Pleas, viz. first, Not guilty; secondly, as to the first Count, that Adam Williamson, Esq; is seised of the Manor of Sandburst, in his Demesne as of Fee, and that Defendants, as his Servants, and by his Command, cut and dug the Turves in the first Count mentioned, then growing and being in the Locus in quo, as being in the several Soil and Freehold of the said Adam Williamson, and took and carried away the same for the Use of the said Adam Williamson; thirdly, the like Plea as to the second Count.

New Assignment. As to the second Plea, the Plaintiff, by a new Assignment, says, that he ought not to be barred from having his Action, because that the 100 Cart Loads of Turves mentioned in the first Count, were 100 Cart Loads of Turves cut and dug for Sale, and sold, taken and carried away, and were other 100 Cart Loads of Turves than the 100 Cart Loads mentioned in the Plea to be cut, dug, taken and carried away for the Vol. II.

114 Costs, &c.

Use of the said Adam Williamson; and concludes with an Averment; and inasmuch as the Defendants have not answered the cutting, digging and carrying away the Turves newly assigned, the Plaintiff prays Judgment, and his Damages; and replies in like Manner to the third Plea.

Plea to the new Assignment. As to the Trespasses, &c. as to the Turves first and fecondly anew affigned to be cut and dug for Sale, and fold, taken and carried away, the Defendants fay, that the said Adam Williamson long before the Time when. &c. was, and still is, seised in his Demesne as of Fee of and in the Manor of Sandburft, and being so seised before the Time when &c. viz. on the 27th October 1735, he gave and granted to one Thomas Solmes, in his Life-time, Licence and Liberty to cut and dig Turf and Peat for Sale, from and off the faid Place called Sandburst Common, in which, &c. and to take and carry away the same, and to fell and dispose thereof, for his own Use and Benefit, at his own Will and Pleafure, to hold the faid Licence and Liberty from Michaelmas then last past for 99 Years, in Case the said Thomas Solmes should so long live; by Vertue of which Licence and Liberty the Defendants, after the granting of the faid Licence, and during the Life of the faid Thomas, viz. on the 1st May 1743, and at divers other Days and Times between that Day

Day and the 24th of November in the same Year, on which Day the faid Thomas died, (except within and during the Times above excepted) as Servants of the said Thomas Solmes, and by his Command, entered into the faid Places, in which, &c in order to cut and dig Turves there, for the Purpose aforesaid, and then and there cut and dug the faid Turves first anew affigned, and also the Turves fecondly anew affigned, and took and carried away, and delivered the same to and for the Use and Benefit of the said Thomas Solmes, as it was lawful for them to do; which faid Turves were afterwards fold by the faid Thomas Solmes, by Virtue of his Grant and Licence aforesaid; which are the same Trespasses, &c. above anew assigned; and concludes with an Averment.

Demurrer. To this the Plaintiff demurs. Joinder in Demurrer. And the Defendants join in Demurrer.

On the Demurrer the Plaintiff had Judgment, but on the Trial of the Issue joined upon the Not guilty, the Plaintiff was non-suited.

Prothonotary Cooke having a Doubt as to the Taxation of Costs for the Plaintiff on the Demurrer, in Easter Term 21 Geo. 2. Plaintiff moved the Court, and obtained a Rule for the Defendants to shew Cause why Costs of the two Pleas pleaded by the Defendants, which on a Demurrer joined were

judged insufficient, should not be given for the Plaintiss; and the Taxation of the Defendants Costs of the Nonsuit was ordered to be stayed till the Court should otherwise order.

After hearing Counsel on both Sides, and after a Consultation with all the Judges, (amongst whom was some Division in Opinion) the Court in Hilary Term 22 Geo. 2. ordered, that it be referred to the Prothonotary to tax the Plaintiff's Costs of the Demurrer joined between the Parties, according to the Act of Parliament made in the fourth Year of the Reign of her late Majesty Queen Anne, intituled, An Act for the Amendment of the Law, and the better Advancement of Justice; and that so much as shall be thereon allowed, be deducted out of the Sum that shall be allowed the Defendants for their Costs in this Action. Prime and Belfield for Plaintiff; Skinner for the Defendants.

Fyson against Cooke and others, in Replevin. Mich. 22 Geo. 2.

Efendants having obtained an Order to amend their Avowry on Payment of Costs; Noyes, Defendants Agent, after Plaintiff's Death, which he knew not of, paid 5 l. 11 s. 6 d. Costs, taxed on the Amendment, to Lloyd, Plaintiff's Agent. The Judges

Judges in the Treasury ordered the Money to be repaid.

Malton, who as well, &c. against Acklam and others, in Prohibition.

AFTER a Verdict for Defendant as to Part, the Question was, Whether he should be allowed Costs, pursuant to Stat. Will. 3. or not? In Quare Impedit, if Defendant has Judgment, a Writ is awarded to the Bishop; in Replevin, a Writ of Retorn' Habend', and Costs are given to the Avowant in some Cases by Stat. 21 Hen. 8. in Prohibition by 4 Jac. 1. a Consultation is given, and fince the Statute W. 3. Costs, &c. if Verdict, &c. pass against Plaintiff. Rule that Judgment be entered for a Consultation as to Part, and for Costs. The Postea was agreed to be altered, with Respect to finding that Plaintiff proceeded in the Spiritual Court after the Writ of Prohibition delivered to him, which is material. Bootle for Defendants; Agar for Plaintiff.

Poole against Boulton and others, in Trover. Hil. 22 Geo. 2.

N the Trial, Plaintiff obtained a Verdict against one of the Defendants, but the two others were acquitted. Prime moved on Behalf of the two Defendants found Not guilty, for Costs. Denied. This is an Action of Trespass on the Case, and not within the Statute 8 & 9 W. 3. giving Costs to Defendants acquitted in Trespass, &c.

Lomax, Esquire, against The Bishop of London, Crespin, Clerk, and Cooke, Esquire, in Quare Impedit. Same Term.

HE Bishop's Plea was, No Claim but as Ordinary; Judgment passed against Defendant Cooke for Non-appearance on a Distringus. An Issue between Plaintiss and Defendant Crespin, on the Right of Presentation, was tried, and a Verdict sound for Plaintiss. Afterwards a Writ of Enquiry was awarded as to Matters (omitted at the Trial) viz. first, Whether the Vicarage was full? secondly, If sull, at whose Presentation; and how much Time is elapsed since it last began to be vacant? and thirdly, The

true Value of the Vicarage by the Year? By the Inquisition it was returned. That the Vicarage was full of the Defendant Daniel Crefpin, on the Presentation of the King; that it began to be vacant 26th June 1746, on the Death of John Romney, Clerk; Value by the Year 120 l. Draper for Plaintiff moved for Costs, Damages being given by the Statute of Westminster 2. and by the Statute of Gloucester, Costs in all Cases where Damages. He quoted Holl against Holland, 2 Lev. 25. and Skinner 25. Rule was made to shew Cause, which was afterwards discharged. The Statute of Gloucester, 6 Ed. 1. relates to Cases at Common Law and Statutes antecedent. The subsequent Statute of Westminster 2. 13 Ed. 1. creates Damages in Quare Impedit, where there were none before at Common Law, (doth not add to Damages that were recoverable before) gives two Years Value, where the Turn is lost by Laches; if not, and Living full, Half a Year's Value. Mich. 10 James 1. Pinfold's Case, 10 Coke, where Damages are created, (none before) no Costs; where the Damages are additional, Costs. 1 Jones, Sir Thomas, 234. Kelway 26. a. Skinner is mistaken, he refers to two Cases in Coke which don't warrant him. In Quare Impedit the King has no Damages, because he is not within the Statute of Westminster. Hob. 23. If Writ of

of Error, Costs per Stat. Hen. 7. no Costs in any other Instance. Skinner for Defendant Crespin.

Jones against Davies and his Wife, in Trespass and Assault. Easter 22 Geo. 2.

Efendants had pleaded to two Assaults, &c. laid in the Declaration, several Matters, by Leave of the Court, viz. an Accord with Satisfaction by the Husband; That what the Wife did was in Aid of her Husband; Not guilty; and Son Assault demesne. On Trial the Verdict was on the two first mentioned Pleas for the Defendants, Residue for Plaintiff, without any Damages; no Certificate from the Judge, that Defendants had probable Cause to plead the two last mentioned Pleas. The Court thought they had no discretionary Power, but are bound by the Statute 4th Qu. Anne, as the Judge has not certified. Rule absolute, that Plaintiff have Costs occasioned by the two later Pleas, and that the same be deducted out of Costs allowed Defendants. Skinner for Plaintiff; Belfield for Defendants.

Moorhouse against Barham. Hilary 23 Geo. 2.

Efendant had obtained a Treasury Rule for Taxation of Plaintiff's Attorny's Bill, at Peril of Costs. On Plaintiff's Application to the Court to discharge the Treasury Rule, the Court ordered the Bill to be taxed as between Attorny and Client, at Peril of Costs. Poole for Plaintiff; Bootle for Defendant.

Cremer against Dent. Easter 24 Geo. 2.

Pleas in Bar to an Avowry, three of which were found for the Plaintiff, and the fourth for the Defendant. The Judge before whom the Issues were tried not having certified, under the Statute 4 Queen Anne, That Plaintiff had probable Cause to plead the fourth Plea in Bar; Defendant moved for Costs as to the fourth Plea, and obtained a Rule to shew Cause. The Judge, after the Motion, and before Cause shewn, certified in Plaintiff's Favour; whereupon the Rule was discharged, and Plaintiff ordered to pay Defendant Costs of the Application.

122 Costs, &c.

N. B. The Certificate is not required by the Statute to be made in Court at the Trial. Prime for Plaintiff; Poole for Defendant.

Yates against Gun and his Wife. Mich. 25 Geo. 2.

Plaintiff proceeded to try the Issue, and recovered a Verdict; afterwards the Demurrer was argued, and the Court gave Judgment thereupon for Defendant. Plaintiff moved for Costs of the Trial. The Court ordered the Prothonotary to tax Costs on both Sides, and that Plaintiff's Costs of the Trial be deducted out of Defendant's Costs, if Defendant's Costs exceed Plaintiff's; if Plaintiff's Costs exceed Defendant's, Defendant to pay Plaintiff's Exceedings. Poole for Plaintiff; Bootle for Defendant.

Bligh and another, Executors, against Cope. Mich. 25 Geo. 2.

Efendant pleaded to Plaintiff's Action his Discharge as a Fugitive, under the insolvent Debtors Act 16th George 2. Plaintiffs not content with Judgment and Execution as to suture Effects, to have Execution against Desendant's Person, replied and took Issue, that Desendant was not a Fugitive beyond the Seas within the Statute; and on Trial

Trial a Verdict was found for Defendant: whereupon Prime, for Defendant, moved for Treble Costs, pursuant to said Statute; which Statute doth not in Words extend to Executors; the Discharge was obtained in 1743, subsequent to Testator's Death; and Plaintiffs the Executors were fummoned, and had an Opportunity of controverting the Fact at the Seffions. The Serjeant infifted, That though this Action could not have been supported by Plaintiffs in their own Right, without fuing in the Capacity of Executors, yet as they have made themselves Principals, by putting in Issue a Fact which happened fince the Testator's Death, they have made themselves liable, and ought to pay the Treble Costs. Rule was made to shew Cause; which was afterwards discharged, on hearing Willes and Agar for the Plaintiffs. The Court held, that the Rule, as to Fugitives and infolvent Debtors, must be the same; that if the Executors are liable to any, they are liable to Treble Costs: but the uniform Construction of Law has constantly been, that where an Executor can bring the Action in his own Right, and yet brings it quatenus Executor, there, if he fails, he shall pay Costs; but if he could not bring the Action otherwise than quatenus Executor, though he fails, he shall pay no Costs. Executors have been excused from Costs, because they are obliged to get in the Testator's Effects, and cannot be supposed to be quite cognisant of his Rights; they act in autre Droit; the Cause of Action arose in Testator's Life-time; this Act is not distinguishable from Constructions of former Statutes; an Executor is not considered as a Plaintiss, but as a Representative. There has been a like Determination in the Court of King's Bench, where the Desendant applied for Double Costs on the Mint Act. Hitchcox, Executor, against Gale, Mich. 13 George 2.

Tiffin against Glass. Hil. 25 Geo. 2.

HIS was an Action for slanderous Words; seven Sets were put into the Declaration; the first Set as follows, He (Plaintiff) has done such Things as I (Defendant) could hang him for, if the Truth was known; the following Sets were of like Import. 'Twas laid, that Plaintiff was a Blacksmith by Trade, and that Philip Parker Senior and Philip Parker Junior, two of his Customers, by Reason of publishing the Words, had discontinued to deal with him as before. Verdict was found for Plaintiff, as to the first Set of Words, Damages 1 s. as to four other Sets, Defendant was found Not guilty; but as to the remaining two Sets, and the Special Damage, no Finding of the Jury appeared. The Question was, Whether Plaintiff should have Costs de increincremento, or no more Costs than Damages? Per Curiam: In Turner against Horton, Easter 16 Geo. 2. all the Cases relative to this Point were taken into Confideration. Where Words are of themselves actionable. the Special Damage makes no Alteration, except by way of Aggravation; where Words are not in themselves actionable, the Special Damage is the Jet of the Action. Anciently, perhaps, when Words were taken in mitiori sensu, these Words might not be thought actionable; but in later Times it has been otherwise adjudged, for Preservation of the Peace; and because Words are to be legally understood as the By-standers, and all the World understand them. These Words seem rather to be actionable than otherwise. The Court cannot presume that the consequential Damage was found. Though no Motion has been made in Arrest of Judgment, yet had it been plain that the Words were not actionable, the Court ought not to give Judgment; but where 'tis not plain, and the Court incline to think the Words actionable, Judgment ought not to be stayed. Where, on Trial, Words plainly appear not to be actionable, and no Special Damage interferes, Plaintiff ought to be nonfuited, that Defendant may have Costs, which in Arrest of Judgment he cannot have. The Court will not refine on a good Statute 21 Jac. c. 16. against its obvious Intent. Rule to shew Cause why Plaintiff

126 Costs, &c.

Plaintiff should not be allowed Costs de incremento discharged. Prime for Plaintiff; Agar for Defendant.

Barrowclough against Webster and Smith, in Assault and Battery. Easter 25 Geo. 2.

DOTH Defendants plead Not guilty; and Defendant Webster, by Leave of the Court, pleads also Son Assault demesne. Verdict for Plaintist against both Desendants on the Not guilty, and for Desendant Webster on the Son Assault; Damages as to Smith 9 s. Two Certificates were signed on the Record of Nish prius by the Lord Chief Baron, who tried the Cause; one, that the Assault and Battery was sufficiently proved; the other, that there was a probable Cause for making Webster a Desendant. Webster moved for Costs on Stat. 4 Ann. which doth not extend to this Case; nor Stat. 9 Will. 3. as held by the Court. Costs denied. Prime for Webster.

Bright against Jackson and others, in Replevin. Trin. 25 & 26 Geo. 2.

Plaintiff had pleaded, by Leave of the Court, two feveral Matters in Bar to the Avowry, by way of Prescription for Right

Right of Common, &c. And on one of the Pleas the Fact was found for him; but there being no Certificate from the Judge who tried the Cause, that Plaintiff had probable Cause to plead the other Plea, Desendants moved for Costs occasioned thereby, pursuant to Stat. 4 Qu. Anne. The Question was, Whether these Proceedings are within that Statute or not? The Avowant in Replevin is omitted in the Words of the Statute. Rule to shew Cause why Plaintiff should not pay Costs, enlarged. Prime for Desendant; Poole for Plaintiff.

Gregory against Dormer. Mich., 26 Geo. 2.

passes, (inter al') a Trespass in Stock Orchard and Rye Close, with Cattle, and bruising, pressing and spoiling Plaintist's Apples, (viz.) twenty Bushels of Apples there found. The Cause had been tried in Glouce-stershire by a Special Jury of Gentlemen, who found for Plaintist as to the particular Trespass aforesaid; Residue for Desendant. The Question was, Whether Plaintist should be allowed full Costs, or not? Court discharged Plaintist's Rule to shew Cause why he should not have full Costs. The Apples, for ought that appears by the Declaration, might be growing, though not laid to be ibidem

ibidem crescen', but ibidem invent'. The Jury had the Merit of the Cause before them; the Action appears to be frivolous, by the small Damages they gave. Willes and Poole for Defendant; Draper and Hayward for Plaintiff.

Scoffin against Robinson, in Trespass. Easter 26 Geo. 2.

Plaintiff, at last Assizes for Kent, recovered a Verdict against Desendant; and at the same Assizes, in an Ejectment, on the Demise of Robinson (Desendant in this Action) against Scoffin (Plaintiff in this Action) Plaintiff recovered a Verdict. Robinson applied to have the Costs he was intitled to, set off and deducted out of the Costs to be allowed Scoffin. Rule for that Purpose made absolute. Willes for Desendant; Poole for Plaintiff.

Damages.

Donelly against Baker, in Assault and Battery. Mich. 18 Geo. 2.

BOOTLE, for Plaintiff, moved to set aside Inquisition taken on Writ of Enquiry, for Smallness of Damages; the Jury found 8 l. only, though Desendant's Cure by a Surgeon was proved to be worth Eighteen Guineas, and though no Witness was produced by Desendant to controvert the Fact. The Court resused to make any Rule.

Vol. II.

K

Deaf

Deaf and Dumb Persons.

Earl of Jersey and another, Demandants, Barnes and another, Tenants; Lady Mary O'Bryen, Vouchee. Hil. 26 Geo. 2.

HE Vouchee being naturally Deaf and Dumb, Lord Chief Justice wrote down a Question, as to her Consent to suffer Recoveries of Estates in three different Counties, Bucks, Oxon and Berks, Mr. Henry Barker being fworn, explained the Question to her by Signs, which the answered by Signs, and then he deposed that she understood the Question, and was, willing the Recoveries should pass; she also under-wrote the Question with these Words, (viz.) Yes, I do know and consent; and figned her Name Mary O'Bryen; whereupon the Recoveries were passed at Bar. Vide Griffin against Ferrers, Easter 6 Geo. 1. Sir G. Cooke's Cases. ral fimilar have happened, particularly one, as to Service of a Deaf and Dumb Woman, Tenant in Possession of Premises, with a Declaration in Ejectment, by fignifying to her the Meaning and Contents of fuch Declaration, and the Notice subscribed, by Means of

Deaf, Dumb, &c. 131

of a Person who explained the same to her by significant Signs, which she understood, as the Person explaining made Affidavit; and thereupon the Court made the usual Rule for Judgment, unless the Tenant, &c. appeared. Goodtitle, on the Demise of Wessell, Esquire, against Badtitle, in Ejectment, Susannah Grey, Tenant. Hil. 22 Geo. 2. Willes for Demandants.

K 2 Demutrer,

Demurrer, and other Special Arguments.

Dowding, Administrator, &c. against - Baker & al. Trin. 13 & 14 Geo. 2.

HIS was an Action of Debt upon a Bond; Declaration delivered of Trinity Term last past, with an Imparlance 'till Michaelmas Term; Defendant procured a Judge's Order for Time to plead 'till the 15th December, and then pleaded Solvit ad diem by one of the Defendants. In Hilary Term Plaintiff replied, Nonpayment; and Defendant the same Term rejoined, entred a Waiver of his Plea, and fet out Letters Testimonial dated 26th November, whereby it appeared, that Plaintiff was excommunicated on 23d November, and fo pleads the Excommunication puis darrein continuance in Easter Term following. Plaintiff demurs, and Defendant joins in Demurrer. Bootle for Defendant alledged, that Plaintiff in making up the Demurrer Book, had continued the Imparlance 'till the last Return of Michaelmas Term, which is 25th November, tho' the Plea was delivered generally of that Term, and the Imparlance ought to be carried no farther than Tres Mich. By the Plaintiff's

Demurrer, &c. 133

Plaintiff's continuing it beyond 23d Nowember, an Absurdity was created, and the Excommunication appeared to be before, and not after the last Continuance. Draper for Plaintiff insisted, that it is Plaintiff's Right to enter Continuances by Imparlance, from the Declaration to Judgment or Issue. That Time to plead and an Imparlance are the same Thing, and as Defendant in Truth had Time to plead till the 15th December, the Imparlance ought to be continued according to the Fact; and of that Opinion were the Court, and ordered the Imparlance to stand continued till Quinden' Martini.

Shields and another against Cuthbertfon. Mich. 15 Geo. 2.

Defendant pleads in Abatement, and traverses the Inhabitancy; Plaintiff demurs, and on Argument made two Objections: 1st, that the Statute of Additions expresses the Word Conversant; that Rastall, and all the old Entries, are so; indeed some modern Entries are Commorant, but none Inhabitant; and 2dly, That the Plea begins, that Desendant comes and desends the Wrong and Injury when, &c. and after a full Desence, Desendant cannot plead in Abatement. The second Objection was over-ruled; but the

134 Demurrer, &c.

first held good. A Man may lodge in one Parish, and work in another; he is conversant where he works. Judgment for Plaint.ff, that Defendant answer over. Bootle
for Plaintiff; Skinner for Defendant.

Littlehales, an Attorny, against Bofanquett, by Attachment of Privilege. Easter 15 Geo. 2.

Efendant demurred to the Declaration, and affigned for Cause the Want of Pledges. Plaintiff joined in Demurrer, and Defendant moved to withdraw his Demurrer on Payment of Costs, to pay 10 l. into Court upon the common Rule, and plead the General Issue; which was ordered, Plaintiff not opposing the same.

Note; It hath been determined, that Pledges need not be put into the Declaration. Pledges are upon the Writ, and may be found any Time before Judgment. Manfield un' Cleric' against Richman, on Demurrer, and Want of Pledges shewn for Cause, Easter 2 Geo. 2. Durrant, one, &c. against Lynes, Trin. 10 & 11 Geo. 2. Bootle for Defendant; Skinner for Plaintiff.

Sharpe against Sharpe. Mich. 16 G. 2.

AFTER Joinder in Demurrer, Plaintiff 27th October moved for a Consilium, and afterwards delivered the Paper-Book the fame Day, which was held to be irregular, and the Cause ordered to be struck out of the Paper. The regular Practice is to tender the Paper-Book to Desendant's Attorny; if he results to accept and pay for it, Judgment may be signed for want thereof; if he accepts and pays for it, then Plaintiff is proper to move for a Consilium, and proceed to Argument. Skinner for Desendant; Agar for Plaintiff.

Wilson, an Attorny, against Finch, an Attorny. Hilary 17 Geo. 2.

Plaintiff declared on a Promisory Note; Defendant pleaded Non Assumpst infra sex annos. Plaintiff replied, an Attachment of Privilege, bearing Teste five Terms before the Term of which the Declaration was delivered. Defendant demurred to the Replication, and Plaintiff joined in Demurrer. Upon the Argument, it was objected to the Replication, That no Return of the Attachment of Privilege, General or Special, appears; nor doth it appear that the Writ was delivered to the Sheriff, or returned; and that K4

136 Demurrer, &c.

the Lapse of five Terms was bad. The Court held, That an Appearance cures all Errors and Defects in Process; and that the Words in the Declaration (was attached by Writ of Privilege) refer to the Return of that Writ, whenever it was; and gave Judgment for Plaintiff. Draper for Plaintiff; Bootle for Defendant.

Trinity 17 & 18 Geo. 2.

PER Cur': For the Future, in all Demurrer-Books delivered to the Judges, let the Counsels Names be inserted who figned the Pleadings; and let the Number-Roll and Day of Argument be set down on the Outside of each Book.

Gott against Vavasor and others, Heir and Devisees, in Debt on Bond. Hilary 18 Geo. 2.

THE Action was brought on the Statute 3 & 4 Will. & Mary, cb. 14. feet. 3 & 4. and on Demurrer the Court gave Judgment for Defendants; it appearing by the Pleadings that the Testator's Estate was devised to Trustees for the Payment of Debts, and consequently this was a Case out of the Statute.

Stone against Rawlinson and another. Hilary 18 Geo. 2.

ACTION brought on Promisory Note, 1 payable to A. B. or Order, and indorsed to Plaintiff by the Administrator of A. B. Demurrer to the Declaration, and two Causes assigned: First, That Plaintiff declared without a Profert in Cur' of the Letters of Administration of A. B. and fecondly, That it did not appear by whom the fame was granted. A third Objection was taken at the Bar, viz. That an Executor or Administrator cannot assign a Promisory Note, so as to give an Indorsee an Action in his own Name. The first and second Objections were over-ruled; because the Letters of Administration cannot be supposed to be in the Custody or Power of Plaintiff, but of the Administrator himself; and on Trial it would be incumbent on Plaintiff to thew the Person who indorsed the Note to him to be the proper Administrator of A. B.

The third Objection over-ruled, because it has been the constant Practice among Merchants, for Executors and Administrators to indorse both Promisory Notes and Bills of Exchange; and the Court will endeavour to adapt the Rules of Law to the Course of Trade; and is warranted in this Opinion by the Words of the Statute 3 & 4 Ann. c. 9.

138 Demurrer, &c.

sect. 1. which says, that Promisory Notes are to be indorsed in like Manner as Bills of Exchange. The Equitable Interest is converted into a Legal Interest, and the whole Interest is vested in the Administrator, who, before the Statute, might assign his Equitable, and since, his Legal Interest. Moor against Manning, Mich. 5 Geo. in C. B. held, That whoever has the absolute Property, may assign a Note payable to Order. Judgment for Plaintiff. Prime for Plaintiff; Birch for Defendant.

Brumwell against Garnett, one, &c. Trin. 18 & 19 Geo. 2.

RULE for a Confilium, made 24th May, in last Easter Term, though the Paper-Book was not then delivered, nor afterwards till the 20th of June instant, held irregular, and the Rule for a Confilium discharged this Day, viz. Wednesday 26th June 1745: But on Motion of Plaintiff's Counsel the same Day, the Court made a new Rule for a Confilium, and gave Leave to set down the Cause for Friday next; dispensing with the Shortness of the Time for the Delivery of Books to the Judges. Turner against Horton, Trin. 10 & 11 Geo. 2. Sharpe against Sharpe, Mich. 16 Geo. 2. quoted. Willes for Desendant; Draper for Plaintiff.

Burgess against Halding. Trinity
19 & 20 Geo. 2.

N the Argument of a Point reserved at Nisi prius, the Court held, That in the Case of a Tender, the Placita is of no Validity. An Original must be produced. Judgment ordered to be entered for Desendant. Willes for Plaintiff; Bootle for Defendant.

Savile against Wiltshire and another, Executors. Mich. 20 Geo. 2.

THIS Action was Debt on a Judgment obtained against the Testator, suggesting the Judgment to have been recovered in E/fex, and the Venue was laid in Effex. Objected. That the Venue must be in Middlesex. and no where elfe. Answered, The original Action wherein Judgment was recovered being laid in Effex, this Action may either be in Essex or in Middlesex, where the Record of the Judgment is; and cited Hall against Wingfield, Hob. 95. where a Recognizance was taken at Serjeants-Inn, London, and recorded in Middlesex, the Scire facias may be either in London or Middlesex. Per Cur': This Action is not founded partly in Effex and partly in Middlesex, being intirely on the Judgment. The original Action is at an

140 Demurrer, &c.

End, Transit in Rem judicatam. The Court must take judicial Notice where the Common Pleas sit, though not laid in the Declaration to be in Middlesex. Mr. Justice Birch quoted Musgrave against Wharton, Yelv. 218. and Cro. Jac. 241. Comyns's Reports 305. Declaration held bad on Demurrer, and Judgment for Desendant. Draper for Desendant; Agar for Plaintiff.

Furnis against Hallom. Easter 22 Geo. 2.

AWARD that Defendant should pay Plaintiff, or Mr. William Cock his Attorny, such Costs as Plaintiff was liable to pay, of an Action in the Peverel Court, and Costs of an Action at Common Law, between Plaintiff and Defendant and others, held to be uncertain, and not final. Costs to be taxed by the proper Officer, has been held good. The Authority of Arbitrators may be delegated to a known Officer; or if Costs are awarded generally, the fworn Officer may ascertain the Quantum. Certum est quod certum reddi potest. An Award may be good in Part and bad in Part; but the Objection here goes to the Justice of the Whole. Judgment on Demurrer for Defendant. Bootle for Defendant; Poole for Plaintiff.

Powell against Rowles and his Wife. Mich. 25 Geo. 2.

DLaintiff declared in Middlesex; Defendant pleaded in Abatement under the Statute of Additions, That he was a Pawnbroker, and not a Yeoman, as called in the Declaration. Plaintiff réplies an Original Writ in placito prædicto in Gloucestershire, wherein Defendant is called a Pawn-broker: to which Replication Defendant demurs, and Plaintiff joins in Demurrer. On Argument the Court held, that Continuances of the Original Writ in this Case are not necessary; but that on an Original in Gloucestershire, Plaintiff cannot proceed in another County; nor have the Court any Jurisdiction in Middlesex under this Original in Gloucestershire. Defendant may be brought in after Capias returned Non est inventus, by a Testatum into any other County, but Plaintiff must come and proceed according to his Original Writ, and in the same County. Judgment Quod Breve cassetur. Draper for Desendant; Poole for Plaintiff.

142 Demurrer, &c.

Wade, junior, against Wadman, Gent. one of the Attornies, Administrator, &c. Hilary 25 Geo. 2.

Efendant demurred generally to Plaintiff's Declaration; Plaintiff joined in Demurrer; and on Argument two Objections were made by Defendant's Counsel, first, That it was not alledged in the Declaration that Administration had been granted to Defendant; and fecondly, that Defendant being fued as Administrator, ought, in that Capacity, to have been profecuted by Original Writ, and not by Bill, as at present. The Court over-ruled both Objections. As to the first they held, that calling Defendant Administrator of the Goods and Chattels of the Intestate, was sufficient, without alledging that Administration had been granted to him. And as to the second, (which is objected as Matter of Abatement, and not shewn for Cause of Demurrer) the Fault is cured by Defendant's Appearance; 'tis no Objection after Appearance. Poole for Defendant; Agar for Plaintiff.

Spencer and another, Executors, a-gainst Thomlinson, one, &c. by Bill. Easter 25 Geo. 2.

Laintiffs concluded their Declaration (And thereof they bring Suit, &c.) inftead of (pray Remedy, &c.) Defendant demurred, and shewed said Conclusion for Cause; Plaintiff joined in Demurrer. On Argument, the Court inclined to think either of these Ways of concluding good; but for the sake of keeping up to the old constant Form of prays Remedy, &c. proposed an Amendment, without Payment of Costs; to which both Sides consented; and a Rule was made accordingly. Poole for Desendant; Draper for Plaintiff.

Nesbett

144 Demurrer, &c.

Nesbett against Farmer. Mich. 27
Geo. 2.

der for Time to rejoin, (rejoining iffuably) demurred to Plaintiff's Replication. Plaintiff moved to fet afide the Demurrer, and obtained a Rule to shew Cause. Whereupon Draper for Defendant insisted, That as the Replication stood, Defendant could not with Safety rejoin issuably, but must demur, to bring the Merits of his Case in Question. The Court held a Demurrer not to be an issuable Rejoinder within the Judge's Order; but that whether it was necessary or not, might appear. Plaintiff was ordered to join in Demurrer, and the Rule was enlarged till after the Argument. Poole for Plaintiff.

Discontinuance.

Wignall against Bouch, in Replevin. Mich. 17 Geo. 2.

AFTER Joinder in Demurrer, Plaintiff obtained a Rule for the Avowant to shew Cause why he should not discontinue, on Payment of Costs. It was objected for the Avowant, that a Discontinuance in Replevin is very different from a Nonpros; and that after a Discontinuance, a Writ of Retorn' Habend' could not be awarded. The Court did not enter into the Consideration of that Matter, because the Parties entered into a Rule by Consent to stay Proceedings on Payment of the Rent in Arrear, with Costs. Wynne for Plaintiff; Draper for Avowant.

Ejedments.

Goodright, on the Demise of Rowell, against Vice, in Ejectment. Trin. 13 & 14 Geo. 2.

Efendant at the Trial not appearing to confess Lease, Entry and Ouster, a Nonsuit happened, and afterwards Plaintiff's Lessor, instead of taking his Remedy for Costs taxed upon the common Rule, as he ought to have done, entered Judgment against the Casual Ejector, sued out a Fi. fa. against Defendant's Goods, and levied his Costs thereon, acting as special Bailiff him-An Action was brought by Defendant in the King's Bench for this irregular Levy, against Plaintiff's Lessor and Kimber his Attorny; and after Special Pleadings therein, Defendant moved here to fet aside the Fi. fa. and Court ordered Restitution to be made. and Defendant's Costs to be paid by Plaintiff's Lessor and Kimber. And by Consent, the Action in the King's Bench to be discontinued, without Costs, and no other Action to be brought. Wynne for Defendant; Hussey and Draper for Plaintiff.

Bingham, on the Demise of Lane and others, against Gregg, in Ejectment. Trinity 14 & 15 Geo. 2.

RULE on the Statute 7th Geo. 2. to shew Cause why Proceedings should not be stayed, on Payment of the Mortgage-Mony and Costs, was made absolute; Lesfors of the Plaintiff, Assignees of the Mortgagee, insisted to be paid a Bond and a Simple Contract Debt due to themselves in their own Right. Per Cur': A Bond is no Lien in Equity, unless where the Heir comes to redeem. Prime for Plaintiff; Bootle for Defendant.

Stiles,

148 Ejeaments.

Stiles, on the Demise of Redhead, against Oakes, in Ejectment. East. 15 Geo. 2.

Efendant, the Landlord, admitted to defend by special Rule, did not appear at the Trial to confess Lease, Entry and Ouster, whereby Plaintiff was nonsuited. Plaintiff produced the Postea, and moved for Leave to take out Execution against the Casual Ejector, upon the Judgment signed by virtue of the special Rule to defend, which was granted absolutely. Agar for Plaintiff.

Goodtitle against Thrustout, in Ejectment, on the Demise of Massa. Trinity 16 Geo. 2.

JOHN Crystall, Tenant in Possession, upon a Sunday acknowledged the Receipt of the Declaration, which before the Essoign Day had been delivered to his Daughter, and she acquainted with the Contents. This was held sufficient Service, and the Common Rule was made for Judgment Nist, &c. Willes for Plaintiff.

Thrustout, on the Demise of Dunham an Infant, against Percivall and others, in Ejectment.

Princed a Pule to Co. tained a Rule to shew Cause why Proceedings should not be stayed till a good Plaintiff be named, or Security, to be approved by the Prothonotary, be given by the Infant Lessor, for securing Costs to Defendant, in Case of a Nonsuit or Verdict for Defendant. Draper for the Lessor urged. that though in the King's Bench such Rules have been made, yet the Practice here is otherwise, because the Infant is liable to an Attachment for Non-payment of Costs. He quoted Throgmorton against Smith, Easter 5 Geo. 2. in B. R. Robinson, on the Demise of Meager, against Burton, Mich. 3 Geo. 2. in C. B. where Attachments for Non-payment of Costs were granted against Infants of very tender Age; and observed, that the Infant who is inabled to make a Leafe in Ejectment, must take it with all its Inconveniencies. Per Cur': In all other Suits, an Infant under Years of Discretion, cannot be guilty of a Contempt. Non diuturnitas temporis sed soliditas rationis est consideranda. Rule absolute.

Duckworth

Duckworth, on the Demise of Tubley and others, against Tunstall, in Ejectment. Mich. 16 Geo. 2.

Effors of the Plaintiff were both Devi-fees and Executors, and in each Capacity Rent was due to them. Defendant moved to stay Proceedings, upon Payment of the Rent due to Lessors of Plaintiff as Devisees, they not being intitled to bring an Ejectment as Executors. There appeared to be a mutual Debt due to Defendant by fimple Contract, and Defendant offered to go into the whole Account, taking in both Demands as Devisees and Executors, having just Allowances; which Lessors of Plaintiff refused. The Rule was made absolute to stay Proceedings, on Payment of the Rent due to Lessors as Devisees, and Costs. Prime and Bootle for Defendant, Wynne for Plaintiff.

Goodright, on the Demise of Griffin, against Fawson, in Ejectment.

HIS Ejectment was brought for one Messuage, with the Appurtenances, in the Parishes of St. John the Baptist and St. Michael, in the City of Coventry and County of the same City, or one of them; and after a Verdict for Plaintiff, the Judgment

was arrested. The Plaintiff's Excuse for defcribing the Parish where the Messuage stood, as above, was, That by a late Act of Parliament the first Parish was to be divided into two, and the Division was not yet settled. The Court held the Description to be totally uncertain; and that one of the Parishes cannot be rejected as Surplusage. In Real Actions, and where the Possession of Lands is to be recovered, Certainty is always required. In this Case, Desendant could not know what to desend for, nor the Sheriss of what to give Possession. Willes for Desendant; Draper for Plaintiss.

Doe, on the Demise of Henant, alias Henden, against Thomas and others, in Ejectment. Hilary 16 Geo. 2.

Ithin the first four Days of the Term Birch moved for Leave to plead Ancient Demesse, upon an Affidavit that the Premisses in Question were reputed to be Lands in Ancient Demesse; and a Rule was made to shew Cause, and afterwards absolute upon hearing Counsel on both Sides. The Affidavit is sufficient to shew a probable Cause to plead this Plea; and any other Plea to the Jurisdiction of the Court may be pleaded in Time, without Motion. Skinner for Plaintiff.

Bagshaw

Bagshaw, on the Demise of Ashton, against Toogood.

Etelbey moved, upon an Affidavit of tendring the Declaration to fane Reynolds, Widow, Tenant in Possession, which she refusing to accept, it was left on the Floor, in her Presence; and she retiring into a Parlour and shutting the Door, the Person serving read the Subscription aloud, so as she might hear it; which was held sufficient Service; and the Common Rule for Judgment was made.

Fenn, on the Demise of Rickattson, against Marriott, Esquire, and his Wise, in Ejectment. Mich. 17 Geo. 2.

OR the Future, let Rules for Leave to take out Execution by the Plaintiff against the Casual Ejector, after Verdict against the Landlord made Defendant instead of the Tenant in Possession, pursuant to the late Statute, be absolute, and not to shew Cause, Eyre for Plaintiff.

Roe against Doe, on the Demise of Stephenson, in Ejectment, in Middlesex.

DRIME moved for Judgment, upon an Affidavit of Service of a Declaration intituled Trinity Term 17th, instead of 16th & 17th Geo. 2. and prayed a Rule for Judgment, unless the Tenants appeared within four Days after Notice. He quoted York, on the Demise of Chambers, against Ferris, where the Declaration was intituled Trinity 4th, instead of 3d & 4th Geo. 2. in Cornwall, moved in Michaelmas Term 4th; and fuch a Rule was made: But upon Affidavit of Service thereof, the Court, by a second Rule, inlarged the Time for appearing, till four Days after the next issuable Term [Hilary], as usual in Country Causes. Per Cur': The Declaration in Ejectment is the first Process; and there is nothing precedes whereby it can be amended. This fingle Precedent, without Opposition, is not of Weight sufficient to overturn the general Practice; and the first Rule does not feem to have been well confidered. A new Declaration might have been delivered before the Effoign Day of Hilary Term, and Plaintiff would have been as forward thereby as by his former Declaration; and in Country Causes, where

154 Ejeaments.

where Declarations are of Trinity, the Notice may be good to appear in next Hilary, (passing over Michaelmas) though not the usual Practice. No Declaration in Ejectment in the King's Bench, or here, can be amended before Appearance; and afterwards in Form only, but not in the Demise, or other Matter of Substance. The Court can make no Rule in this Case.

Roe against Doe, on the Demise of Hyde, in Ejectment. Easter 18 Geo. 2.

THE Tenants had the Forenoon of the 29th April this Term to appear in; Foster, the Landlord, moved to add himself to the Tenants, but no Appearance being entered, Plaintiff on the 30th figned Judgment against the Casual Ejector. The Landlord afterwards, without disclosing to the Court what had been previously done, applied for the Conditional Rule, as a Matter of Course, and by Virtue thereof on the 1st May appeared alone, without the Tenants. Prime, for Plaintiff, moved for Leave to take out Execution on the Judgment; and on shewing Cause, the Judgment appeared to be regular, and the Appearance out of Time. Plaintiff offered to waive his Judgment, if the Landlord, who refided at Jamaica, would give

give Security for Costs; to which his Counfel not consenting, the Court made the Rule absolute, for Leave to take out Execution, Skinner and Draper for the Landlord.

Goodtitle, on the Demise of Symons, Elq; against Thrustout, in Ejectment, Clarke, Esq; Landlord. Trin. 19 & 20 Geo. 2.

HE Declaration was of Hilary Term, ferved with Notice to appear in Easter Term last, and not moved till this Term, when a Rule was made for Judgment, unless the Tenant should appear within fix Days after Notice. The Landlord prayed for the Conditional Rule, and for Leave to plead Ancient Demesne, upon an Affidavit that the Premises were Ancient Demesne; and obtained a Rule to shew Cause. Per Curiam: The Landlord, by the late Statute, is to enter into the Common Rule by Confent; before that Statute, he might have been added a Defendant; and if he had applied in Time, must have had Leave to plead Antient Demesne. He is to be considered in all Respects in the same Case as the Tenant in Possession, but must apply according to the Course and Rules of the Court. If the Plaintiff should prevail on this Plea to the Jurisdiction of the Court, the Judgment must be, that Defendant

dant shall answer over. Therefore, if this Plea be not confined to a Time certain, great Delay of Justice must follow. The Rule discharged, as to pleading Ancient Demesne, because the Application was not made in Time, that is, within the first four Days of this Term, Belsield for Clarke; Bootle and Eyre for the Lessor of the Plaintiff.

Deighton, on the Demise of Roberts and his Wise, against Forster. Trin. 21 Geo. 2.

RULE to shew Cause why Desendant should not have Leave to plead Ancient Demesne. Objected, and allowed, That the Motion was not made within the first four Days of the Term. The Rule discharged. As the Declaration must be delivered before the Essoign Day, the Party may always apply within the first four Days of the Term; and though the Appearance in Ejectment is generally entered afterwards, yet it is always considered as an Appearance of the first Day of the Term. Bootle for Desendant; Poole for Plaintiff.

, on the Demise of Preston, against , in Ejectment. Hil. 21 Geo. 2.

I T appearing, by Affidavit, that one Geldart, the Tenant in Possession, and his Wise, both absconded, and could not either of them be served with a Declaration in Ejectment; and that they had left a Woman Servant in the House on the Premises, in whose Presence a Declaration was fixed up. The Court made a Rule for the Tenant to shew Cause why Service of a Declaration on his Servant, at his House, should not be deemed good; and directed the Rule to be served in that Manner.

Short, on the Demise of Elmes, against King. Easter 22 Geo. 2

RS. Northcot, the Tenant in Possessian, a single Woman, absconded and secreted herself in the Messuage in Question, and could not be personally served with a Declaration in Ejectment. Rule to shew Cause why Service of the Servant, at the House, should not be good. This Rule to be served on the Servant at the House. Poole for Plaintiss.

Orion against Mee. Mich. 25 Geo. 2.

ORION, Defendant in an Ejectment brought in the Name of Jacob Mee, on the joint and several Demises of Powers and Maddison, having obtained a Verdict, and one of the Lessors being dead, and the other infolvent, Orion brought Debt on the Judgment against Plaintiff, and served Process on one Jacob Mee of St. Ives, Com' Hunt', Yeoman, as Plaintiff; who moved to stay Proceedings, being totally ignorant of, and unconcerned in the Matter. On shewing Cause, Mr. Huske, of St. Ives, was alledged to be Attorny for Plaintiff in said E= jectment, wherein he had made Use of said Mee's Name. Upon which the Rule was inlarged, and Hulke ordered to shew Cause why he should not pay Orion's Costs taxed in said Ejectment. Huske's Affidavit being laid before the Court, it appeared, that not he, but one Stephenson, formerly his Clerk, (to whom he had refigned his Business long before said Ejectment brought, and intirely left off Practice) was Plaintiff's Attorny. Stephenson made Affidavit, that he found 7acob Mee to be the usual Name made Use of for Plaintiff in Ejectment in Huske's Office; that he used it purely as fictitious, and not as the Name of an existing or real Person. Lord Chief Justice was of Opinion, That though 4

though Stephenson might have made a fictitious Plaintiff, yet as he has voluntarily made Use of a good Plaintiff, a real Person, dwelling in the same Town with himself, he ought to stand in his Place, and pay the Costs. The three other Judges were of Opinion. That this Proceeding is to be confidered purely as fictitious, and not real; and that Jacob Mee of St. Ives, or any other Person in human Nature, is not to be taken to be the real Plaintiff. It would be a dangerous Precedent, with Respect to Attornies, to make them liable to pay Costs, whenever a Defendant in Ejectment (Lessors of Plaintiff being infolvent) can find out a real Perfon of the same Name as the fictitious Plaintiff. Nominal Plaintiff and Casual Ejector stand in the same Light. Nominal Plaintiff cannot release the Action; Casual Ejector cannot bring a Writ of Error, No Imposition or Misbehaviour in Stephenson appears. Where Leffor of Plaintiff is abroad, or an Infant, Court, on Motion, interpose, and order a sufficient Plaintiff to be named, or Security given for Costs; but this is the ordinary Case within the common Course of Rule absolute to stay Proceedings Practice. against Mee; discharged as to Huske; no Rule upon Stephenson. Wherein Lord Chief Justice acquiesced; but said, he thought the Court, for the future, should extend the Rule for making a good Plaintiff, or giving Security

Security for Defendant's Costs, to other Cases besides those before mentioned. Willes for Desendant and Huske; Prime for Plaintiff.

Roe, on the Demise of Stone and Wise, against Doe, in Ejectment. Trinity 26 & 27 Geo. 2.

TAYWARD, on the Behalf of Stone, moved, that the Conditional Rule entered into by Stone's Wife, by the Name of Anne Field, Widow, might be set aside, upon Affidavits tending to prove the Marriage between Stone and her; and obtained a Rule to shew Cause. Whereupon Prime and Agar, on the Part of Anne Field, produced Affidavits to shew a long Cohabitation between her and the late Counfellor Field of Hertfordshire, as Husband and Wife. he had a Child by her, and devised the Estate in Question to her, by the Name of his Wife. That Stone was married to, and lived with, another Wife. The Court thought the Validity of Stone's pretended Marriage to Field a fit Matter to be tried; and (the Tenants in Possession having consented to appear) fet aside the Judgment signed against the Casual Ejector, for Want of their Appearance; and ordered Field, the Landlady, to be added a Defendant to the Tenants; whereby Stone, if Plaintiff recovers, will be fecure as to Costs.

Erroz.

Trinity 18 & 19 Geo. 2.

AFTER an Award of Execution against Bail on a Recognizance in Error, they brought a Writ of Error as to such Award of Execution. Plaintiff moved for Leave to take out Execution for Want of Bail on the Writ of Error brought by the Bail; and obtained a Rule to shew Cause; which was discharged; no Bail in this Case being required. Prime for Defendant; Eyre for Plaintiff.

Stone against Rawlinson, in Error. Mich. 19 Geo. 2.

RULE to shew Cause why Nonpros of a Writ of Error, for Want of transcribing the Record, should not be set aside with Costs. Objected, That no final Judgment is entred, and therefore no Transcript could be made. The Nonpros set aside, without Costs. It appeared that the Clerk of the Judgments was paid his Fee, by Plaintiff's Attorny, for entering the final Judgment, which he had neglected to do; but Plaintiff did not pray any Rule against him. Prime for Plaintiff; Skinner and Agar for Defendant.

Bevan against Jones. Trinity 13 & 14 Geo. 2.

THE Court were of Opinion, That after Execution executed, though the Judgment be for a Penalty, they have not Jurisdiction at Common Law, or by Statute, to refer to the Prothonotary to examine into the Sum due for Principal, Interest and Costs, and into the Quantum levied, and to order Restitution of the Overplus, without Confent, but Desendant must seek Relief in a Court of Equity. Rule to shew Cause discharged. Belsield for Desendant; Birch for Plaintiff.

Calcraft against Swann. Hilary 14 Geo. 2.

Efendant became a Bankrupt, and after his Certificate allowed, his Goods were taken in Execution. Defendant obtained a Rule on the Statute 5 Geo. 2. fest. 7 & 20. to shew Cause why the Fi. fa. should not be set aside, and Restitution. Per Cur': We are not required by the Statute to proceed in a Summary Way, as to the Goods of a Bankrupt,

Bankrupt, though as to his Person we are. If the Desendant did not obtain his Certificate in Time, so as to plead it, he may bring an Audita Querula. The Rule was discharged. Willes for Plaintiff; Skinner for Defendant.

Pickering against Landon. Easter

Udgment was entered in 1736, in Cooke's Office; in 1739 two Scire facias's in Borrett's Office were returned Nichil, and the Judgment being revived, a Fi. fa. and afterwards a Venditioni exponas issued out of Borrett's Office: after the Execution whereof, and an Action tried against the Sheriff of Northamptonshire, for a false Return on the Venditioni exponas, Defendant moved, and had a Rule to shew Cause why the Writs of Fi. fa. and Venditioni exponas should not be fet aside; insisting, that they were irregular, and ought to have been in Cooke's Office. was urged for Plaintiff, that a Sci. fa. is as much a new Suit as an Action of Debt. and is not confined to the Office where the Judgment is entered, but may be brought in any other. Per Cur': By an old Rule of this Court in 1654, the whole Proceedings after Appearance ought to be in one and the same Office; a Sci fa. is not a new Action, but a Continuance of the same Suit, and the M 2

Fi. fa. and Venditioni exponas are irregular; but the Application to fet them aside, ought to be made in due Time. The Fi. fa. issued so long ago as 1739, it is not reasonable, after what has passed, for the Court to interpose now. The Rule was discharged. Prime and Draper for Plaintiff; Skinner and Willes for Desendant.

Meriton against Stevens. Mich. 15 Geo. 2.

TUdgment was figned 28th October, and 20th October, between five and fix in the Evening, the Sheriff took Possession of Defendant's Goods, by Virtue of a Fi. fa. Defendant moved to set aside the Fi. fa. a Writ of Error having passed the Great Seal in the Morning of the 29th; but it was not pretended to have been allowed by the Clerk of the Errors before the Fi. fa. executed. And the Question was, From what Time the Writ of Error is to be deemed a Supersedeas? The Court, after Consideration. determined, That it is not a Supersdeas from the Sealing, but from the Delivery to the Clerk of the Errors, according to a Rule of this Court, Mich. 28 Car. 2. Wynne for Defendant; Skinner and Draper for Plaintiff. This was the Point determined, whereupon the Parties entered into an equitable Rule by Confent.

Thompson

Thompson against Bristow. Mich. 16 Geo. 2.

TUdgment was entered 11th & 12th, re-Judgment was consider Term 13th Geo. 2. and Defendant was taken in Execution in July 1741, and was then discharged by Plaintiff's Consent; and a written Agreement was entered into by the Parties, that the Judgment should stand revived for twelve Months. After more than a Year from the last Ca. sa. Plaintiff caused Defendant to be again taken in Execution, without Continuance on the Roll; relying upon the written Agreement. The Court held the Agreement to be null and void; and made the Rule absolute to set aside the last Ca. sa. and discharge Defendant out of Custody. Skinner and Agar for Defendant, Willes for Plaintiff.

Ashdowne against Fisher. Trinity 16 & 17 Geo. 2.

Efendant rendered in Discharge of Bail, and his Person was discharged out of Execution by the Court as a Bankrupt, pursuant to the Statute. His Goods were afterwards taken by a Fi. fa. and he applied to have them released, and obtained a Rule to shew Cause, which was discharged. The Court held that the Goods may be taken;

M 3 there

there is no Clause in the Statute which extends to the Goods. Skinner for Plaintiff; Bootle for Defendant.

Eaton against Southby.

AFTER the Record removed into the King's Bench by Writ of Error, Defendant died; Plaintiff moved for Leave to fue out of this Court a Sci. fa. against Defendant's Executors, and obtained a Rule to shew Cause; which was discharged. The Record being removed out of this Court, the Motion is improper here. Bootle for Plaintiff; Belfield for Defendant.

Martin against Ridge.

Want of a Declaration, in an Action of Debt on Judgment, and was afterwards taken in Execution by a Capias ad Satisfac' iffued after a Year and Day from the Time of the Judgment, without any Sci. fa. to revive. Defendant brought his Action for False Imprisonment, and Plaintiff justified under the Ca. sa. Defendant now applied to set aside the Ca. sa. and it appearing that a Ca. ad respond only, and not a Ca. sa. had issued within the Year, there was nothing to warrant the Continuance of a Ca. sa. on the Roll. And the Rule was made absolute

to set aside the Ca. sa. Draper for Plaintiff; Belfield for Defendant.

Rownson and his Wife against Williamson. Mich. 17 Geo. 2.

ACTION brought for the Labour of Plaintiff's Wife, done for Defendant during Coverture. Plaintiffs failed in the Action, and the Wife only, without the Husband, was taken in Execution by Ca. sa. for Costs. The Court held, That as the Demand did not accrue to the Wife dum sola, she was wrongfully joined a Party in the Action; and that the Wife, who, by Law, is fupposed to have nothing whereout to make Satisfaction, ought not to be detained in Execution. The Rule to discharge the Wife was made absolute. If, in such Case, the Wife could be detained, a run-away Hufband would have it in his Power to procure his Wife to be imprisoned. Bootle for the Wife: Prime for the Defendant.

Pickering and his Wife against Thomfon, Bail for Miller. Hilary 17 Geo. 2.

Judgment in Middlesex against the Principal, Sci. fa. against the Bail in Middlesex, and Award of Execution, Fi. fa. in Middlesex, M 4 and

and nothing levied; post ann' & diem two Scire facias's to revive the Award of Execution returned Nichil in London, and Fi. fa. thereon in London, and Levy there. Rule absolute to set aside the Fi. fa. in London, and for Restitution. Sci. fa. to revive a Judgment, or Award of Execution, must be in that County where Judgment is recovered, or Execution awarded. Sci. fa. against Bail may be in Middlesex (Record of the Recognizance being at Westminster) or in the County where the Caption of the Recognizance appears to be on Record, if in any other County except Middlesex. Hayward for Defendant; Agar for Plaintiss.

Farside, on the Demise of Lord Sidney Beauclerk and others, against Hayley. Trinity 17 & 18 Geo. 2.

AFTER a Verdict for Plaintiff, Motion for Leave to take out Execution on the Judgment against the Casual Ejector, non obstante a Writ of Error brought by Defendant Hayley, the Rule to shew Cause was discharged. Per Cur': In Cases where the Landlord is permitted to defend without the Tenant, the Reason of Judgment against the Casual Ejector, per Statute, is, that under it, after an End of the Suit Plaintiff may obtain Possession of the Premises sued for, which

which he could not do by Virtue of a Judgment against a Person out of Possession. But where a Writ of Error is brought, there is not the least Reason to give Plaintiff Leave to take Possession till after a Determination in Error. Skinner for Plaintiff; Willes for Defendant.

Burdus against Satchwell. Hil. 18 G. 2.

AFTER a Writ of Error allowed, Plaintiff brought Action on Judgment, and Bail was justified. Afterwards the Writ of Error was nonproffed for Want of transcribing the Record. Plaintiff, without discontinuing his Action on the Judgment, took Defendant's Goods in Execution by Testat. Fi. fa. which was held irregular, and the Testat. Fi. fa. set aside, and the Goods ordered to be restored, with Costs. Plaintiff will be at Liberty to take out Execution after discontinuing his Action on Judgment. Skinner and Draper for Plaintiff in Error; Willes and Prime for Defendant in Error. Obiter per Cur': No Rule to transcribe ought to be given till the Record is brought In Case of a Testat. Fi. fa. the Court will not go into a nice Enquiry when the Fi. fa. in the Original County to warrant the Testat. was sued out; it is sufficient if the first Fi. fa. returned be produced.

Sykes, on the Demise of Oates and others, against Dawson, in Ejectment. Hilary 18 Geo. 2.

AWSON, the Landlord, was made Defendant by Rule, the Tenant in Possession not appearing. After Verdict for Plaintiff, Defendant the Landlord brought a Writ of Error, and ferved Plaintiff's Attorny with a Rule to be present at taxing Costs. Plaintiff figned no Judgment on the Verdict, but moved the Court, producing the Postea, and obtained a Rule of Course for Leave to take out Execution against the Casual Ejector. Defendant perceiving this allowed and served Notice of his Writ of Error, and moved to stay Proceedings on the Judgment. Per Cur': The Writ of Error is no Supersedeas before delivered to the Clerk of the Errors to be allowed. Vide Meriton against Stephens, Mich. 15 Geo. 2. where, so far as Execution had gone, it stood, and further Proceedings only were stayed. In this Case the Writ of Habere fac' possession' was executed. No Rule. Wynne and Bootle for Defendant.

Smith and his Wife against Phripp, one, &c. Mich. 20 Geo. 2.

Udgment was obtained in Middlesex, and Desendant was taken 8th May last by a Testat. Ca. sa. out of Middlesex into Somersetshire. Objected, That no Ca. sa. in Middlefex was returned to warrant the Testat', as appeared per Search in Easter and Trinity Terms last; but after the Search a Ca. sa. in Middlesex was returned, and entered in the Sheriff's Books. The Court declared, that had the Application been recent, they must ex Debito Justitiæ have taken Notice of it; but as Defendant had so long acquiefced, and as possibly an Action for an Escape might have been brought against the Sheriff of Somersetshire, the Rule to shew Cause why the Testat. Ca. sa. should not be set afide, was discharged. Belfield for Defendant: Willes for Plaintiff.

Turner against Cowper. Hilary 20 Geo. 2.

AFTER a Rule by Consent to refer it to the Prothonotary, to inquire into the Quantum of the Debt and Value of Goods levied, and before Prothonotary had made his Report, Plaintiff died. Upon the Application of Plaintiff's Executor, who offered

to stand in Plaintiff's Place, he was made a Party to the Rule; and the Prothonotary was directed to proceed, without the Consent of Defendant to this Rule, *Prime* and *Draper* for Plaintiff's Executor; *Skinner* and *Willes* for Defendant.

Low against Beart. Easter 20 Geo. 2.

Nulle to shew Cause why Fi. fa. should not be set aside, the Judgment being above a Year old, and not revived by Sci. fa. nor any Continuances of Fi. fa. entered on Record; Plaintiss, before Cause shewn, entered the Continuances, and produced intervening Writs of Fi. fa. to warrant the same. Rule discharged sans Costs. Elegit may be continued before suing out the Writ, Fi. fa. or Ca. sa. cannot be continued without suing out the Writ. Prime for Plaintiss; Draper for Desendant.

Stanynought, one, &c. against and seven others. Mich. 21
Geo. 2.

AFTER Judgment in a Joint Action against all the Desendants, Plaintiff sued out a Fieri facias against the Goods of , one of the Desendants, only. Motion per Leeds, for Desendant

to set aside the Fieri facias, and for Restitution. Skinner and Draper, for Plaintiss, prayed to amend the Fieri facias by the Judgment, and quoted Browne against Hammond, Easter 12 Geo. 2. The Parties came into Terms of Agreement between themselves, without any Determination by the Court; and, by Consent the Rule was made absolute, with Costs.

De Revose, Executor, against Hay-

Efendant having brought a Writ of Error, and put in Bail thereon foon after, was last Term served with a Rule for better Bail, and thereon gave Notice to justify at a Judge's Chamber, but did not. The Bail not being justified within four Days, Plaintiff took a Certificate thereof from the Clerk of the Errors, and fued out a Ca. sa. which was held to be regular. Defendant has not Time of Course to perfect his Bail till the Term next following, where the Rule is ferved in Vacation, but ought to justify before a Judge; and if Plaintiff be not fatisfied with that, then Defendant, having done every Thing in his Power, is intitled to Time till the next Term, but not otherwise. Poole for Defendant: Skinner for Plaintiff.

Sweetapple against Atterbury. Trin. 22 & 23 Geo. 2.

Plaintiff having obtained Judgment in Middlesex, sued out in the first Instance a Testat. Fi. fa. into Warwickshire, and took Desendant's Goods in Execution. Desendant moved to set aside the Testat. Fi. fa. for Want of a Fi. fa. returned Nulla Bona in Middlesex to warrant it. Plaintiff, after the Testat. Fi. fa. executed as aforesaid, and Notice of Motion, but before the Motion made, got a Fi. fa. in Middlesex returned; which the Court held sufficient, and discharged the Rule to shew Cause. Wynne for Desendant; Draper for Plaintiff.

West and his Wife against Hedges. Hilary 24 Geo. 2.

A Bill of Sale held to be a Removal of Goods taken by a Fi. fa. and a Year's Rent ordered to be paid the Landlord out of the Mony levied by the Sheriffs of London. Draper for Steere the Landlord; Prime for Plaintiff.

Incledon against Clarke, in Error. Easter 25 Geo. 2.

AFTER Writ of Error allowed, and Notice thereof given, Plaintiff in the Judgment executed a Fi. fa. for Want of Bail within four Days; Defendant moved to fet aside the Fi. fa. suggesting that Plaintiff could not regularly take out Execution, till after a Certificate from the Clerk of the Errors that no Bail was put in. The Court discharged the Rule. Such Certificates have been frequently taken out of Caution, but are not effentially necessary. The Statute 16 & 17 Car. 2. is positive as to Bail within four Days. Vide General Rules, Trinity & Mich. 28 Car. 2. No Bail is yet put in; Bail ought to have been put in before the Motion. A Question arose, Whether after Bail perfected the Goods can be restored? Vide Meriton against Stevens, Mich. 16 Geo. 2. Sykes against Dawson, Hil. 18 Geo. 2. Held, that if Defendant's Person be taken by a Ca. sa. and Bail in Error afterwards perfected, the Person shall be discharged; but in Case of a Fi. fa. the Proceedings, so far as the Sheriff hath gone, must stand. Draper for Plaintiff: Willes for Defendant.

Fine.

Lombe against Lombe. Trinity
14 & 15 Geo. 2.

of Chancery, were to convey by Fine. Birch moved, that the Fine might be ordered to pass, notwithstanding the Infancy of the Trustees, who were Daughters of the late Sir Thomas Lombe, and one of them the Wise of Sir Robert Cliston. The Order in Chancery being read, and the Parcels compared, the Motion was granted. Scrope versus Dom. Fitzwilliam & Ux. Hilary 6 Geo. (a Case in Point) was quoted.

Heathcock, Baronet, against Hanbury, Esquire, and his Wife. Mich. 24. Geo. 2.

TWO Fines of Lands in Northamptonfhire and Rutlandshire, taken at Hamburgh in Foreign Parts, where the Cognisors resided, were ordered to pass by all the sour Judges, upon an Affidavit of a Commissioner of the due Execution of each Fine, sworn before a Clerk in Chancery of the City of Hamburgh, and authenticated by his Certisicate or Attestation as a Notary Publick.

Pabeas

Habeas Corpus et Procedendo.

Lawndy against Clarke, in Case. Mich. 17 Geo. 2.

Efendant brought a Writ of Re. fa. lo. but took no Care to procure it to be returned and filed within two Terms; Plaintiff afterwards obtained a Certificate from the Filazer that the Re. fa, lo. was not filed, and thereupon the Cursitor made out a Procedendo as usual, and Plaintiff proceeded to Trial, and had a Verdict in the Court below. Defendant infifted, that the Certificate ought to have been from the Prothonotary, and not the Filazer. In Replevin the Re. fa. lo. is filed by the Filazer, but in all other Actions by the Prothonotary; and fo the Officers reported, and the Court held the Practice to be. The Rule to fet afide the Procedendo was discharged, the Application being too late. Rule to shew Cause why Re. fa. lo. should not be taken off the File, enlarged, but never finally determined. Draper for Defendant; Barnardiston for Plaintiff.

178 Habeas Coppus, &c.

Burdus against Shorter and Satchwell. Mich. 17 Geo. 2.

Plaintiff moved for a Ha. cor. to bring two Prisoners in the Fleet, both charged in Execution, to the Sittings at Guildhall, to testify in this Cause, upon an Affidavit of their being material Witnesses; and a Rule was made to shew Cause why such Ha. cor. should not be granted; or why the Witnesses should not be examined upon Interrogatories, and their Depositions read in Evidence at the Trial; and afterwards enlarged to shew Cause as before, (Plaintiff indempnifying the Warden); but for Want of the Consent of Defendants and the Warden, the Rule was difcharged. Sometimes fuch Writs of Ha. cor. have been granted. The fingle Point of Law is, Whether, under fuch Ha. cor. (the Prifoners being in Execution) the Warden could not defend himfelf against an Action for an Escape? The last Time this Question was before all the Judges, seven against five were of Opinion, that the Ha. cor. would not excuse the Warden, but he would be liable to answer for an Escape. Stiles's Practical Register 160, 283. Lord Raymond 851. granted ad testissicand. apud le Old Baily pro Rege, without Affidavit, Pasch. 11 Ann. 51. The King against Huggins, at the Old Baily, granted ad testissicand. pro Rege,

Geo.

habeas Corpus, &c. 179 Geo. 2. Willes for Plaintiff; Skinner for Defendant.

Pettit and others against Molloy. Mich. 19 Geo. 2.

A. cor. ad fatisfaciend. in this Cause only, three Judgment-Rolls produced in this and two other Causes, by Attorny for Plaintiffs, who defired that Defendant might be charged in Execution in all three. By the Judges in the Treasury, Defendant can only be charged in that Cause wherein the Ha. cor. is brought. There must be an Ha. cor. on every Judgment.

Francia against Lumbroza de Mattos and his Wife.

N an Affidavit that Mordecai Dalmeida, a Prisoner in the Fleet charged in Execution, was a material Witness, Defendant moved for an Ha. cor. ad testificand. to bring him before Lord Chief Justice at the Sitting after Term. The Court declared it to be a very doubtful Point, whether such an Ha. cor. would be a Justification for the Warden in an Action of Escape; and therefore did not grant the Writ, but by Consept a Rule was made, that the Depositions of the said Mordecai Dalmeida, taken in Chancery,

180 Habeas Cozpus, &c.

be read in Evidence on the Trial at Law. Skinner for Defendant; Willes for Plaintiff.

Ex parte Martin. Easter 25 Geo. 2.

CAmuel Martin, brought into Court by Ha. cor. directed to the Sheriff of Gloucestershire, prayed to be committed to the Fleet, with the Causes mentioned in the Return, which were, first, a Detainer for Want of Sureties, by a Warrant from a Justice of Peace, on an Indictment for leaving a Bastard Child, whereby a Parish became chargeable with it's Maintenance. Secondly, an Excommunicato capiendo issued out of Chancery, returnable in the King's Bench. And thirdly, with Exchequer Process on a Recognizance forfeited at the Seffions. The Court remanded the Prisoner, being of Opinion, that as to the two first Causes of Detainer, they had no Jurisdiction. As to the third, the Court inclined to think, that as it was not an Extent, Defendant might have been committed therewith, abstractedly considered.

Imparlance.

Fitzwilliams against The Bishop of Hereford and the University of Cambridge, in Quare Impedit. Trin. 13 & 14 Geo. 2.

Imparlance, the Declaration having been delivered after the Essoign Day, (viz. 4 June) Draper for Plaintiff produced a peremptory Rule to plead, after which there can be no Imparlance. The Rule to shew Cause was discharged; but the Court gave Desendants a Month's Time to plead.

against Higham, 12 June, in the Treasury. Trin. 17 & 18 Geo. 2.

Efendant appeared to be a Lunatic, by Affidavits of his Wife and Dr. Monro, and a Commission of Lunacy was produced under Seal in Chancery, teste 7th instant. Imparlance ordered, upon hearing the Attornies on both Sides.

Baker

Baker against Barlow and his Wife. Mich. 18 Geo. 2.

THE Writ was returnable the first Return of the Term, and Defendants put in Bail in Time, and Plaintiff declared; but the Declaration not having been delivered with Notice to plead, according to the General Rule, Pasch. 3 Geo. 2. Defendants moved for an Imparlance. Per Cur': This Rule has been taken to extend only to Cases where Plaintiff appears for Defendant, according to the Statute; but so long as the Rule subsists, in plain and express Words requiring all Declarations on Process returnable the first or second Return of any Term, to be delivered with Notice to plead, no Construction can be put upon it, contrary to the Letter, and an Imparlance cannot be denied. Rule absolute for Imparlance. Urlin for Defendants; Skinner for Plaintiff.

Cam against Gardner. Hil. 19 Geo. 2.

RIT returnable the first Return of this Term, in a Bailable Action, Declaration lest in the Office without Notice to plead indorsed, but Notice of Declaration and to plead served on Desendant. Desendant moved in the Treasury for an Imparlance, for Want of Notice indorsed; which

was denied, the Notice served on Desendant is sufficient within the Rule 3 Geo. 2.

Turner against Pigg.

RIT returnable the first Return of this Term, Declaration delivered without Notice to plead indorsed; a Summons taken out for an Imparlance, afterwards Notice to plead given in Time, before the last four Days of the Term; held good Notice, and Imparlance denied in the Treafury, on hearing the Attornies on both Sides.

Note; A Rule to plead must be given sub-

fequent to the Notice.

Swinley against Woodhouse. Mich. 21 Geo. 2.

AFTER the Judgment set aside by Rule of Court, Plaintiff's Agent applied to Defendant's Agent, and desired Leave to indorse Notice to plead on the Declaration delivered; which being denied, Plaintiff's Agent gave Notice to plead in Writing. Defendant applied for an Imparlance for Want of Notice to plead indorsed on the Declaration; which was granted. Vide General Rules, Mich. primo, Mich. 3tio & Pasch. 3tio Geo. 2. as to the Delivery of Declarations with Notice to plead; and Baker against N 4

Barlow & Ux. Mich. 18 Geo. 2. Prime for Defendant, Skinner for Plaintiff.

Cracroft, one, &c. against Willoughby, one, &c. Hilary 22 Geo. 2.

DLaintiff recovered Judgment by Bill, Hil. 19 Geo. 2. and in Trinity Term last (after a Writ of Error brought) had Leave of the Court to file a Bill to warrant the Proceedings of Mich. 10 Geo. 2. and this Bill, with Minutes of an Imparlance subscribed, was certified by the Custos Brevium into the Court of King's Bench; which being a nugatory Act, that Court would take no Notice of it. Afterwards Plaintiff, (Defendant in Error) alledged Diminution, and by Certiorari carried up to the King's Bench a Record of the Imparlance, Defendant (Plaintiff in Error) now moved to strike the Imparlance off the Roll. But the Court held, That by Virtue of the Rule for Leave to file a Bill of Mich. 10 Geo. 2. to warrant the Proceedings, Plaintiff might, as a necessary Consequence, enter the Imparlance on the Roll. Rule by Confent, to refer to Prothonotary to tax Defendant's Costs, occasioned by Plaintiff's not entering Imparlance on the Roll in Time, and Costs of Application. Defendant to bring Damages, and Costs recovered, into Court; Costs to be taxed as above, to be deducted, and Residue paid Plaintiff; Satisfaction

faction on Record to be acknowledged at Defendant's Expence. Agar and Bootle for Plaintiff; Draper for Defendant.

Gascoigne and his Wife against Brown. Trinity 24 Geo. 2.

Efendant having been ferved with Process returnable the first Return of this Term, Plaintiff on the first Day of the Term left a Declaration in the Office de bene esse, and caused Notice thereof to be personally ferved on Defendant the same Day; but Notice to plead not being indorfed on the Declaration left in the Office, the Question was, Whether fuch Indorfement was necessary, or not? And the Court, on looking into the General Rules Mich. 1st, Mich. 2d and Easter 3 Geo. 2. held, That in this Cause it was not necessary to indorse Notice to plead on the Declaration, the Notice ferved on Defendant is fufficient; it was the original Course. After the Rule of Mich. 1st, to establish the Practice, under the Statute to prevent frivolous and vexatious Arrests, (directing how Notice is to be ferved on Defendant where Plaintiff appears for him) Defendant was intitled to imparl, till the Rule of Mich. 3d took away the Imparlance. The Rule of Easter 3d directs nothing about the Notice, only that Declaration

tion shall be delivered with Notice. The Declaration is not compleat till Notice; it is a Declaration only from the Time of Notice, which is the single Thing material. Rule to shew Cause why Imparlance, discharged. Two Cases in the Treasury had been determined, agreeable to the present Rule, before the Case in Court. Swinley against Woodhouse, Mich. 21 Geo. 2. for Plaintiff; for Desendant.

Inquiry

Inquiry.

Wallace against Humes. Trinity 13 & 14 Geo. 2.

AFTER the Execution of a Writ of Inquiry of Damages, final Judgment figned, and Execution executed, Defendant moved in Easter Term 1740 to set the same aside, and for Restitution of the Mony levied, because the Inquiry was not executed, either before the High Sheriff of Cambridgeshire, (in which County the Action was laid) or his Under-Sheriff, but before one George Worrall, an Attorny, who was defired by Plaintiff's Attorny to act as a Deputy to the Under-Sheriff for this Purpose; and a Rule Nifi was granted. Upon shewing Cause in Trinity Term 1740, it was alledged on Plaintiff's Behalf, that it was a common Practice. where Under-Sheriffs live at a great Distance from the Parties and their Witnesses, for such Under-Sheriffs to appoint Deputies for the Execution of Writs of Inquiry, in order to fave Expence to the Parties. And although it appeared that one White, who acted as Under-Sheriff for this County, had given an Authority for the Execution of this Inquiry

quiry before some Attorny in Wisbech, where the Parties lived, and that Plaintiff's Attorny had paid him 13 s. 4 d. for his Fee; yet the Court feemed clear of Opinion, that the Inquiry was improperly executed; for a Deputy could not appoint a Deputy. But it appearing, that the Defendant had made a Defence upon the Inquiry; and in Regard that only os. Damages were found by the Jury, the Court thought it would be doing Defendant more Service to let the Inquiry, &c. stand, than to set them aside; therefore they discharged the Rule, but declared, that in order to put a Stop to this Practice of Under-Sheriffs making Deputies, they would grant an Attachment against any one that should do it for the future. Prime for Plaintiff; Skinner for Defendant.

Davis against Skyllins. Easter 14 Geo. 2.

RULE to shew Cause why Inquiry and Inquisition should not be set aside, as executed before a Person deputed by the Under-Sheriff, and acting without proper Authority. It appeared, on shewing Cause, that the Inquiry was executed before a Deputy appointed by a Deputation under the Seal of the Sheriff's Office, and the Rule was discharged, with Costs. Bootle for Plaintiff; Gapper for Defendant.

Langley

Langley against Bothwright, an Attorny. Mich. 15 Geo. 2.

A FTER an Interlocutory Judgment, Plaintiff sued out a Writ of Inquiry of Damages, and before the Return thereof, altered the same, caused it to be resealed, and afterwards proceeded to the Execution thereof, according to regular Notice. Defendant moved to fet afide the Inquiry, by Reason of this Alteration, and obtained a Rule to shew Cause; which was discharged, the Court being of Opinion, that as the Writ of Inquiry had not been made Use of before the Alteration, the Plaintiff had done nothing irregular; and the Complaint being groundless, and containing some Scandal, the Court gave Plaintiff his Costs. Willes for Defendant: Prime and Bootle for Plaintiff.

Yate against Swaine, for False Impriforment.

A Rule was obtained to shew Cause why the Writ of Inquiry of Damages, and Inquisition thereon, should not be set aside. Two Objections were made; one, that the Notice was ferved upon the Defendant himfelf, and not his Attorny; and the other, that the Time appointed by the Notice for executing

executing the Writ of Inquiry was between the Hours of ten and five. It was admitted, for Plaintiff, that both Objections were good; but it was infifted, that both of them were cured, by one Russel an Attorny's attending at the Execution of the Writ of Inquiry, on the Part of Defendant, cross-examining Plaintiff's Witnesses, and producing a Witness for Defendant. The Damages were 250 l. No Special Damages being laid, and it appearing that Plaintiff was confined for no longer Time than 26 Days, and Plaintiff himself making no Assidavit about the Damages or Imprisonment, the Court thought the Damages excessive, and ordered the Inquiry to be fet afide, upon Payment of Costs, and a new Writ of Inquiry to be executed before a Judge at next Affizes. Willes and Wynne for Defendant; Skinner and Birch for Plaintiff.

Billers, Knight, and another, against Bowles. Hilary 18 Geo. 2.

RULE to shew Cause why Inquisition taken on Writ of Inquiry of Damages, made absolute; no Evidence of Plaintiff's Demand having been given to the Sheriff and Jury. Plaintiff urged, that the Demand was by Promisory Note indorsed set forth in the Declaration, which was admitted by not pleading, and the Damages sound were only

the

the Amount of Principal and Interest due on such Note. But the Court held, That the Note indorsed ought to have been produced, and the Note and Indorsement proved. Agar for Desendant; Urlin for Plaintiff.

Penrice, Widow, against Penrice, by Writ of Dower unde nihil habet. Trin. 18 & 19 Geo. 2.

N the Execution of a Writ of Inquity, the Jury found for Damages the Value of a Third Part of the Land, from the Time of the Husband's Death to the Day of the Inquisition, without any Deduction for Reprizes, viz. Land-Tax, Repairs and Chief-Rent, and for Costs, the Jury gave the Amount of the Attorny's Bill for the Demandant, upon his Evidence that the same was a reasonable Charge, and he expected it from his Client. Damages are given by the Statute of Merton, Costs by the Statute of Gloucefler. The Court thought, that the Value of the Third Part of the Profits run fince the Death of the Husband, should have been computed only to the Time of awarding the Writ of Inquiry, and not to the Day of the Inquisition. That an Allowance ought to have been made for Reprizes; the Words of the Writ are (ultra Reprisas); and that the Attorny's Bill, to his Client the Demandant, ought

192 Inquiry.

ought not to have been the Measure of Costs. The Inquisition was set aside, and a new Writ of Inquiry ordered to be executed before a Judge at next Assizes, on Payment of Costs. Skinner for Tenant; Birch and Wynne for Demandant.

Quære, Whether the Jury should not have given Common Costs, One Shilling, as usual, and the rest be taxed and allowed de incremento per Prothonotary? But this was not before the Court.

Ellis against Wall. Trinity 19 & 20 Geo. 2.

Nquisition taken on a Writ of Inquiry of Damages set aside, for Want of Plaintiff's proving a Promisory Note set forth in the Declaration. Plaintiff's Attorny insisted, before the Sheriss and Jury, that the Note was admitted by Desendant's suffering Judgment, and the Jury sound the Sum mentioned in the Note for Damages, without any Proof; which was held unwarrantable. Agar for Desendant; Willes for Plaintiss.

Sparrow against Reed, Esquire, for Damage done to Common Right. Trin. 25 & 26 Geo. 2.

RULE made absolute for the Execution of Writ of Inquiry of Damages before a Judge at next Affizes, though no Affidavit was produced to support the Rule. Juries are returned in a much better Manner at the Affizes, than usually, for Writs of Enquiry. An improper Deputy is often appointed to represent the Sheriff, sometimes Plaintiff's Attorny. Summary Jurisdictions are not to be encouraged. Defendant is in the Rank of Esquire; he desires that the Writ may be executed in the Presence of a Judge; the extraordinary Costs whereof are like to fall on himself. Willes for Defendant; Prime for Plaintiff.

Vol. II.

Inspection of Court-Rolls and Books.

The Brewers Company against Benson. Easter 19 Geo. 2.

ACTION brought on By-Laws against Defendant, exercising the Trade of a Brewer, but no Member of the Company. By-Laws affecting Strangers interest them therein. Rule absolute for Defendant to inspect the Company's Books, and take Copies. Skinner for Defendant; Willes for Plaintiff.

Roe against Aylmar and others, on the Demise of Hare, Bart. in Ejectment. Hil. 27 Geo. 2.

Demise of the Lord of a Manor, against the Defendant his Tenant, to recover Pos-fession of a Copyhold Estate, which the Lord insisted was forseited, by Reason of the Tenant's not rebuilding a Cottage. Defendant moved for Leave to inspect and take Copies, at his own Expence, of the Court-Rolls of the Manor; but the Motion was denied, for Want of an Assidavit that a previous

Inspection, &c. 19

vious Application had been made on Defendant's Part, to the Lord or his Steward, for an Inspection and Copies, which were denied. Though this is a Dispute meerly between the Lord and his Copyhold Tenant touching a Forseiture, yet the same previous Application is necessary as in other Cases. The Tenants of a Manor are the only Persons who have a Right to inspect the Court-Rolls. The Court always expect an Affidavit to shew that the Person, on whose Behalf the Motion is made, is a Tenant of the Manor, and has applied and been denied, as above-mentioned. Draper for Desendant; Prime for Lesson of Plaintiff.

Webb against Spurrell. Trinity 13 & 14 Geo. 2.

Daintiff recovered a Verdict, and after the Trial, and before Final Judgment figned, died intestate. Plaintiff's Administrator cansed Final Judgment to be signed 19th October 1736, which was within two Terms after the Verdict, but the Roll was not brought into the Office, nor entred upon Record; after the two Terms lapsed, Defendant left a Caveat with the Clerk of Esfoigns, against receiving this Roll; and an Action of Debt being brought by Plaintiff's Administrator on the Judgment, Draper for Defendant moved to stay the Entry of Judgment, the same not having been entred within two Terms, according to the Statute 17 Car. 2. cap. 8. and obtained a Rule to thew Cause; which, upon hearing Prime for the Plaintiff, was discharged, without Costs on either Side. Per Cur': The Practice of not bringing Rolls into the Office within due Time is very inconvenient, and must be remedied by a new General Rule. In this Case, the figning must be considered as the Entry; the Fee for entring the Final JudgJudgment was paid to the Clerk of the Judgments at the Time it was figned; the Roll must be received and filed nunc pro tunc.

Wait, an Attorny, against Garth.

Tudgment was figned of Hilary Term 1733, but, by Omission of Plaintiff's Agent, the Roll was not doquetted and carried into the Office till 29 June 1737; and the true Day of doquetting was marked upon the Doquet by the Clerk of the Essoigns. Milner, who pretended to be a Purchasor of Desendant's Estate for a valuable Consideration, on 19 Jan. 1736, without Notice of this Judgment, moved, and had a Rule for Plaintiff to shew Cause why the Doquet should not be fet aside as void by the Statute 4 & 5 W. & M. cap. 20. Upon shewing Cause it appeared, that the Judgment was for a Debt bona fide, and that the Roll was accidentally mislaid, and omitted to be carried in, the true Time of doquetting appeared to be plainly and fairly entred, without Fraud; and an Elegit upon this Judgment appeared to be executed in 1735; and that Milner had Notice thereof, who feemed, upon the Affidavits, to be a colourable Purchasor to affist Defendant. Per Cur': The true Time of doquetting not being concealed, and no Fraud appearing on the Part of the Plaintiff, We will not interpose; Milner may bring his Eject-

Ejectment, and take what Advantage he can. It appeared that Milner had not made any Search for Judgments against Defendant till after his Purchase. The Rule was discharged. Prime and Bootle for Plaintiff; Birch and Agar for Milner.

Note; Milner having brought his Ejectment before this Motion came on, the Cause was tried at York at the Summer Affizes 1740, before Mr. Justice Parker; when Wait, who was in Possession, set up the above Judgment, in Opposition to Milner's Title; but Milner proving, by the Clerk to the Clerk of the Effoigns, that the Judgment-Roll was not carried in to the Clerk of the Essoigns and doquetted till 29th June 1737, and the Purchase-Deeds being executed 18th & 19th January 1736, the Judge of Assizes determined, That the Judgment, by Reason of it's not being doquetted antecedent to the Purchase-Deeds, was no Bar to Milner's Title: Therefore a Verdict was found for Plaintiff.

Fowler against Whadcock. Easter 14 Geo. 2.

A Rule was obtained by Plaintiff to shew Cause why Judgment should not be entered nunc pro tunc. The Cause was tried in London at the Sitting after Trinity Term 7 & 8 Geo. 2. Desendant filed a Bill in Chancery,

Chancery, and got an Injunction, which was dissolved 19th May 1740, and then Search made among Higham the late Associate's Papers, but the Postea could not be then found. 21st June 1740 Defendant died. It appeared that the Bill in Chancery was brought in 1733, and the Answer did not come in till 1738, and a further Answer not till 1739. Per Cur': By the Statute 17 Car. 2. cap. 8. Judgment may be entred within two Terms after the Verdict, and the Death of the Party between the Verdict and Judgment shall not be affigned for Error; but this Case is not within that Statute; and the Delay is purely the Plaintiff's, and not occasioned by the Court. Let the Rule be discharged. Draper for Humphry Whadcock, Heir and Executor of Defendant: Bootle for Plaintiff.

Gardner against Goodall.

Judgment was figned for Want of paying for the Issue-Book, and Defendant had a Rule to shew Cause why the Judgment should not be set aside. Upon shewing Cause it appeared, that Plaintiff had charged and demanded for the Issue-Book 6 s. 8 d. more than was due. The Court were clearly of Opinion, that the old Doctrine, that Defendants must pay whatever was demanded for O4 Paper-

Paper-Books, ought to be exploded; it is fufficient if they are ready to pay what is due. Let the Judgment be fet afide, without Costs, Defendant taking short Notice of Trial for the third Sitting. *Urlin* for Defendant; *Belfield* for Plaintiff.

Wagstaffe against Long, an Attorny. Mich. 15 Geo. 2.

Efendant, bound by a Judge's Order to plead an issuable Plea, pleaded that Plaintiff was an Infant, and ought to sue by Prochien Amy, and not by Attorny. Plaintiff looked upon this Plea as a Nullity, and signed Judgment. Hayward, for Defendant, moved to set the Judgment aside. But the Court refused to make any Rule, being of Opinion that this is a Plea in Abatement, and consequently null and void. The Judgment is regular, and Plaintiff was not obliged to apply to the Court to set aside the Plea. An issuable Plea is a Plea in chief, upon which Plaintiff may take Issue.

Longman against Rogers.

HIS was an Action of Debt on Bond. Defendant craved Oyer and a Copy of the Bond and Condition, and had the same, but without the Witnesses Names, or a Copy of an Agreement subscribed to the Condition.

tion. Plaintiff figned Judgment for Want of a Plea, and Defendant moved to fet the fame afide; infifting, that he was intitled to a more perfect Copy, with Witnesses Names, &c. The Practice was reported to be, that Defendant was intitled to Oyer of no more than the Bond and Condition, and not the Witnesses Names, &c. But per Cur': That Practice is unreasonable, and must be altered. After a Profert of a Deed, it is confidered as in Court, and it may be material for the Party's Defence to inspect the same, and take a Copy of the Whole, with Witnesses Names, and all Memorandums subscribed or indorsed. which he has a Right to. Anciently the Witnesses were Parties to the Deed, and were incorporated with the Jury to try the Deed. Let the Judgment be fet afide, without Costs. Let Defendant have a Compleat Oyer, and a Copy of the Deed and Witnesses, &c. and plead an issuable Plea. It was objected, that Milton, Defendant's Attorny, who figned the Notice of Motion, was a Prisoner in the Fleet, and consequently the Notice, &c. void. But per Cur': The late Act of Parliament disqualifying Attornies who are Prifoners from practifing, relates only to profecuting, and not to defending Suits. Wynne for Defendant: Skinner for Plaintiff.

Buckle against Lucas, Administrator.

Judgment was figned as quickly as could be, and strictly regular, but was set aside on Payment of Costs; and Desendant had Leave to plead two Bonds, and Plene administravit præter. Draper for Desendant; Prime for Plaintiff.

Hopkins against Knapp, an Attorny.

HIS was an Action on the Case super Assumption, and after Issue joined on Nul tiel Record, Plaintiff's Attorny delivered the Book, and gave Defendant a Day to bring into Court the Record by him averred, (viz.) Monday next after eight Days of St. Martin; and the Record not being brought in that Day, Plaintiff drew up a Rule for Judgment, unless Cause, on Wednesday next, figned Judgment, and executed a Writ of Inquiry of Damages. Defendant objected to the Judgment, that the Rule should have been, unless Cause within four Days, and not for a shorter Time. Per Cur: Where the Judgment is final, the Rule should be, unless Cause within four Days, that Defendant may have that Time to move in Arrest of Judgment; but where the Judgment is interlocutory, (as in this Case) that Reason fails, and there is no Occasion for a four Days

Days Rule; because Defendant may move in Arrest of Judgment after the Inquiry executed. Where the Proceeding is by Original, and a general Return Day is given to bring in the Record, the Defendant ought to be called to bring in the Record at the Rifing of the Court that Day; and if he fail, the Rule for Judgment should be, unless Cause on the Appearance Day of that general Return, and the Record may be brought in on that, or any intervening Day; but here, where the Proceeding is by Bill against an Attorny, and the Day given to bring in the Record is a Day certain, the Record cannot be brought in after that Day; but on that Day, at the Rifing of the Court, Defendant ought to be called to bring in the Record; and if he fail, the Court will appoint the Day to be inferted in the Rule for Judgment Nisi Causa. The Rule drawn up for Judgment Nisi was held good, and the Objection to the Judgment over-ruled.

Defendant objected to the Writ of Inquiry, that it was executed on less than fourteen Days Notice, though he lived above forty Miles from London; and this Objection being valid, the Inquiry, and Inquisition taken thereon, were set aside. Defendant's being an Attorny, and supposed to be present in Court, makes no Difference, the Place of his actual Residence being at Abingdon, above

forty Miles from London. Skinner for Defendant; Bootle for Plaintiff.

Smithson against Broughton, an Attorny. Trinity 16 Geo. 2.

PON an Attendance of the Attornies on both Sides 2d June, a Judge's Order was made, by Consent, for nine Days Time to plead; on 12th June Defendant obtained and ferved a Summons for further Time to plead; and after such Service, which was before Noon, Plaintiff's Agent figned Judgment; infifting, that the Summons for further Time, taken out after the Expiration of the Time to plead given by the Order, was a Nullity. This Judgment may be strictly regular; but it is quick Practice in Plaintiff's Agent. The Summons was ferved before he could regularly fign his Judgment, which he could not do till the Opening of the Prothonotary Office in the Afternoon of the 12th June. The Judgment was ordered to be fet aside, and Defendant to plead an issuable Plea, and take Notice of Trial within Term.

Northern

Northern, Administrator, against Oliver.

N the 1st December 1741 Plaintiff's Intestate died, and on the 6th of same December Interlocutory Judgment was figned of the Michaelmas Term preceding; Defendant moved to fet afide the Judgment and the subsequent Proceeding by Sci. fa. thereupon. Upon shewing Cause, the Court were of Opinion, that the Roll having been filed before the Essoign Day of Hilary Term, the Judgment is good by Relation, though the Party was dead before the actual Signing, especially as it is only Interlocutory, and no Day of figning is required to be set to it. Oades against Woodward, Salk. 87. And the Rule to shew Cause why the Judgment, &c. should not be set aside, was discharged. Wynne for Defendant; Draper for Plaintiff.

Southerton, an Attorny, against Greenfield. Mich. 16 Geo. 2.

FTER a Judge's Order for two Days further Time to plead, Plaintiff, on the third Day before Noon, figned Judgment, ten Days before the End of last Term. Defendant did not move then, nor till after Delay of Trial in Middlesex, and Writ of Inquiry executed. Per Cur': The Judge's

Order is an Enlargement of the Time to plead, and Judgment could not be regularly figned till the third Day in the Afternoon: But in this Case, Defendant's Application comes too late. The Rule to shew Cause why the Judgment should not be set aside, was discharged. *Prime* for Plaintiff; *Draper* for Defendant.

Broadbent against Wilks.

VERDICT for Defendant on two Iffues joined upon Not guilty, and a Justification. By the Special Plea the Trespass was confessed; Judgment was ordered to be entered for the Plaintiff, notwithstanding the Verdict, the Trespass being confessed by the Special Plea. The true Method is, not to stay the Entry of Judgment upon the Verdict by Rule, but to enter the Verdict upon Record, and then Judgment for the Plaintiff, non obstante Veredicto. Prime and Agar for Plaintiff; Bootle for Defendant.

Ford and Ford against Odam. Easter 16 Geo. 2.

Demurrer, without any Affidavit of the Infancy; Plaintiff looked upon it as a Nullity, and figned Judgment. The Court held this to be no Plea, either in Bar or Abatement,

ment, but properly a Demurrer; and that an Affidavit is not requisite. The Judgment was set aside. Plaintiffs may reply Full Age, if they think sit. Draper for Desendant; Belfield for Plaintiffs.

Gylbert against Gylbert, in Debt on Bond; The Same against The Same, in Case.

Eclarations were delivered, and Pleas J demanded, in the Country; and Over and a Copy of the Bond demanded, and a Copy given there last Term; and Judgments being figned for Want of Pleas, Defendant moved and obtained a Rule to shew Cause. why the Proceedings should not be set aside; infifting, that the Delivery of the Declarations, &c. in the Country were irregular, and ought to have been transacted in Town; but the Court held otherwise. It is settled. that Notice of Trial and of the Execution of a Writ of Inquiry of Damages, may be given in the Country. Every Thing that depends upon Practice may be varied, but not the Law. Defendant's Attorny accepted the Declarations, demanded Over of the Bond, and was contented with a Copy in the Country. The Rule was discharged. Skinner for Defendant; Belfield for Plaintiff.

Hall against Morse. Trinity 16 & 17 Geo. 2.

Efendant died 16th February, and Judgment figned the 21st; Plaintiff revived the Judgment by Sci. fa. against Defendant's Administrator, and after two Nichils returned, Execution was awarded. Court held, That all Judgments must be taken to be pronounced in Term-Time; and that figning Judgment in the Vacation following, though after the Death of the Party, is good; and the Rule to shew Cause why the Judgment, &c. should not be set aside, was discharged. Belfield for Plaintist; Draper for Defendant's Administrator. Harman against Smith, 6 Mod. Oates against Woodward, Salk. 87. Northern against Oliver, Trin. 1742, in C. B. Fuller against Jocelyn. Duke of Norfolk's Case, Farisley 39. Salk. 401.

The Duke of Leeds against Vevers, in Debt on Bond. Hil. 17 Geo. 2.

Efendant was intitled to eight Days to plead, and within that Time, but after the four Days Rule expired, demanded Oyer of the Bond. Plaintiff infifted, that the Demand after the Expiration of the Rule to plead, was void, and figned Judgment.

The

The Court held, that a Demand of Oyer at any Time within eight Days, where by the Course of the Court Desendant is intitled to eight Days to plead, is good; and set aside the Judgment. Bootle for Desendant; Skinner for Plaintiff.

Fawkes against Atkinson. Mich. 17 Geo. 2.

Defendant died 27th September 1743, on the 1st of October then next Judgment was figned of the preceding Term, by Virtue of a Warrant of Attorny, and 27th same October a Fi. Fa. was executed. Defendant's Representatives moved to set aside the Judgment and Execution, but the Court made no Rule. The Judgment is well signed of the preceding Term, according to the Course of the Court, and relates to the Ession Day of that Term, the Day of signing is material only with Respect to charging Lands, &c. Prime for Desendant.

Dalrymple against Colli.

Efendant, upon his Marriage, executed a Deed dated 20th August 1743, with a Power therein contained to enter Judgment at Plaintiff's Suit for a certain Sum, but without mentioning Term or Time, or whether upon Bond or Mutuatus, or otherwise.

Vol. II.

P

This

This Deed was executed as a Security inter al. for Defendant's transferring 2000 l. South-Sea Annuities, upon Trust for his Wife, within ten Days; and Defendant having failed, Plaintiff, after the End of eighteen Days took out a Fi. fa. upon the Judgment, which was entered 23d August 1743, on a Mutuatus. The Objections were, that the Words of the Power were [I bind myself, &c.] and the Judgment could be properly entered on an Obligation only, not on a Mutuatus, and not till after the Condition broken, and confequently not till this present Term. The Court thought, that as the Power was at large and unconfined, the Judgment was well entered on a Mutuatus of the preceding Term, and the Fi. fa. not being taken out till after a Breach of the Condition was regular, and confonant to the Intention of the Parties. The Rule to shew Cause why the Judgment and Fi. fa. should not be set aside was discharged. Had the Judgment been entered of the preceding Term upon the Bond, it would have been abfurd upon the Face of it, the Date of the Bond would have appeared; but as it is entered upon a Mutuatus, it is not irregular or erroneous. Skinner, Prime, Wynne and Bootle for Plaintiff; Willes and Draper for Defendant.

Wetherall against Hawes. Trinity 18 & 19 Geo. 2.

N shewing Cause against a Rule to set aside a Judgment, all the Objections were fully answered except one, which was an Irregularity in Service of the Process; and the Court held, that this Objection, according to the settled Practice, comes too late aster Judgment. The Rule discharged. Bootle for Desendant; Prime for Plaintiff.

Baker against Barlow and his Wife, Executors. Mich. 19 Geo. 2.

Defendants pleaded three Pleas by Leave of the Court, on two of which Issues were joined; on the third, for Want of a Rejoinder, Plaintiff signed Judgment quod recuperet, and took out Execution. The Court held, that after Judgment on the third Plea, (which was Plene Administravit) the Issues on the two other Pleas must be tried before Plaintiff can recover. If Defendant prevails on any of the Pleas, Plaintiff cannot recover. Rule absolute to set assistant Judgment and Execution, with Costs; Defendants consenting to bring no Action. Prime for Defendants; Skinner for Plaintiff.

Goodtitle against Notitle, on the Demise of Brymer and others, in Ejectment. Easter 19 Geo. 2.

HE Agent for the Tenants in Possession entered their Appearance with the Filazer, entered into the common Rule, and sent a Note to Plaintiff's Agent, That Defendants pleaded Not guilty. Plaintiff's Agent signed Judgment for Want of a Plea in Form. The Counsel for the Tenants submitted to the Court, That according to Words of the Rule for Judgment against the Casual Ejector, unless the Tenants appear, a new Declaration against the Tenants should in Strictness have been delivered, before a Plea in Form could be required. Judgment set aside, without Costs. Skinner and Willes for Desendant; Prime and Bootle for Plaintiff.

Savile against Wiltshire.

Efendant died 20th April, on the 21st April Application was made on Affidavit from Esex, sworn 19th April, for Leave to enter Judgment on an old Warrant of Attorny; Rule made and Judgment signed the 21st April. Motion by Executors of Defendant to set aside the Judgment, Defendant being dead before the Rule made and Judgment signed. Rule to shew Cause. If it had appeared to the Court that Defendant

was dead, Leave had not been given to enter Judgment, but Quod fieri non debuit factum valet. Here is no Imposition on the Court. No Difference between a Warrant of Attorny under or above a Year old, save that if under, Judgment may be entered without, if above, not without Leave of the Court. The Judgment when figned relates to the Esfoin Day of the present or preceding Term. Cases are uniform. The Court will adhere to Fictions and Relations when they tend to promote Justice. The old Practice is altered by Act of Parliament, as to Lands only, with Respect to the Time from which Judgments are to affect Purchasors. Fuller against 70celin in B. R. Mich. 4 Geo. 2. Chauncy against Needham, Viner, Title Judgment, 17 Geo. 2. B. R.

Maurice against Engier. Mich. 20 Geo. 2.

Efendant obtained a Judge's Order for Time to plead, pleading an iffuable Plea, rejoining gratis, and taking Notice of Trial within Term. Defendant pleaded accordingly, and Plaintiff replied; and then Defendant, instead of rejoining, demurred, merely for Delay. Plaintiff not having Time to set down the Demurrer to be argued within Term, signed Judgment. Defendant moved to set aside the Judgment, and a Rule

was made to shew Cause. Upon hearing Counsel on both Sides, the Court thought Defendant's Practice a meer Trick, and discharged the Rule. By rejoining gratis is meant, rejoining without the common four Days Rule to rejoin. Bootle for Defendant; Draper for Plaintiff.

Randle against Warr and others. Hilary 20 Geo. 2.

fet up a fair Defence, which they could not have the Benefit of under the General Issue. The Judgment, which was regular, was fet aside, on Payment of Costs, and pleading an issuable Plea, without confining Defendants to the General Issue; which, for the particular Reasons offered in this Case would signify nothing. Wynne for Defendants; Skinner for Plaintiff.

Swinley against Woodhouse, Clerk, in Debt on Bond. Mich. 21 Geo. 2.

Efendant superseded the Exigent, which was returnable Tres Mich. Plaintiff delivered a Declaration, laying his Action in London, without Notice to plead indorsed, gave a Rule to plead, and for Want of a Plea within four Days, signed Judgment. Desendant objected the Want of Notice to plead

plead indorsed on the Declaration, pursuant to General Rule Easter 3 Geo. 2. relating to all Process returnable the first or second Return of any Term. Desendant also insisted, That as he lived above twenty Miles from London, he was intitled to eight Days Time to plead, by General Rule Mich. 3 Geo. 2.

It was urged for the Plaintiff, That these Rules relate to Process of Capias, &c. ad respondendum, and not to an Exigent. after a Defendant had stood out the common Process of Capias, Alias and Pluries, and came not in till the Return of the Exigent, he was always, by the ancient Course of the Court, obliged to take a Declaration, and plead the same Term, without Imparlance, or more Time to plead than given by the common Rule. Vide Praxis utriusque Banci, Bancus Communis, fol. 8. That these Rules were intended to forward Plaintiffs in common Cases, and not to delay them, where Defendants could not be brought into Court on the ordinary Process. The Words of the Rules being general, and extending to all Process returnable the first or second Return, without Exception as to an Exigent, or any other particular Process, the Court ordered the Judgment to be fet afide, without Costs. Prime for Defendants; Skinner for Plaintiffs.

P 4

Chapman

Chapman against Cattern, otherwise Catterns.

AFTER Judgment, and Notice of executing a Writ of Inquiry of Damages, Defendant in November moved to set afide the Proceedings; objecting, that tho' the Act to prevent vexatious Arrests expired 1st June last, Plaintiff, by Virtue of an Affidavit of Service of the Process, sworn before the Filazer's Deputy 19th October last, had that Day entered an Appearance. That the Affidavit was coram non Judice, and the Appearance void. On shewing Cause by the Plaintiff, it appeared that the Writ was ferved in last May, returnable of Easter Term; that on Service, Defendant paid Part of the Debt and Costs, and Plaintiff gave him Time to pay the Residue; and did not renew the Proceedings till after that Time expired, and Default made. Per Cur': The Application might have been made the first Day of the Term, it feems now to come too late. The Time was inlarged at Defendant's Request, and now he would take Advantage of it, This looks like a Trick to evade Justice. The Appearance may be looked on as entred at the Return of the Writ (as recorded) nunc pro tunc, the Affidavit is not taken before a Person having proper Authority, but it is very late to inquire into that Matter now, Proposal

Proposal to pay the Residue of Debt and Costs, including the Costs of the Judgment, but not of the Motions, agreed to by Defendant; and thereupon Proceedings staved. Agar for Defendant; Bootle for Plaintiff.

Russell against Martin.

Apias returnable 15th Trinity, Plaintiff appeared for Defendant 15th July, after Statute expired gave Notice of a Declaration, and for Want of a Plea figned Judgment, and 10th November gave Notice of executing a Writ of Inquiry. 18th November Defendant moved to fet aside the Proceedings, infifting, that the Appearance was a Nullity. The Court thought, that the Application ought to have been made in the first Instance. By Consent Judgment set afide, without Costs, Defendant to appear nunc pro tunc, plead an issuable Plea, and take Notice of Trial for the Sitting after Term. Skinner for Defendant; Draper for Plaintiff.

Wilcox against Sharpe, in Covenant. Mich. 22 Geo. 2.

Efendant had pleaded three Pleas by Leave of the Court; Plaintiff afterwards got an Order to amend his Declaration, on Payment of Costs, in the Taxation whereof the

218 Judgments.

the Costs of the Pleas were not infisted on, or allowed. Plaintiff paid the Costs taxed, gave a new Rule, and demanded a Plea; whereupon Desendant's Attorny re-delivered the former Pleas, without second Application to Counsel or the Court. Plaintiff signed Judgment for Want of new Pleas. After an Amendment of a Declaration, Desendant has Liberty to plead de novo, that is, may do so if he has Occasion, or thinks proper, but he is not obliged to vary his first Desence. Rule absolute to set aside the Judgment. Willes for Plaintiff; Bootle for Defendant.

Hodges against Charley, Spinster, Executrix. Easter 22 Geo. 2.

Judgment signed for Want of a Rejoinder. Time had been given by Plaintiff's to Defendant's Agent to rejoin till Wednesday; on Thursday, three Days after Rule out, Summons for Time served held to be no Stay of Proceedings. Judgment regular set aside on Payment of Costs, and rejoining immediately. Skinner for Desendant; Prime for Plaintiff.

Cooke against Dethick and another, in Replevin. Easter 23 Geo. 2.

HE Plaintiff brought a Re. fa. lo. returnable in Michaelmas last, and a Pone returnable 8 Hilary last, whereon Defendants appeared, and Plaintiff delivered a Declaration 8th February last, intitled of Michaelmas instead of Hilary Term; and for Want of a Plea figned Judgment, and executed a Writ of Inquiry of Damages last Vacation, upon two Notices thereof, directed to Defendant Detbick and the other Defendant respectively, and both left at the House of Dethick. Defendant infifted, that he was intitled to an Imparlance; but that Question was not entered into. The Court held the Declaration intitled of Michaelmas Term to be null and void. Rule absolute to set aside the Judgment and Inquiry, Costs to attend Event of Trial. Poole for Defendants: Willes for Plaintiff.

Turton against Rishton. Trinity 24 Geo. 2.

N an Issue of Nul tiel Record joined in an Action of Debt on Judgment, wherein Plaintiff had declared for 95 l. adjudged to him for Damages, occasioned by Non-performance of Promises and Undertakings,

220 Judgments.

takings, &c. Plaintiff produced a Record of the Judgment to verify his Declaration, whereupon it was objected by Prime for Defendant, that the Record produced contains a Recovery of 951. Part for Damages, and the Residue for Costs, and the Record alledged is a Recovery for Damages only. But the Objection was over-ruled, and Judgment given for the Plaintiff. The Declaration is in the settled constant Form of this Court, used in such Declarations and in Writs of Scire facias to revive Judgments. After the Costs incorporated with and made Part of the Damages, the Conclusion of the Judgment is, Which faid Damages amount in the Whole to 05 l. The Form of the King's Bench differs from that of this Court. Precedents are uniform, and joined to the Reason of the Thing, must prevail. Brown's Modus intrandi 157. Officina Brevium 283. Bootle for Plaintiff.

Dean against Unwin, one, &c.

ORE Mony was charged on the Issue-Book than due, viz. 2 s. 4 d. for a second Copy of the Declaration, which was of the same Term with the Issue; and Defendant resusing to pay for the Issue, Plaintiff signed Judgment. The Court held it necessary that Desendant should tender the Sum due, and for Want of such Tender discharged

charged the Rule to shew Cause why the Judgment should not be set aside. Poole for Plaintiff; Hayward for Defendant.

Ouldham and another against Lee. Trinity 24 & 25 Geo. 2.

JUdgment signed for Non-payment of Mony due for an Issue-Book, tendered at the House of Defendant's Attorny twice, at proper Hours, though not left there, held to be regular, and Rule to shew Cause why the Judgment should not be set aside discharged. Prime for Plaintiff; Willes for Defendant.

Bickerton against Lewis.

fendant by Plaintiff, according to the Statute, the Clerk of Defendant's Agent took the Declaration out of the Office, and the Clerk of Plaintiff's Agent had Notice thereof; and, as the Clerk of Defendant's Agent fwore, undertook not to fign Judgment without calling for a Plea; notwithstanding which, Judgment was figned without such Calling. The Clerk of Plaintiff's Agent denied the Undertaking. The Court thought the Judgment not fair, though regular; and made the Rule absolute for setting it aside, on Payment of Costs, and pleading the General

Judgments. 222

neral Islue. Draper for Defendant; Prime for Plaintiff.

Eames against Jew. Mich. 25 Geo. 2.

Bjection, That no Plea was demanded in Writing. Answer, That a Demand of a Plea was indorfed on the Declaration delivered. Held, That such Indorsement is insufficient. A Plea must be demanded in Writing, after Declaration delivered, and Rule to plead given. Rule absolute to set aside the Judgment, with Costs. Willes for Defendant: Prime for Plaintiff.

Hobbs against Greene. Easter 25 Geo. 2.

THIS was an Action of Trespass for breaking and entring Plaintiff's House, and taking and carrying away divers Quantities of China Ware, Earthen Ware and Linen, without fetting forth the Particulars. Defendant suffered Judgment by Default; and after a Writ of Inquiry executed, and one Penny Damages found, Defendant moved in Arrest of Judgment, and obtained a Rule to shew Cause; objecting, that though the Writ be short, the Count should explain the Particulars of the Goods. Playter's Case 5 Coke 34. Pisces suos cepit, held to be uncertain, neither Number nor Kind being mentioned. Elphick

I

Elphick against Acton, 1 Vent. 114. in Trover de diversis Vestimeni, bad for Uncertainty. 1 Vent. 272, 329. 1 Inst. 383. A. Doc. Placitand. 85, 86, 87. On thewing Cause it was answered, on the Part of Plaintiff, that in Trespass or Trover there feems to be no Occasion for great Certainty, because Damages are to be given only for what is proved, as in an Indebitat. Assumplit, and this Recovery may be pleaded in Bar to a new Action. Bourn and Wife against Matair, in Replevin, in B. R. Lord Hardwicke Ch. Just. Hartford against Jones, 2 Salk 654. Harrison against Botomley, Trin. 2 Geo. 1. Kempton against Lampster, Trin. 1 Geo. 1. Rast. 509. 1 Keble, 184. 1 Ld. Raymond 588, &c. Rule discharged. Prime for Defendant: Poole for Plaintiff.

Whitehead, Administrator of Reveley, against Gale, Bail for Stewart. Trin. 25 & 26 Geo. 2.

RULE made absolute to set aside the final Judgment against Desendant Stewart, and all the subsequent Proceedings thereon against him and his Bail. Three Objections were made in Points of Irregularity; the first to the Judgment, That it was not signed till about two Months after the Death of Reveley the original Plaintiss;

224 Judgments.

he died (as was admitted) in September 1747, and the Judgment was figned in November following. The second, to the Revival of the Judgment per Whitehead the Administrator, which was by one Scire facias only, returned Nichil habet, (no new Person being called in on Desendant's Part.) The third, to the Award of Execution, not doquetted till after Desendant had appeared to the Sci. fa. which was returnable Octabis Purisicationis 1748.

The Court did not think it necessary to give any Opinion as to the second and third Objections, but as to the first, they held it to be good. The Law abominates Circuity and Expence; though the Judgment be erroneous in Point of Fact, yet it may also be deemed irregular, where the Application to set it aside is recent, the Bail ought not to be put to an Audita Querela. The Judgment is a Nullity. Plaintiff, at the Time when it was given, could not come to demand it, and his Warrant of Attorny was extinct. Prime for Defendant; Willes and Poole for Plaintiff.

Machin against Delaval, Esquire.

MOTION to set aside Judgment, &c. entred by Warrant of Attorny, which Warrant Defendant insisted was void, as being given in Pursuance of an Usurious Contract, which

which is not pleadable to a Scire facias on the Judgment. Plaintiff's Counsel observed, that the pretended Usury is subsequent to the Judgment; and that Usury for Continuance does not avoid the first Security, though a Penalty of treble the Value is given by Action, &c. The Court directed an Issue to try the controverted Fact, as to the Usury. Willes and Draper for Defendant; Prime and Poole for Plaintiff.

Wood against Dodgson. Trinity 26 & 27 Geo. 2.

DULE to shew Cause why Judgment R should not be set aside, discharged. The Objections were, that Defendant had never been ferved with Copy Process, or Notice of Declaration. The Answer was, that Copy of the Process had been tendered to Defendant at his House, who refusing to accept the same, it was left there; and that within 16 Days after such Service of Process, Notice of Declaration was left under the Door of faid House, which was then empty and shut up. The Court thought the shutting up of the House a Trick of Defendant's to avoid Process, &c. . By the General Rule 1 Geo. 2. Notice of Declaration is to be left, at Defendant's last Place of Abode. for Defendant; Wilson for Plaintiff.

Vol. II.

2

Bulling

226 Judgments.

Bulling against Rogers. Mich. 27
Geo. 2.

Efendant had moved in Arrest of Judgment, and obtained the common Rule, which is, That the Entry of Judgment be stayed till the Court be moved on Behalf of the Plaintiff, and shall otherwise order; of which Motion Defendant is to have Notice.

Draper, for Plaintiff, admitted the Objection made in Point of Law, and prayed that an Entry be made on the Roll as the Adjudication of the Court, That the Judgment be arrested, which was ordered. The Rule leaves the Action pending pleadable in Bar to a new Action; till the Entry prayed be made, Plaintiff cannot bring a Writ of Error, or maintain a new Action. Prole for Defendant.

Pony, Goods, &c. brought into Court.

Scarrall against Horton. Mich. 14 Geo. 2.

Efendant paid Mony into Court upon the Common Rule, which Plaintiff accepted, and after the Costs taxed and demanded, moved for an Attachment against Defendant for Non-payment. The Court refused the Rule; because, as the Words of the Common Rule stand at present, Defendant is not ordered to pay the Costs; but granted a Rule upon Desendant to shew Cause why he should not pay Costs; and declared, that the Form of the Common Rule should be altered, and made obligatory upon Desendants to pay Costs. Agar for Plaintiff.

N. B. A new Form bath been fince fettled accordingly.

Peirce

Peirce against Sanders. Easter 14.

HIS was an Action of Debt upon a Bill penal for 2 l. 2 s. and in the Declaration a Count was added on a Mutuatus. Defendant took a Rule from Secondary Paramor, as a Rule of Course, to pay 21.2 s. into Court, and pleaded Solvit ad diem to the Bill penal, and Nil debet to the Mutuatus. Plaintiff refused to accept the 2 l. 2 s. went on to Trial, and recovered 2 l. 2 s. and no more. Whereupon he applied to the Court to set aside the Rule for Payment of Mony into Court; and a Rule to shew Cause was granted, which, on shewing Cause, was discharged. Per Cur': The Rule to bring Mony into Court, in this Case, is not supported by any Precedent, and is certainly wrong; but Plaintiff should have applied sooner; after a Verdict in Defendant's Favour he comes too late. Hulley for Plaintiff; Draper for Defendant.

Fuller against Swan. Easter 14

Geo. 2.

FTER the Plaintiff's Death, a Motion was made that his Executor might pay Defendant a Sum of Mony, which the Prothonotary had reported to have been levied

vied by Plaintiff more than was due, and a Rule granted to shew Cause; but was afterwards discharged. *Draper* for the Executors; *Willes* for Defendant.

Royden against Batty, in Trover. Mich. 15 Geo. 2.

DEfendant obtained a Rule for Plaintiff to shew Cause why, on Defendant's bringing four new wrought Dimothy Bed-Curtains, Vallance and Bases, being the Goods specified in the Declaration, into Court; and Payment of Costs, Proceedings should not be stayed; it appeared on the Part of the Plaintiff, that the Curtains had been cut, altered and scowred, and thereby lessened in Value. Per Cur': These Sort of Rules are discretionary; and in this Case it is not reasonable to oblige Plaintiff to take his Goods again, altered as they appear to be Let the Rule be discharged. Prime for Defendant; Willes for Plaintiff.

Walnouth against Houghton. Hilary 15 Geo. 2.

THIS was an Action of Covenant, in which a Breach was affigned in a Sum certain (111.) for not dreffing Corn. Agar, for Defendant, moved to bring 111. into Court upon the Common Rule; to which Q.3 Draper

230 **Mony**, &c.

Draper for Plaintiff consented, admitting that this Breach is affigned with equal Certainty as for Non-payment of Rent.

Fisher against Kitchingman. Easter 16 Geo. 2.

Judgment was arrested, and consequently no Costs were to be paid on either Side. The Court ordered 20 l. brought into Court by Defendant, to be paid out to Plaintiff. Skinner and Bootle for Plaintiff; Agar for Defendant.

Vane against Mechell. Hilary 17 Geo. 2.

ONY was paid into Court upon the Common Rule, which Plaintiff refused to accept, and delivered an Issue; but afterwards changed his Mind, and applied to the Court for Leave to take the Mony out of Court, with Costs to the Time of bringing it in; which was ordered, upon Payment of subsequent Costs to Defendant. Skinner for Plaintiff; Urlin for Defendant.

Atkins against Taylor. Hilary 18 Geo. 2.

A CTION of Debt brought on a Bond, conditioned for a Bailiff's Good Behaviour, & inter alia, for his paying Mony collected for the Sheriff's Use. Defendant obtained a Rule to shew Cause why he should not have Leave to bring Mony into Court on the Common Rule, as to the Sums collected, and to plead Performance as to the Rest of the Condition. The Rule was discharged, as contrary to the Course of the Court. Prime for Defendant; Skinner for Plaintiff.

Yeoman against Ross. Easter 19 Geo. 2.

A Rule to pay Mony into Court in an Action of Debt for the Penalty of a Charter-Party, discharged, as contrary to the Course of the Court. Vide Atkins against Taylor, Hil. 18 Geo. 2. Willes for Plaintiff; Eyre for Desendant.

Q 4 Tidmash

Tidmash against Smith, in Covenant. Trinity 21 Geo. 2.

AFTER a regular Judgment set aside on the usual Terms of pleading the General Issue, &c. Defendant applied for Leave to bring Mony into Court on the Common Rule; denied, and Rule to shew Cause discharged. After a regular Judgment, the Court never give Leave to bring in Mony which comes in lieu of a Tender. Draper for Defendant; Agar for Plaintiff.

Hellier against Hallett, Widow, Administratrix, in Case, nine Counts. Trinity 21 & 22 Geo. 2.

RULE made absolute, giving Defendant Leave to pay 5 l. 5 s. into Court on the Common Rule, with Respect to the 7th and 8th Counts; and as to the Rest, to plead the General Issue, the Statute of Limitation, and a Set-off. This is similar to Covenant for Non-payment of Rent, where other Breaches are also assigned. If Plaintist takes the Mony out of Court, he must have Costs of the Whole to that Time. Fawcett against Rowles, Mich. 21 Geo. 2. The Court will not give Desendant Leave to pay Mony into

into Court, and plead as to some of the Counts, and demur to the Rest. James against Hosey, Mich. 2 Geo. 2. in Sir George Cooke's printed Cases of Practice. Prime for Plaintiff; Draper for Defendant.

Green, Executor, against Beaton, in Covenant. Mich. 22 Geo. 2.

REACH affigned for Non-payment of Rent. Defendant had obtained the Common Rule to pay 79 l. 1 s, into Court, and afterwards moved to add 1 l. 4 s. But it appearing that Defendant had pleaded, and that no Mony was yet brought into Court, the Rule was discharged. Draper for Defendant; Agar for Plaintiff.

Wright against Benington. Hilary 22 Geo. 2.

In Debt for Penalty of a Bond, conditioned for Performance of Covenants in an Indenture of Lease; Breach affigned for Non-payment of 10 l. for Half a Year's Rent. Motion to bring 10 l. into Court on the Common Rule, denied. This has never been done in Debt, though in Covenant it may. By the 8 & 9 W. 3. the Judgment in Covenant is to stand, and Sci. fa. may be sued out for subsequent Breaches; but that Statute does not extend to this Case. In Debt

234 Mony, &c.

on Bond for Payment of Mony by Instalments, Mony cannot be brought in on the Common Rule. Easter 19 Geo. 2. Yeoman against Ross and others, in Debt for the Penalty of a Charter-Party, a Motion to bring Mony into Court denied. On suffering Plaintiff to enter Judgment, and Payment of 10 l. and Costs, Proceedings stayed. Agar for Defendant; Poole for Plaintiff.

Austin against Ross, Executor. Hil. 23 Geo. 2.

RULE absolute, giving Defendant Leave to bring Mony into Court on the Terms of the Common Rule, and plead Plène Administravit, as well as the General Issue to the Whole. Draper for Desendant; Wynne for Plaintiff.

Bate, Assignee, against Crane, in Covenant. Easter 24 Geo. 2.

WO Breaches were affigued, one for Non-payment of Rent, the other for not using the Land in a Course of Good Husbandry. Defendant last Term paid Mony into Court on the Common Rule, as to the first Breach, which Plaintiff then refufing to accept, delivered an Issue with Notice of Trial for last Assizes, and afterwards countermanded fuch Notice. Defendant this Term ferved the Common Rule to enter the Issue on Record; whereupon Plaintiff applied to the Court, and had Leave to take the Mony out of Court, with Costs to the Time of bringing it in, he first paying subsequent Costs to Defendant out of the Mony in Court, if sufficient, and if not, Plaintiff to make good the Deficiency, and thereupon Proceedings to stay. Prime for Plaintiff; Bootle for Defendant.

Emes, Widow, Executrix, against Jew. Hilary 25 Geo. 2.

HIS was an Action on the Cafe, on feveral Undertal the last Count for Mony received for Plaintiff's Use as Executrix. Defendant moved, and obtained a Rule to shew Cause why he should not have Leave to pay Mony into Court on the Common Rule, as to the last Count, and why, if Plaintiff shall not recover more Mony than the Sum paid into Court on that Count, and shall not recover any thing on the other Counts, why she should not pay Defendant's Costs; it appearing that Plaintiff might, as to the fourth Count, have brought the Action in her own Right. On shewing Cause, a Rule was entred into by Consent, That Plaintiff do accept the Mony offered, as to the last Count, with Costs hitherto as to it; and that the last Count be struck out of the Declaration. Willes for Defendant: Poole for Plaintiff.

Potice and Countermand.

Tilney against Watson. Mich. 14
Geo. 2.

N Inquisition taken upon a Writ of Scire fieri inquir' was set aside, for Want of due Notice of the Execution of the Writ. Plaintiff insisted, that Notice was not necessary. If the Sheriff returns a Devastavit, Defendant may traverse the Return. But per Cur': The same Notice is requisite as of executing a Writ of Inquiry of Damages. Draper for Desendant; Bootle for Plaintiff.

Stafford against Thompson.

Was Monday, and Notice of Trial was countermanded on Saturday next before, and Sunday being the only intervening Day, the Question was, Whether the Notice was regularly countermanded, or not? The Court held the Countermand to be regular, and discharged the Rule to shew Cause why Plaintiff should not pay Defendant Costs for not proceeding to Trial. Skinner for Plaintiff; Bootle for Defendant.

Bowler

Bowler against Jenkin. Hilary 15 Geo. 2.

Efendant lived above forty Miles from London, and Plaintiff proceeded to Trial at a Sitting there, upon ten Days Notice; no Defence was made, and Defendant infifting, that he was intitled to fourteen Days Notice of Trial, moved to fet afide the Verdict, and had a Rule to shew Cause, which was made absolute. By the Act 14 Geo. 2. no Cause is to be tried in London or Middlesex, where Defendant resides above forty Miles from London or Westminster, unless Notice in Writing be given at least ten Days before such intended Trial. Before this Act, fourteen Days Notice was the fettled Practice; and unless necessitated. the Court will not be bound by an Act made to take away a Benefit from Defendants. The Practice or Law of the Court cannot be taken away but by Negative Words, i.e. There shall be no more than ten Days Notice. Fourteen Days Notice, notwithstanding this Act, still necessary. Hayward for Defendant: Agar for Plaintiff.

Smith against Lacock. Trinity 16
Geo. 2.

OURT held, Notice of the Execution of the Writ of Inquiry of Damages, given in the Country to the Attorny there, (and not to the Agent who received the Declaration in Town) good and sufficient Notice, and discharged the Rule to shew Cause why the Inquisition should not be set aside. Bootle for Desendant; Agar for Plaintiff.

- Tashburn against Havelock. Mich. 16 Geo. 2.

OTICE of Trial on an old Issue was given to the Attorny in the Country, and not to the Agent in Town; the Queflion was, Whether it was good Notice, or not? Per Cur': The Notice on this old Isfue is well given to the Attorny in the Country, for it may be given either to Attorny or Agent; but where Notice of Trial is given on the Issue-Book, it must be given to the Agent, because the Issue can be delivered no where but in Town. Notices of Trial and Countermands, Notices of executing Writs of Inquiry and Countermands, may be given either to the Attorny in the Country, or to the Agent in Town. But of those Things which are to be done only in Town, Notice must

must be to the Agent; and all Notices, where the Party hath a known Attorny, must be given to that Attorny, or his Agent, and not to the Party himself. There has been no Determination of this Court that Notice of Trial in the Country is bad, though it hath been so understood. Mountsteven against Templar, Mich. 7 Geo. 2. Attornies in the Country are to take no Notices but of Trial, Inquiries, and their Countermands. Easter 6 Geo. 2. That Countermand of Notice of Trial may be given either in Town or Country.

Darker against Edwards. Mich. 16 Geo. 2.

THE Capias ad respond bore Teste 7th July, returnable 27th October, and was dated 25th October 1742. A Copy was served, with Notice to appear on the 27th October next; which must refer to the Time when served, and consequently must intend October 1743. The Notice should have been to appear on the 27th of this instant October, or October 1742, and not October next. The Act of Parliament designed to make certain the Time for Desendant's Appearance, by the Notice. The Rule to stay Proceedings was made absolute. Ketelbey for Desendant; Agar for Plaintiff.

Hester against Hall.

AFTER Notice of Trial given, and regularly countermanded, Plaintiff obtained a Rule to discontinue, upon Payment of Costs. After the Notice of Trial, and before the Countermand, a Witness for Defendant, who resided in London, set out for York Assizes; and the Question was, Whether the Expence of this Witness could be allowed Defendant in Costs? The Court held, that as the Countermand was regular, Costs for this Witness could not be allowed. Draper for Defendant; Willes for Plaintiff.

Bailey against Semple. Trinity 16 & 17 Geo. 2.

DEfendant being beyond the Seas, and his Attorny dead, Rule absolute, that Demand of a Plea in the Office shall be sufficient Notice; upon Affidavit of Service of a Rule to shew Cause on one of Defendant's Bail, and that the other was not to be found. Draper for Plaintiff.

Vol. II. R Blackmore

Blackmore against Smith. Mich. 17
Geo. 2.

AFTER Plea pleaded, Proceedings had stayed three Years, and then Plaintist delivered an Issue, and afterwards gave fourteen Days Notice of Trial. The Court made the Rule absolute to set aside the Verdict, for Want of a Term's Notice of his Intent to proceed, by the Party proceeding pursuant to General Rule, Easter 13 George 2. Birch for Plaintist; Agar for Desendant.

Miller against Parsons. Hilary 17 Geo. 2.

HE Name [White] was put on the Bail-piece, as Attorny for Defendant; Plaintiff's Attorny, not being able, upon diligent Inquiry, to find this White, left a Declaration in the Office, and gave Notice thereof to Defendant, and for Want of a Plea figned Judgment, and gave Notice of executing a Writ of Inquiry to Defendant. On the Part of Defendant it was infifted, that the Proceedings were irregular; that Plaintiff's Attorny ought to have found out Defendant's Attorny; or if he could not, that Notice of the Declaration, &c. could not be ferved on Defendant without Leave of the

the Court. And a Rule was made to shew Cause why the Proceedings should not be set aside, with Costs. Upon shewing Cause, the three Prothonotaries reported, and the Court held, the Proceedings to be regular, and the Rule was discharged. Where the Party's Attorny cannot be found, Notice may be served on the Party himself. Where neither Attorny nor Party can be found, the Court must be applied to, and will order Notice, &c. in the Office to be good, unless the Bail (if any) shew Cause to the contrary. Vide Bailey against Semple, Trin. 16 & 17 Geo. 2. Gapper for Plaintiff; Agar for Desendant.

Johnson against Johnson and Ouchterlony. Trinity 17 & 18 Geo. 2.

APIAS returnable Cro. Trin. Dated 18th May 1744, and served with Notice to appear 21st May next [May 1745] instead of this instant May. Rule absolute to stay Proceedings. Skinner for Plaintiff; Draper for Defendant.

Potice, &c.

244

Roe, on the Demise of Hutchings, against Dunning and others. Mich. 18 Geo. 2.

as in Case of a Nonsuit. Objected by Counsel, for the Lessor of Plaintist, that a Term's Notice of Motion ought to have been given; but the Court held otherwise. The General Rule of Court extends only to the Party's Intent to proceed, not to Motions to end Proceedings. Rule absolute. Hussey for Desendant; Gapper for Lessor of Plaintist.

Reed against Blanchett. Hilary 19 Geo. 2.

Efendant moved to amend his Notice, to fet off a mutual Debt, delivered with his Plea of Non assumpti, (by striking out Plaintiff, and inserting Defendant) which the Court denied. Then Defendant prayed Leave to withdraw his Plea, and plead Non Assumptit de novo, with new Notice to set off, which was granted. Skinner and Bootle for Plaintiff; Prime for Defendant.

Walker against Towne and Lee. Trin.
19 & 20 Geo. 2.

the Office served on a Sunday, Rule to shew Cause why Defendant should not have an Imparlance, made absolute. The Court held the Notice on Sunday bad, within the Statute Car. 2. which ought to have a large Construction in Favour of Religion. Declaration in Ejectment, which is considered as Process, cannot be delivered on Sunday. Process and Proceeding have been construed, by Chief Justice Holt, to be the same Thing. Anciently all Pleadings were Ore tenus at the Bar. Notice of Declaration is the same as Delivery. It is no Declaration till Notice. Wynne for Defendant; Bootle for Plaintiff.

Braithwaite against Allan. Hilary

DEfendant objected to the Insufficiency of Plaintiff's Notice of executing a Writ of Inquiry of Damages, with Respect to Uncertainty of Place. The Words of the Notice were at the usual Place at Durham, and obtained a Rule to shew Cause why the Inquisition should not be set aside. Upon shewing Cause it appeared, that for twenty-four Years past, and upwards, the Place, viz.

R 3 the

the Court-House where Causes are tried, and where this Writ was executed, had been the known and established Place for executing Writs of Inquiry; two Counsel for Defendant attended the Execution of this Writ, and cross-examined Plaintiff's Witnesses. The Rule was discharged. *Prime* for Defendant; Willes for Plaintiff.

Kettle against Bulstrode, Clerk of the Juries. Mich. 22 Geo. 2.

A Copy of the Bill filed, with Notice to appear, was left with Mr. Pritchard, Defendant's Deputy, after Nine o' Clock in the Evening. Rule absolute to stay the Proceedings. Poole for Defendant; Prime for Plaintiff.

against Ferguson.

THE Writ was returnable Tres Mich. the Notice to appear subscribed to the Copy served was to appear at the Return, being the 20th October, without interting the Word (next), or (the Year 1748), held defective. Rule absolute to stay Proceedings. Skinner for Desendant.

Thomlinfon,

Thomlinson, Gent. one, &c. against Gorton. Easter 23 Geo. 2.

RULE to shew Cause why Proceedings should not be set aside, with Costs. Objected, that Declaration left in the Office was not indorsed to be lest de bene esse. The Question was, Whether Notice of Declaration lest de bene esse, without indorsing the Declaration, was or was not sufficient? The Secondaries did not agree in their Report of the Practice. One of them thought the Notice sufficient without the Indorsement. The two others contra. Rule absolute to set aside the Delivery of the Declaration, and subsequent Proceedings, sans Costs. Draper for Desendant; Willes for Plaintiff.

Nash against Harrow. Trinity 24 Geo. 2.

Plaintiff's Attorny gave two Notices of executing Inquiry of Damages, one to Defendant himself, a Prisoner in the Fleet, the other to the Turnkey; but, by Mistake, in both Notices the Name Birt, instead of Nash, was inserted as Plaintiff; notwithstanding which, the Inquiry was executed, and final Judgment signed. Rule absolute to set aside Inquisition and final Judgment, with Costs. Prime for Defendant; Wynne for Plaintiff.

R 4

1201:

Nonpros, Nonsuit, &c.

Wilson against Barber. Mich. 14
Geo. 2.

Demurrer, and several Issues were joined; before the Demurrer argued Plaintiff proceeded to try the Issues; as to one of which the Proof lay upon Defendant, and as to the rest upon Plaintiff. Plaintiff began at the Assizes to give Evidence upon the first Issue, and failing in Proof, was nonsuited. Plaintiff moved to set aside the Nonsuit, which was thought reasonable, though against the Course of the Court. The Nonsuit was set aside by Consent, on Payment of sull Costs. Draper and Willes for Plaintiff; Bootle for Desendant.

Diggs against Price. Mich. 15 Geo. 2.

RAPER for Defendant moved, that the Issue-Roll might be brought into Court, and for Judgment as in Case of Non-suit, pursuant to the Act of Parliament 14 Geo. 2. Per Cur': In the first place a Rule must be given for Plaintiff to enter the Issue upon Record, which if he fails to do, Defendant may have a Nonpros for Want thereof.

If Plaintiff enters the Issue, the Roll must be produced in Court, and thereupon Defendant may move for a Nonsuit upon the Act of Parliament. Whenever the Court admits the Cause shewn by Plaintiff sufficient to discharge the Rule to shew Cause why a Nonsuit, the Court will appoint a future Day for the Trial, in Country Causes at the next Affizes, in London or Middlesex at a Sitting at a convenient Distance.

Clarke against Gorrill.

Plaintiff's own Illness was held sufficient to prevent a Nonsuit upon the late Act of Parliament, and was allowed as sufficient Cause, and next Assizes appointed for the Trial. After Debate, and the Court's Opinion, Bootle objected to Plaintiff's Assidavit, that it was sworn before his own Attorny. But, per Cur': That Objection comes now too late. Bootle for Desendant; Prime for Plaintiff.

Dapp against Woodman. Easter 15 Geo. 2.

RULE to shew Cause why Judgment as in Case of Nonsuit, pursuant to the late Statute, discharged. Plaintiff ordered to pay Costs of the Application, and peremptorily to try the Cause at the next Sitting.

250 Nonpros, &c.

Sitting. The Court inclined to think they could, if they thought it reasonable, enlarge the Time afterwards, in Case of a Default.

Agar for Plaintiff; Wynne for Defendant.

Vile, Widow, against Daw and others. Trinity 16 Geo. 2.

Jack But Plaintiff did not proceed to Trial at the then next Assizes, and before the last, which was the second Assizes, Plaintiff married, to wit, 10th December 1741. After Notice of Trial given, Desendant moved for Judgment as in Case of Nonsuit; and upon shewing Cause, the Court were of Opinion, that though no Excuse was shewn for Plaintiff's not proceeding to Trial at the first Assizes, yet Desendants, for that Desault, should have applied in Michaelmas Term last; but are now too late. As to the second Assizes, the Excuse is sufficient; by the Marriage the Suit is abated de facto. The Rule was discharged. Draper for Plaintiff; Bootle for Desendants.

Sutton against Waddilove, in Replevin. Mich. 16 Geo. 2.

Efendant, by Leave of the Court, made two Avowries, viz. first for Damage fesant; second for Rent in Arrear. Plaintiff

Time to plead in Bar to the Avowries, pleading issuably, and taking Notice of Trial for the Sitting after last Term in Middlesex; and within Time demurred to the first, and pleaded in Bar to the last Avowry. Defendant signed a Nonpros, for Want of Plaintiff's pleading issuably to both Avowries, which the Court held to be regular; but upon Payment of Costs, pleading issuably to both Avowries, and taking Notice of Trial within this Term, the Nonpros was set aside. Willes and Agar for Defendant; Belfield for Plaintiff.

Guy against Wilkinson. Trinity 16 & 17 Geo. 2.

RULE to shew Cause why Judgment as in Case of Nonsuit, discharged. Defendant having first applied for Costs for Plaintiff's not proceeding to Trial, has made his Election. The Plaintiff was ordered peremptorily to proceed to Trial at next Assizes. Draper for Plaintiff; Bootle for Defendant.

Milton

Milton and another, Assignees of a Bankrupt, against Terrill. Mich. 17 Geo. 2.

PLaintiffs not having proceeded to Trial after Issue joined, according to the Course of the Court, Defendant had applied for Judgment as in Case of Nonsuit, pursuant to the Statute; and Plaintiff having made a reasonable Excuse, further Time was allowed by the Court for Trial peremptorily at last Assizes. Plaintiffs gave no new Notice of Trial, but made Default again, and endeavoured to excuse the second Default by Affidavit, purporting, that Plaintiffs, the Affignees, found a Debt entred in the Bankrupt's Books as due from Defendant, but for Want of the Bankrupt's attending Plaintiffs in Time, as requested, according to his Duty, and supplying them with Proof of the Debt, and informing them how to answer a Set-off infifted on by Defendant, Plaintiffs could not proceed to Trial. Per Cur': The Word [peremptory] in the Rule, doth not preclude the Court from a farther Enlargement of the Time, if they think it reason-'Tis wrong to infert the Word [peremptory]; the second Excuse may be better than the first. The Statute is founded on Neglect. Suppose Plaintiff's Attorny should die die Manu Dei, or Defendant should, by some Act of his, hinder the Trial; the Effects of the Bankrupt must not be wasted to the Prejudice of his Creditors. No Notice of Trial was given for last Assizes, Defendant's Attendance was then unnecessary. The Bankrupt, after obtaining his Certificate, may be a Witness. The Time for Trial was further enlarged till next Assizes, upon Payment of Costs of the Application. Belsield for Defendant; Draper for Plaintiff.

Sugar, qui tam, against Webster. Trinity 17 & 18 Geo. 2.

Judgment as in Case of a Nonsuit applied for; and the Question was, Whether an Action qui tam was within the Statute, or not? Per Cur': A common Informer may be nonsuited. Plaintiff was ordered to pay Costs of the Application, and peremptorily to proceed to Trial at next Affizes. Willes for Plaintiff; Skinner for Defendant.

Ogle, Esquire, Executor, against Mossitt.

Efendant had applied for and received Costs, for Plaintiff's not proceeding to Trial at last Assizes, and now moved for Judgment as in Case of Nonsuit, pursuant to the Statute; but having made his Election, and taken Costs for not proceeding to Trial,

254 **Nonpros**, &c.

he cannot have the other Remedy. The Motion was denied. Bootle for Defendant; Prime for Plaintiff.

Lowe against Peacock and others. Hilary 18 Geo. 2.

Cause why Judgment of Nonsuit secundum Stat. Plaintiff afterwards had a Rule to shew Cause why he should not have Leave to discontinue, which was enlarged, and both came on together. The Court held the Application for Leave to discontinue, after the first Motion, wrong, and made the Rule absolute for a Nonsuit. Bootle for Defendant; Willes for Plaintiff.

Jones, on the Demile of Wyatt, against Stephenson, in Ejectment.

were disabled by Gout, &c. from attending the Trial last Assizes. Excuse good to prevent Nonsuit. Time given Plaintiff to try at next Assizes peremptority, on Payment of Costs for not proceeding to Trial at last Assizes only. Where the Excuse is sufficient, the Court do not give Costs of the Application; aliter where it is insufficient. Prime for Plaintiff; Birch for Defendant.

Pepiatt,

Pepiatt, one, &c. against Bell. Easter 19 Geo. 2.

Judgment as in Case of Nonsuit moved for, on Affidavit of Notice of Motion only, and Rule to shew Cause. Objection by Plaintiff's Counsel, that to support the Rule, there ought to have been also an Assidavit that the Cause was not tried; which Objection was allowed, and the Rule discharged.

Hartley, alias Green, against Atkinson. Mich. 25 Geo. 2.

OTION by Plaintiff, and Rule to shew Cause why a Nonsuit at last Yorkshire Affizes should not be set aside. Plaintiff at the Trial had offered in Evidence an unstamped Copy of a Record of Proceedings at the Sessions of the Peace; to which Defendant's Counsel objecting the Want of Stamps, the Plaintiff's Counfel gave up the Point, and submitted to a Nonsuit; though on looking into the Acts of Parliament fince, it appears, that no Stamps on fuch Copy of a Sessions Record are requisite. Per Curiam: The standing Rule is, that if a Nonsuit be regular, the Parties are out of Court, and it cannot be fet afide; if irregular, it is not confidered as a Nonfuit. Lord Chief Justice

256 Nonpros, &c.

not quite satisfied with this Rule; but till the Judges of all the Courts of Westminster agree to alter it, the Rule must stand. If the Courts were to set aside regular Nonsuits, the Merits of Causes and Points of Law would be brought into Question on Motions. Prime for Defendant; Bootle for Plaintiff.

Beere against Brooking. Mich. 26 Geo. 2.

Issue joined, and Notice of Trial given for last Sitting in London within last Term; but a Mistake being discovered in the Declaration, Plaintiff did not proceed to Trial. Defendant applied for Judgment as in Case of a Nonsuit, and obtained a Rule to shew Cause. On hearing Counsel on both Sides, the Issue-Roll not being struck into the Bundle, and the Amendment being small, the Court gave Plaintiff Leave to amend his Declaration, on Payment of Costs of Application, and for not proceeding to Trial; and appointed a peremptory Day for Trial. Draper for Plaintiff; Willes for Defendant.

Bentley against Scott and another, in Replevin. Easter 26 Geo. 2.

Judgment as in Case of Nonsuit. Poole for Plaintiff endeavoured to distinguish this from Common Cases, because, in Replevin Defendants might, in the first Instance, have carried down the Record to Trial. Per Cur': The Act of Parliament has made no Distinction.

Margerum against Fenton. Trinity 26 & 27 Geo. 2.

Conpress figned for Want of Plaintiff's entring Issue, set aside as irregularly figned one Day before the Time limited by Rule for entring the Issue expired. The Rule runs, "Unless Plaintiff within four Days" next after Notice shall cause the Issue to be entered", which excludes the Day of Notice. The Rule was served Friday 22d of June, and the Issue-Roll brought in Tuesday following, on which Day the Nonpress was signed. Wilson for Defendant; Willess for Plaintiff.

Vol. II.

Dutlawiy.

Speed against Barber. Mich. 15 Geo. 2.

RULE to shew Cause why Proceedings on the Exigent post Ca. sa. should not be stayed, was made absolute. The Exigent bore Teste 29th May last, and after that Day, and before the Return, Defendant became a Prisoner in the Fleet, at the Suit of a third Person. It was notorious at Chester that Defendant was become infolvent, and had affigned his Effects for the Benefit of his Creditors. Steele, Plaintiff's Agent, was told by Kent, Defendant's Agent, that Defendant was in Custody; the Exigent was not yet returned, but remained in the Sheriff's Hands. Per Cur': The Exigent was well fued out before Defendant's Commitment to the Fleet, and no Notice of that Commitment was given to Plaintiff's Agent till after the Exigent, but the Outlawry will fignify nothing, because it may be reversed by Writ of Error. Let the Rule be absolute, and Plaintiff may charge Defendant in Execution. Abr. 804. pl. 3. where Defendant goes bevond the Seas after the Teste of an Exigent, he may be regularly outlawed. Wynne for Defendant: Willes for Plaintiff.

White

White against Dunster.

Process as a single Woman, by the Name of Dunster; and after the Exigent, and before the Outlawry, she married one William Priseley, viz. in February 1740; in August 1741 she was taken by the Name of Dunster, by a Capias Utlagat, and a Rule was obtained to shew Cause why the Outlawry should not be reversed at the Expence of William Priseley, on his entring a common Appearance for himself and his Wise: But the Rule was discharged, the Court refusing to interpose, as the Marriage was after the Exigent. Bootle for Desendant; Belsield for Plaintiff.

Heely against Hewson. Easter 16

IT appeared that pending the Exigent, Defendant was a Prisoner in the Gaol for the City of York; for which Reason the Court ordered the Outlawry to be reversed, without Payment of Costs to Plaintiff, upon Desendant's entring a common Appearance. Birch for Plaintiff; Bootle for Desendant.

Farnworth against Smith. Hilary 18 Geo. 2.

JULE to shew Cause why Outlawry should not be reversed, at Plaintiff's Expence. Objected, on the Part of Defendant. That he was a publick visible Man, and Plaintiff had not endeavoured to arrest That the Capias, Alias and Pluries, were all fued out at one and the fame Time. That no Affidavit of the Debt was indorfed on the Writs (though bailable) pursuant to the Statute to prevent vexatious Arrests. That no Date was put to the Writs, as required by the Statute. The Affidavits as to Defendant's Visibility were fully answered, and his total Absconding proved. And the Court held, That in case of a total Absconding, no Endeavours to arrest are necessary. That Suing out the Capias, Alias and Pluries together, was regular, and warranted by constant Practice. That on Process to the Outlawry, no Affidavit for Bail is required by Statute, or the Course of the Court; nor is a Date to fuch Process usual. The Rule discharged, without Costs. Prime for Plaintiff; Draper for Defendant.

Dale, Widow, against Robinson, Clerk. Mich. 20 Geo. 2.

Bjected by Defendant, who had been outlawed on the Profecution of the Plaintiff. That he was a publick visible Man, and that the Return of the Proclamation was bad; it importing, that Proclamations were made as the Sheriff was by the Writ commanded, but not where or according to the Form of the Statute. Defendant's being a publick visible Man was fully denied; and it was fully proved that he absconded, and his Living was under Sequestration. The Court feemed to think the Return of the Proclamation sufficient. Frustra sit per plura, &c. but faid, Defendant might, as to it, bring a Writ of Error, if so advised. The Rule to shew Cause why the Outlawry should not be reversed at Plaintiff's Expence, was discharged. Skinner for Defendant; Willes for Plaintiff.

Withall against White,

AFTER the Return of the Exigent, but whilst it remained in the Hands of the Sheriffs of London, and before Defendant was returned Outlawed, the Court made a Rule, That a Supersedeas to the Exigent should be S 3 allowed

Dutlawry.

262

allowed, on Payment of Costs. Vide General Rules, 17 Cha. 2. & 2 Jac. 2. Prime for Defendant; Willes for Plaintiff.

Wiate against Parker. Trinity 21
Geo. 2.

Efendant outlawed, after Judgment moved to fet afide the Outlawry for Want of a Proclamation. Per Cur: This is not a fit Matter to be determined in a Summary Way. Defendant may bring a Writ of Error. Cro. Jac. 577.

French against Manby. Mich. 27
Geo. 2.

A Writ of Allocatur on the Exigent had iffued (after Judgment and Ca. fa.) returnable on the Morrow of All Souls last, 3d November 1753, whereupon Defendant was returned to be outlawed (Quinto exactus) 16th July 1753. It appeared, that Plaintist died 6th August 1753, and that a Commission of Bankrupt issued against Defendant 21st same August. Defendant obtained a Rule to shew Cause why Proceedings should not be stayed, which Rule was discharged; the Court being of Opinion, That the Writ and Return must be filed, notwithstanding Plaintist's Death after the Day of Outlawry, but before the Return. Before an actual Assignment

fignment by Commissioners of Bankruptcy, the Crown is not bound; though there is a great Difference between an Extent in Aid pro Rege, and an Outlawry for a private Perfon's Debt. Here is no Foundation to tie up Plaintiff's Hands; he may proceed, if shall be so advised. Prime for Defendant; Wilson for Plaintiff.

Ashley, Esquire, against Stockwell, Esquire, and Husband, Esquire.

HREE feveral Outlawries had been pronounced about a Year ago, and transcribed into the Exchequer; one against both Defendants, a second against Defendant Stockwell, and a third against Defendant Husband; all at Plaintiff's Prosecution. Penvold and Roberts, authorized by Power of Attorny executed by Defendants, applied on their Behalf, and obtained a Rule to shew Cause why these Outlawries should not be reversed, at Plaintiff's Expence; Defendants at the Time when the Writs of Exigent iffued and still being in Parts beyond the Seas. On shewing Cause by Plaintiff it appeared, that Defendants had been abroad three Years, and probably never intended to return to England; and it was urged, that as they stay abroad longer than their lawful Occations S 4

cafions required, such Stay must be looked upon to be with a View to defeat Justice; and confequently they were duly outlawed. That if not, they ought to bring their Writ of Error, and should not be relieved in this fummary Manner by Motion. The Court thought it discretionary in them to relieve by Motion, or put the Parties to a Writ of Error, according to the Circumstances of the Case. Courts have gone further of late Years than heretofore, on Motions, as more effectual to expedite Justice, save Expence, and preserve Credit and Character. It is difficult to determine, when Defendants Stay abroad to avoid Process shall be taken to commence. There is not sufficient Foundation for the Court to order Plaintiff to reverse these Outlawries at his own Expence. But as they are not special, but only in Trespass Quare clayjum fregit, Defendants have a Right to reverse them at their own Expence, on entring common Appearances, and Payment of Costs. Rule made accordingly. Defendants, before the Outlawries were transcribed into the Exchequer, might have reversed them, on entring common Appearances and Payment of common Costs, as far as the Exigent; but now, after they are transcribed, Costs must be paid to the Time of Reversal. Prime for Defendants; Willes for Plaintiff.

Dyer, &c.

Barber, Assignee of the Sheriff, against Satchwell, on a Bail-Bond. Trin. 17 & 18 Geo. 2.

By a Judge's Order Defendant was allowed two Day's Time to plead, which expired 30th May. On the Day following, [31st May] Oyer of the Bail-Bond was demanded; which Demand, after the Time for Pleading expired, Plaintiff looked upon as a Nullity, and signed Judgment; which was held to be regular, and the Rule to shew Cause why the Judgment should not be set aside, was discharged. The Court seemed to think [Capitalis Justic' solus] that it was reasonable Oyer might be demanded any Time before Judgment, but would not overturn the established Practice. Skinner for Defendant, Willes for Plaintiff.

The Weavers Company against Ware. Action on a By-Law. Mich. 18 Geo. 2.

Efendant prays Oyer, and a Copy of the Letters Patent set forth in the Declaration with a Profert in Cur', and Plaintiffs give him Oyer and a Copy, for which Copy Defendant pays, and afterwards doth not make the Over Part of his Plea, but pleads the General Issue, Non cul'; Plaintiffs make up the Issue with Oyer; Defendant moves that the Oyer may be struck out of the Issue; and upon hearing Counsel on both Sides, the Motion was denied. Draper: Giving Over is the Act of the Court, and when fet out, is Part of the Declaration. Letters Patent are a Record, and Non Concessit pleaded doth not deny the Letters Patent, but the Operation thereof only. Action on Bail-Bond, in the Declaration not laid that the Bond was given to the Sheriff per Nomen Officii; Defendant pleads Non est factum, Plaintiff in his Replication sets out the Bond by Way of Oyer, to help the Defect in the Declaration. Per Cur': Plaintiffs may by Replication pray an Involment in hæc verba, but cannot make Defendant pray Oyer in his Plea upon Record whether he will or no. Where Over is prayed, Plaintiffs have a Right

Right to make the Oyer Part of Defendant's Plea. If no Oyer is prayed, an Inrolment proper. If Oyer prayed, no Inrolment. The Pleadings are supposed to be Ore tenus at the Bar, and a Record is to be made of what is done there. Bootle for Defendant; Draper for Plaintiff. Cases cited for Plaintiffs, Plow. 491. 20 H. 7. 8. Dyer 133, 187. Cro. Jac. 679. Stonebouse against Read, 1 Lut. 680. Blewit against Appleby, Co. Lit. 260. a. Brook, Tit. Record. Aliter in Banco Regis, Mich. 19 Geo. 2.

Pleadings, and Time to Plead.

Fitzwilliams against The Bishop of Hereford and the University of Cambridge, in Quare Impedit. Trin. 13 & 14 Geo. 2.

Ayward, for Defendants moved for an Imparlance, the Declaration having been delivered after the Essoign Day, viz. 4th June. Draper, for Plaintist, produced a peremptory Rule to plead, after which there can be no Imparlance. The Rule to shew Cause was discharged; but the Court gave Desendants a Month's Time to plead.

Dowding, Administrator, against Baker and others.

HIS was an Action of Debt on Bond, Declaration delivered of Trinity Term last, with an Imparlance till Michaelmas Term; in that Term Defendants procured a Judge's Order for Time to plead till the 15th December, and then pleaded Solvit ad diem by one of the Defendants; in Hilary Term Plaintiff replied Nonpayment; and Defendants

dants the same Term rejoined, and entred a Waiver of their Plea, and fet out Letters Testimonial, dated 26th November, whereby it appeared, that Plaintiff was excommunicated 23d November, and so plead the Excommunication puis darrein Continuance; in Easter Term following, Plaintiff demurs, and Defendants join in Demurrer. Bootle for Defendants alledged, that Plaintiff, in making up the Demurrer-Book, had continued the Imparlance from Trinity Term till the last Return of Michaelmas Term, which is 25th November, though the Plea was delivered generally of that Term, and the Imparlance ought to be carried no farther than Tres Mich. which is the constant Practice. That by Plaintiff's continuing it beyond 23d November, an Absurdity was created, and Defendants would thereby lose the Benefit of their Defence, for that the Excommunication would then appear to be before, and not after the last Continuance. Draper for Plaintiff infifted, that it is Plaintiff's Right to enter Continuances by Imparlance, from the Declaration to Judgment or Issue; that Time to plead, and an Imparlance, are the fame Thing; and as Defendants, in Truth, had Time to plead till 15th December, the Imparlance ought to be continued, according to the Fact; and of that Opinion was the Court, and ordered the Imparlance to be continued till Tres Mich. agreeable to the common

common Practice, and from thence till Quinden' Martini, agreeable to the Fact.

Harrison against Morris and others, in Trespass. Mich. 14 Geo. 2.

Rule to shew Cause why Defendant Roads should not have Leave to withdraw the General Issue, pleaded by Mistake, and join with the other Desendants in pleading a Special Justification, upon Payment of Costs, was made absolute, no Delay or Inconvenience being occasioned to Plaintiff thereby. Bootle for Desendant Roads; Prime for Plaintiff.

Wells against Trehern, an Attorny.

PER Cur': Claim of Cognizance by the University of Oxford disallowed as coming too late, after Plea pleaded and Replicacation tendering an Issue. Rule to shew Cause why Claim of Cognizance should not be allowed was discharged.

Dunn against Hutt, in Trover.

Dunn against Hutt, in Assumpsit.

WO Declarations by the By delivered 16th October next before this Term, (after Declaration in Chief delivered in Easter Term last) were held to be out of Time,

and could not be regularly delivered after the Term in which the Writ was recomable. An Agreement to receive the Declarations by the By was fworn upon Defendant's Attorny, but he denied it by Affidavit. Rule absolute to stay Proceedings. Agar for Defendant; Ketelby for Plaintiff.

Lloyd, Assignee of the Sheriff, against Cullum, upon a Bail-Bond.

HE Capias in the Original Action was returnable Menl. Mich. and the Bail Bond affigned 17th November, and Process served thereupon, returnable Quinden' Martini, whereto Defendant appeared; and in last Vacation Plaintiff declared generally of Michaelmas Term, with an Imparlance till this Term. Defendant demurred, and Plaintiff joined in Demurrer, and delivered the Demurrer-Book made up of this Term. Defendant obtained a Rule to shew Cause why the Entry of the Declaration should not be made generally of Michaelmas Term, as delivered. Per Cur': This Rule shall be discharged, but every Thing ought to be entered according to Truth. Let the Declaration be amended by intitling it in fifteen Days of St. Martin in Michaelmas Term. the Demurrer be withdrawn, and Defendant have four Days to plead de novo. Bootle for Defendant; Skinner for Plaintiff.

Cosens,

Cosens, Attorny, against Etherington, Executor. Trinity 14 & 15 Geo. 2.

A Rule was made to shew Cause why Defendant should not plead doubly, viz. a special Plene Administravit, and a Set-off, without an Affidavit; and no Cause being shewn, the Rule was made absolute. Bootle for Defendant.

Steele and others against Pindar, in Trover. Mich. 15 Geo. 2.

A Rule to shew Cause why Defendant should not plead doubly, viz. Not guilty, and A General Release from one of the Plaintists. The Court have been too nice in the Construction of the Act of Parliament for pleading doubly, which is general, and a remedial Law. These Pleas are not absolutely contradictory; the Release is general, and not particular, and cannot in this Case be given in Evidence under the Not guilty. Draper for Defendant; Bootle for Plaintists.

Garnett, Attorny, against Harrison and Freeman, Executors.

RULE to shew Cause why Defendants should not plead Non Assumpsit, and Plene Administravit; was made absolute, without an Affidavit from Defendants that they have fully administered. Before Lord Chief Justice Eyre's Time this Affidavit was not required, and it is not reasonable to expect it for the future. Pleading doubly is a Privilege Defendants are intitled to by Act of Parliament. The Court give Leave to plead Non Assumpsit, and Non Assumpsit infra sex Annos, without an Affidavit; and that is a Case more within the Party's Knowledge than a Plene Administravit. If either of the Pleas are false, Costs are given by the Statute. Gapper for Defendants; Draper for Plaintiff.

Thornhill against Tunnard.

RULE to shew Cause why Defendant should not withdraw his Avowry, and avow Property in a Stranger, was made absolute. Birch and Draper for Defendant; Bootle for Plaintiff.

VOL. II.

Clixby against Dinas.

Efendant was sued by the Name of Finis Dinas; he pleaded in Abatement, that his Name was Phineas, and not Finis; but both the Plea and Affidavit to verify it were intitled, In a Cause between Clixby, Plaintiff, and Finis Dinas, Defendant. Rule to shew Cause why the Plea should not be set aside, was made absolute. Bootle for Plaintiff; Agar for Defendant.

Lacy against Lock, in Trespass. Easter 15 Geo. 2.

RULE made absolute to plead doubly, (viz) Not guilty, and 4 l. 4 s. paid Plaintiff in Satisfaction for all Trespasses to such a Time. Draper for Desendant; Willes for Plaintiff.

Fleming, Clerk, against Betts and Blake, in Trespass, for placing a Stile in Plaintiff's Fence, and cutting down Trees.

RULE discharged to shew Cause why Desendant should not plead doubly, Not guilty, and a Licence. Draper for Desendant; Prime for Plaintiff.

Goddard

Goddard and Martin against Ballard and his Wife, Executors. Trinity 16 Geo. 2.

RULE made absolute to plead doubly, viz. Ne unques Exec', and Plene Administravit; no Cause being shewn to the contrary.

Salmon against Aldrich. Hilary 16 Geo. 2.

RULE to shew Cause why Desendant should not withdraw his Plea of Tender, and plead the General Issue, and pay Mony into Court upon the Common Rule, was discharged. The Court will permit Desendant to withdraw a Special Plea, and plead the General Issue; but after Plea pleaded, cannot give him Leave to bring Mony into Court without Plaintiff's Consent. Draper for Plaintiff; Agar for Desendant.

T a

Rutter

Rutter against The Bishop of Hereford and the University of Cambridge; &c. in Quare Impedit. Easter 16 Geo. 2.

RULE to shew Cause why Desendants should not plead nine different Matters, (denying all the Facts in the Declaration) discharged. And the Court resused to grant a Commission to examine touching secret Trusts for Papists, according to the Statute, without the University's Consent to plead the Popish Act only. Draper for Plaintiss; Hayward for Desendant.

Hall against Lane, in Case on several Promises.

THE Court gave Defendant Leave to plead Bankruptcy to the first Count, and to pay Mony into Court on the Common Rule, and plead the General Issue to the other Counts. Willes for Plaintiff; Agar for Defendant.

Brewer against Mathews, in Trespass.

Eclaration was delivered so late last Term that Defendant had not Time to move to plead doubly, but, to prevent Judgment, pleaded Liberum Tenementum. Plaintiff replied, and Defendant demurred. Plaintiff applied for Leave to amend the Replication, and Defendant to withdraw his Plea, and plead Non cul' and Liberum Tenementum. A Rule was made to shew Cause upon Defendant's Motion, and afterwards discharged, the Pleas being contradictory. Where the Locus in quo is ascertained by the Declaration (as in this Case) Liberum Tenementum is no Plea. It is only necessary where the Trespass is laid generally, to put Plaintiff upon making a new Aflignment. No Affidavit is produced to verify that Defendant's Case requires both Pleas for his Defence. Bootle pro Plaintiff; Wynne pro Defendant.

Rolle, Esquire, against Lytton and others, in Trespass.

JULE to shew Cause why some of Defendants should not plead two Matters, viz. Non cul', and That the Premisses in Question are the Freehold of Sir William Courtenay, Baronet, discharged. The Place is ascertained by the Declaration; and Plaintiff

T 3

tiff may give the same Evidence on the General Issue as on both Pleas. Belsield for Plaintiff; Draper for Defendant.

Prinnell against Preston, in Trespass, for erecting a Shed in Plaintiff's Close called The Yard.

otion, without an Affidavit, to plead Not guilty, and a Licence. Where the Pleas are contradictory, Defendant should make appear by Affidavit that it is necessary for his Defence to insist upon both. If the Trespass be by Cattle, the Nature of the Case is sufficient, an Affidavit is not necessary, because the Matter may be without the Party's Knowledge. If by the Party himself, he must move upon Affidavit. The Court have never admitted Not guilty, and a Release of a particular Trespass; tho they have admitted Not guilty, and a General Release, where an Affidavit was produced.

Burnand against Burnand. Trinity
16 & 17 Geo. 2.

RULE absolute to plead Non cul', and Son Assault Demesse, (No Cause shewn) Prime for Desendant.

Bayley against Houldston.

Term, and the Declaration, which was delivered the Day before the Essoign-Day of this Term, was sent per Post to Shrewsbury the same Day. Defendant's Agent could not have Instructions to plead a Tender within the first four Days of this Term, but moved as soon as he could. Rule to plead a Tender. Skinner for Desendant; Prime for Plaintiff.

Lawrence against Playford.

RULE obtained upon Affidavit to shew Cause why Desendant should not plead three Pleas, Non cul', Son Assault Demessive, and Molliter manus imposuit, made absolute to plead the first and last, rejecting the second. Willes pro Plaintist; Prime for Defendant. The Case made by the Affidavit not making it necessary for Desendant's Desence to plead the second.

Banks against Bulcock, Executor. Mich. 17 Geo. 2.

RULE absolute, upon Assidavit of Service, to plead Non est factum, and Ne unques Executor. Prime for Desendant.

Bristow

Bristow against Trappett, in Trespass and Assault.

Nul cul', and Son Assault Demesne. By Defendant's Affidavit the Assault appeared to be justifiable. He has a Right to plead the Special Plea, but is under a Doubt whether without it the General Plea will be sufficient or not. He takes upon himself the Proof of a Colateral Matter by adding the Special Plea. If Plaintiff recovers, he will have full Costs, without a Certificate, though the Damages should be under 40 s. Prime for Desendant; Willes for Plaintiff.

Lannie against Fieldhouse, in Trespass, Assault and Maim. Hilary 17 Geo. 2.

OT guilty, Son Assault Demesse, and Satisfaction for all Trespasses, not a particular Trespass, allowed to be pleaded; and Rule giving Desendant Leave to plead the same, made absolute. Skinner for Defendant; Hayward for Plaintiff.

Bingham against Davis.

RULE was made absolute, giving Defendant Leave to plead a Tender of Mony of last Term, notwithstanding the General Imparlance. Defendant's Agent, though he appeared in Time, had no Notice of the Declaration till the first Day of this Term; and on the 26th January he obtain'd a Judge's Summons. Hayward for Defendant; Birch for Plaintiff.

Bullythorpe against Turner, in Replevin. Easter 17 Geo. 2.

THE Court held, That the particular Place of taking Goods, &c. ought to be inserted in every Declaration in Replevin; and that Cepit in alio Loco is to be considered as a Plea in Bar, and not in Abatement. No Affidavit is requisite to be filed therewith, nor is it necessary to be pleaded within four Days after the Declaration delivered. Resolutio Curiæ.

The King against The Archbishop of York, in Quare Impedit. Easter 18 Geo. 2.

RULE to shew Cause why Defendant should not have Leave to plead doubly, discharged. The Statute 4 Anne, chap. 16. does not extend to Suits where the King is a Party, unless for Debt immediately owing, or Revenue. Vide 24th Sect. of the Statute.

Benson against Hemming. Trinity 18 & 19 Geo. 2.

DLaintiff's original Demand was 151. 35. o d. Defendant gave Notice to set off. but took no Advantage under it; proving on the Trial Payments in Part, which reduced the Debt to 1 l. 13 s. 9 d. and that Sum the Jury gave Plaintiff in Damages. Defendant obtained a Rule to shew Cause why he he should not have Leave to enter a Suggestion on the Roll (pursuant to the Statute 1st William and Mary, setting up Courts of Conscience in Bristol and Gloucester:) That the Parties are both Inhabitants of Gloucester, and the Debt recovered under 40 s. Plaintiff's Counsel quoted a Case in B. R. Pitts against Carpenter, Trinity 16 & 17 Geo. 2. where a Cross Demand of 3 l. 2 s. had been proved

proved by Way of Set-off, and thereby Plaintiff's Original Debt of 41. 15s. was reduced to 11. 13 s. 3 d. After the Benefit of said Set-off, the Court denied Leave to Defendant to enter Suggestion. This Court was of the same Opinion as the Court of King's Bench. The Demand in the Case quoted was reduced by Defendant's Act; it was not known to Plaintiff, at the Time of bringing his Action, whether Defendant would take Advantage of a Set-off or not. The Inferior Court has no Jurisdiction for a Debt above 40 & But this Case differs from that quoted here; no Set-off is used, but Payment proved under the Non Assumption. The original Debt, which was the Cause of Action, appears to be no more than 11. 13s. 9d. Defendant's submitting to the Jurisdiction of this Court doth not take away his Remedy; after Verdict, he now comes primo instante. The Suggestion may be traversed as to Inhabitancy. Rule for Leave to enter Suggestion absolute. The London Court of Conscience, Act 3 Jac. 1. chap. 15. is a good Statute; and though this Act relating to Bristol and Gloucester be inaccurately penned after a good Precedent, yet the Court is bound by it. Skinner for Plaintiff; Willes and Draper for Defendant.

284 Pleadurgs, &c.

Thompson against Atkinson, in Covenant broken. Mich. 19 Geo. 2.

JUNE 20th 1745 Defendant obtained a Judge's Order for a Fortnight's Time to plead, pleading an iffuable Plea, and taking thort Notice of Trial. Defendant pleaded a general Performance of Covenants (not figned by Counfel), which was held to be no iffuable Plea, and fet afide. Costs to attend the Event. Prime and Wynne for Plaintiff; Skinner for Defendant.

Smith against Philips, one, &c. Hilary 19 Geo. 2.

DILL intitled generally of Michaelmas Term; Declaration with a Memorandum of the 23d October; after which Day, and before 25th November, the true Day of filing the Bill, the Defendant had tendered Mony to Plaintiff. Willes, for Defendant, moved, after the first four Days of this Term, that the 25th November might be inserted in the Memorandum instead of 23d October, in order that Defendant might plead a Tender. No Rule. Defendant is too late to plead a Tender, after a general Imparlance. He should have applied within the first four Days of this Term.

Tayler against Wittall, in Trespass and Assault. Trinity 19 & 20 Geo. 2.

RULE made for Leave to plead three Pleas, (viz.) Non Cul', Son Assault Demessione, and Molliter Manus imposuit. Belfield for Defendant; Wynne for Plaintiff.

Harman against Dunn, for Words. Mich. 20 Geo. 2.

RULE made absolute for Desendant to plead Not guilty, and a Justification. Wynne for Desendant; Skinner for Plaintiff.

Haddock against Howard. Hilary 20 Geo. 2.

Efendant, whilst a Feme sole, was arrested in the Palace Court, and a Day or two after the Arrest married, and then removed the Plaint by Ha. cor. into this Court, and pleaded her Coverture in Abatement. Rule to shew Cause made absolute to set aside the Plea, upon hearing Counsel on both Sides.

Crabb, Clerk, against Button, Clerk, Executor.

RULE made absolute to plead two Pleas, viz. Ne unques Executor', and Plene Administravit. Draper: Defendant is sued as an Executor de son Tort, and it is dangerous for him to rely on the first Plea; he knows not whether the Act he has done makes him Executor, or not. If he has done Wrong, he has made Satisfaction. Plene Administravit is within his own Knowledge. Draper for Defendant; Wynne for Plaintiff.

Harison against Speight, Transitory Action of Trespass for taking and carrying away Brackens. Easter 20 Geo. 2.

LAVE given Defendant to plead two Pleas, viz. Not guilty, and a Justification; prescribing as Owner and Occupier of Defendant's Messuage, &c. and because Plaintiss wrongfully cut down the Brackens, Desendant took them as belonging to him. This is not stronger than Not guilty, and Liberum Tenementum. Bootle for Desendant; Skinner for Plaintiss.

Smith, one, &c. against Lodge, for Words. Trinity 21 Geo. 2.

Pule made absolute for Defendant to plead two Pleas, (viz.) Not guilty, and a Justification as to the Truth of the Words, which Words imported, That Plaintiff was perjured in an Affidavit he had made. If the Words are true, Defendant may be trapp'd, by imagining that he may give the Truth of the Words in Evidence on the General Issue. There are no other Pleas in Actions for Words but these two, and if the Rule be denied, the Court must determine Actions for Words to be out of the Statute for pleading doubly. Bootle for Defendant: Prime for Plaintiff.

Penvold against Thomlinson, one, &c. By Bill.

Efendant moved to stay Proceedings, the Declaration having been delivered without the usual Memorandum. Court gave Plaintiff Leave to amend, by inferting the Memorandum, on Payment of Bootle for Defendant; Prime for Plaintiff.

Browne

Browne against Hagan. East. 21 G. 27

RULE to shew Cause why Defendant should not have Leave to plead a Tender of Mony of last Term, notwithstanding the General Imparlance, made absolute on Payment of Costs, though the Application was not made within the first four Days of this Term, according to the General Practice; it appearing that the Declaration was not delivered till the Day before the Essoign Day of this Term; and that Desendant's Agent, who was obliged to write into Susfolk, had applied almost as soon as he possibly could. Belsield for Plaintiss; Bootle for Desendant.

Jones against Davis and his Wife. Same Term.

Leave of the Court, though he had obtained no Rule for that Purpose, but a Judge's Order. Plaintiff moved, that either three of the four Pleas, or the Words [By Leave of the Court] might be struck out. The Statute giving the Power of Leave to plead several Matters to the Court only, the Pleas were held to be improperly pleaded; but the Court gave Desendant Leave to plead the same four Pleas de novo of this Term, on Payment of Costs. Draper for Desendants; Belsield for Plaintiff.

Hill against Williams, Assignee, &c.

Efendant had pleaded a Tender made 13th January; Plaintiff replied an Original teste 2d January. On Defendant's Application, the Court of Chancery had ordered the Teste of the Special Original sued out by Plaintiff to be altered from 2d January (the common Teste Day of an Original returnable OET. Hil.) to 16th January, the true Day on which the Instructions for this Original were left with the Cursitor. As the Original, thus altered, would not answer Plaintiff's Purpose, the Tender having been made before 16th January, he took the Mony brought in with the Plea, out of Court, entered an Acquittal, and gave Defendant Notice that he would proceed no farther, refusing to pay Defendant's Costs; whereupon, on Defendant's Motion, a Rule was made for Plaintiff to shew Cause why the Entry of Acquittal should not be set aside, with Costs; or why Plaintiff should not pay Defendant the Costs he had been put to on Account of this Action. On shewing Cause, the Court held, that after Plaintiff had replied, he ought not to have entered an Acquittal, without Leave of the Court. And with Regard to the Replication, it (as the Original was altered) ought not to stand; and Vol. II. that

that though Plaintiff may take out of Court the Mony tendered, and make an Entry of Acceptance before Replication, yet still he must pay Costs. The Replication to the Tender is a Refusal to accept the Mony. Rule to set aside the Entry of Acquittal, and that Plaintiff be at Liberty to withdraw his Replication, on Payment of Costs of that Replication, and reply de novo. Draper for Desendant; Poole for Plaintiff.

Lamb and his Wife against Goodenough, Clerk, Executor. Easter 21 Geo. 2.

A. R. as Defendant's Attorny had, eleven Years ago, without Defendant's Order or Privity, fraudulently pleaded two Judgments, one on Bond to himself, the other on Bond to a Person to whom he was Executor, after he knew them fatisfied, having himself received the Mony. On Defendant's Motion a Rule was made for Plaintiff to thew Cause why these Judgments should not be struck out of the Plea, on Payment of Costs, and A. R. was ordered to answer the Matters in the Affidavits. On hearing all Parties, a Rule was made by Confent, That A. R. should pay Plaintiff's Costs ab initio; and thereupon Plaintiff should discontinue; and that A, R. should pay Costs of the Application to Plaintiffs and Defendant, and that no Action be brought by Defendant against A.R. for any thing

thing relating to this Cause. Prime and Belfield for Plaintiff; Skinner for A. R. Poole for Defendant.

Alderson against Dodding. Mich. 22 Geo. 2.

RULE to shew Cause why Desendant should not plead Not guilty, and a Tender, discharged. As the Pleas are contradictory, the former denies, the latter admits. *Prime* for Plaintiff; *Bootle* for Defendant.

Roberts, Administrator, against Hughes. Easter 22 Geo. 2.

Declaration of Hilary last; Plaintiff thereupon, by Virtue of a Judge's Order, amended his Declaration, on Payment of Costs; and this Term gave a new Rule to plead. Defendant moved for Leave to plead a Tender as of last Term, or that Plaintiff might make his Declaration of this Term. Rule to shew Cause made absolute. Skinner for Desendant; Draper for Plaintiff.

Merefield against Hulls. Trinity 24
Geo. 2.

RULE made absolute to plead Non est factum, and Duress. These Pleas are not contradictory; one is a General, the other a Special Non est factum. Eyre for Defendant; Agar for Plaintiff.

Lacy and Garrick against Barry, in Covenant. Mich. 24 Geo. 2.

BREACH affigned for acting at Covent-Garden Theatre, contrary to Articles. Rule absolute for Leave to plead doubly, viz. first, That Plaintiffs do not act under Letters Patent, or Licence from Lord Chamberlain; and secondly, That Defendant is not qualified to act under such Letters Patent or Licence. Unless prima facie the Pleas appear to be frivolous, the Court, on Motion, will not consider whether they are material or not. Plaintiffs may demur. Draper for Defendant; Willes and Poole for Plaintiffs.

Herbert against Flower and others, in Trover. Trin. 24 & 25 G. 2.

ULE to shew Cause why Desendants should not plead doubly, Not guilty, and That Plaintiff became a Bankrupt, and his

his Effects were affigned, discharged. These Pleas are not both necessary for the Desence, they amount to an Inversion of the Action, and pleading Property in Desendant. The latter may be given in Evidence on the former; on Non Assumptit every Thing may be given in Evidence but a general Release. Bootle for Desendant; Prime for Plaintiff.

Whaley against Harrison and others, Mich. 25 Geo. 2.

HE Declaration was delivered last Vacation, with an Imparlance till the first Return of this Term; Defendants, within the first four Days of this Term, moved, and had a Rule to shew Cause why they should not plead three Pleas, (viz.) Non Assumpsit, a Set-off, and a Tender as of last Term. Plaintiff's Counsel objected to the last Plea, That Defendant had taken out a Judge's Summons for Time to plead, which (though no Order was made thereon) shews that they have not been touts Temps prist. But per Cur': The Motion was made in Time. A Tender is no dilatory Plea. The Rule made absolute. Agar for Defendants; Prime for Plaintiff.

Bownas against Wilcock, Widow.

Respass brought by Tenant against Land-lady (who had distrained for Rent) for breaking and entering Plaintiff's Close and Shop, and taking and carrying away his Farrier's Tools and Goods. The Declaration contained five Counts (fol. 73.) Motion by Defendant to reduce the five Counts into one. Rule to shew Cause. On Plaintiff's Part an Affidavit was produced, proving fix different distinct Trespasses; but the Court did not confider these as similar to Counts in Assumpfit. The Trespasses on different Days may be laid in one Count for breaking and entering the House and Shop, on such a Day, &c. with a Continuando; and another Count may be added for taking away the Goods, &c. without laying the Taking to be out of the House and Shop. The Declaration ordered to be reduced into two Counts. Poole for Defendant; Prime and Willes for Plaintiff.

Jackson against Warwick and others, in Replevin. Trinity 25 & 26 Geo. 2.

PULE made absolute, giving Plaintiff Leave to withdraw his Plea in Bar to Desendant's Avowry, and to plead doubly,

viz. the same Plea, with another Plea added, on Payment of Costs. In the Course of this Motion it was said, that the frequent Applications made to the Court to plead Non Assumption, and Non Assumption in fra sex Annos, were unnecessary; because the latter Plea singly would answer all Purposes, without the former; but this is a Mistake. Under the former Plea, Coverture, a Release, a Set-off, may be given in Evidence, which under the latter cannot be done. Poole for Plaintiff; Willes for Defendants.

Pay against Dearsley. Easter 26 Geo. 2.

HE Declaration (fol. 17.) in a Country Cause, was delivered 8th February last, between eight and nine in the Evening, to Defendant's Agent, who had not Time to fend a Copy by that Post to his Client. 16th February Defendant pleaded a Tender of Mony, which Plaintiff's Agent infifting to be irregular, as not pleaded in Time, Summons was taken out; whereupon Lord Chief Justice ordered Proceedings to be stayed till fecond Day of this Term; when Poole for Defendant moved to plead a Tender, and a Rule was made to shew Cause. Now Willes for Plaintiff came to shew Cause, and insisted. That where a Declaration is delivered four Days before the End of a Term, on U 4 Process

Process returnable the first or second Return of that Term, (in which Cafe Defendant is not intitled to an Imparlance) if Defendant would plead a Tender, he must do it within four Days after Declaration delivered, the fame Time he has to plead in Abatement. The Court did not establish this Doctrine; but held, that whatever the strict Rules of Practice may be, yet they may and ought to be dispensed with on particular Circumstances. The Delivery of this Declaration at the last Minute looks like a Trick, to deprive Defendant of the Benefit of his Plea, which is not confidered as dilatory; it is issuable, and the Mony pleaded to be tendered is brought into Court with it. Rule absolute, giving Defendant Leave to plead a Tender.

Pitsield against Morey. Trinity 26 & 27 Geo. 2.

Mony to the first Count, and Non Afjumpsit to the Residue, as of the last Term; the Declaration not being delivered till the Day before the Essoign Day of this Term, Desendant's Agent could not get Instructions from the Country in Time, though he might have had an Answer, and applied a Day or two sooner. A Tender is a fair Plea. Wynnefor Desendant; Draper for Plaintiss.

Browne

Browne against James, in Replevin.

Wilson for Plaintiff.

ULE made, giving Defendant Leave to withdraw his former Avowries, &c. and plead the same again, with two other Pleas added, on Payment of Costs, (after Issues joined twelve Months ago) Plaintiff to be at Liberty to plead in Bar de novo, and to proceed to Trial next Assizes. Poole for Defendant; Wilson for Plaintiff.

Halton against Holme, one, &c.

RULE to shew Cause why Desendant should not have Leave to withdraw his Plea, pay 50 l. into Court, and plead the General Issue, made absolute; Desendant doing so within a Week, and taking short Notice of Trial for next Affizes. Poole for Desendant; Willes for Plaintiff.

Bell against Crossthwaite, in Trespass. Mich. 27 Geo. 2.

Interlocutory Judgment regularly figned for Want of a Plea, Rule to shew Cause why should not be set aside on Payment of Costs, and pleading an issuable Plea. On shewing Cause, Willes for Plaintiff urged, that the Action was laid in Cumberland, where the Assizes are held but once a Year, and Plaintiff had been delayed of a Trial; and that if the Court did set aside a regular Judgment, they would confine Desendant to plead the General Issue. But it appearing that the Dispute was Matter of Title, and that the Plea, through Accident, was not settled in Time, the Rule was made absolute. Poole for Desendant.

Pzisoners.

Ash against Day. Mich. 14 Geo. 2.

last, and Interlocutory Judgment signed the same Term. A Writ of Inquiry was executed, returnable Tres Trin' last; but being set aside by the Court, because the same was executed before a Person not properly deputed by the Sheriss, Desendant applied for a Supersedeas for Want of Plaintiss's proceeding to final Judgment within three Terms after the Declaration, and obtained a Rule to shew Cause, which was made absolute. Prime for Plaintiss; Willes for Desendant.

Maddock against Fletcher.

Efendant being arrested by Bill of Middlesex at Plaintiff's Suit, and being charged also with a Capias at another Person's Suit in this Court, removed himself to the Fleet Prison by Habeas Corpus 7th May 1740, and Plaintiff not having declared within two Terms, Desendant applied for a Supersedeas. Plaintiff objected, that the Motion here was improper, and Desendant ought to apply to the Court of King's Bench, from whence whence the first Process issued. But per Cur': Defendant's Application is regular, and agreeable to the constant Practice of this Court and the Court of King's Bench. The Removal to the Fleet being before a Declaration delivered, Plaintiff must declare in this Court, he cannot declare in the Court of King's Bench, (unless he removes Defendant by Habeas Corpus ad respondend',) and for Want of a Declaration Defendant is to be difcharged by this Court. Where a Defendant is removed after Declaration delivered, the Action must proceed in that Court wherein Plaintiff declares, and Defendant is to be superseded by that Court for Want of subsequent Profecution, though detained in the Prison of the other Court. Prime for Plaintiff; Belfield for Defendant.

Mich. 15 Geo. 2.

N the Warden of the Fleet's Petition, inter alia desiring Leave to shut up the Prison Gate sooner than the Time appointed for that Purpose, it was prayed, that two Prisoners might be brought into Court on the Day of hearing the Matter, to oppose the Petition on Behalf of the Prisoners, (viz.) John George, detained by mesne Process of this Court, and James Browne, detained in Execution out of the Exchequer at the Suit of the King. Per Cur': George may

may be brought up by Rule; but Browne being held by an Execution from another Court cannot be brought up without an Habeas Corpus.

Coates's Case. Easter 15 Geo. 2.

MAY 6th Robert Coates was brought into Court by the Gaoler, by Habeas Corpus directed to the Sheriff of the Town of Newcastle upon Tyne; and by the Return Coates appeared to be charged with Process of this Court, and with several Writs of Capias from the Court of Exchequer, at the Suit of the King for 800 l. and upwards, as a Smuggler. Per Cur': The Habeas Corpus is not returnable till the 12th instant. Defendant must be then brought into Court again, and in the mean Time may give Notice to the Solicitor of the Customs. The King may chuse his own Prison; Defendant cannot be committed to the Fleet without the Confent of the May 12th, it appearing by Affidavit that Mr. Metcalfe, Solicitor of the Cuftoms, had, by the Direction of the Commisfioners, figned a Consent, and Serj. Prime consenting pro Rege, Defendant was committed to the Fleet. Bootle for Defendant.

Ashdowne against Fisher.

RULE made absolute to discharge Desendant, a Bankrupt, taken in Execution for a Debt accrued before the Bankruptcy. Desendant could not plead his Discharge in the first Instance, because he did not obtain his Certificate till after he was obliged to plead. But it was insisted by Plaintiff's Counsel, that he might have pleaded Post darrein Continuance. These Cases must be considered equitably. Blackwell against Coates, 2 Peere Williams 70. No Concealment appears.

Judge against Torr. Trinity 16 Geo. 2.

Efendant, after Judgment, was rendered to the Fleet Prison in Discharge of his Bail in Hilary Vacation last, and this Term moved in the Treasury for a Supersedeas, for Want of being charged in Execution within two Terms, pursuant to the General Rule 8 Geo. insisting, that the Render must be taken to be of Hilary Term; the Words of the Rule are, within two Terms after such Judgment obtained; in Case of a Render after Judgment, the Words should be, after such Render. There must be a new Rule to settle the Practice in this and other

other Particulars, wherein the old Rule is defective. A Rule was granted to shew Cause why a Supersedeas, which upon Assidavit of Service was made absolute, no Cause being shewn by Plaintiss to the contrary.

On Behalf of Greenwood.

Efendant, a Prisoner in the Fleet charged on mesne Process for 402 l. 15 s. had not given Security to the Warden for the Liberty of the Rules, petitioned the Court, and obtained a Rule for the Warden to shew Caufe why a Day-Rule should not be granted to the Petitioner, and why a Tipstaff should not take him to Hounflow, to meet and treat with his Creditors, and bring him back the fame Dav. Skinner for the Warden observed, that no Affidavit was filed to verify the Allegations in the Petition; and that no Instance could be shewn where the Court gave Leave to carry a Prisoner such a Distance from the Prison as defired. That one Collett had applied to be carried into Kent, for the same Purpose, in Lord Chief Justice Eyre's Time, and was denied. The Rule was difcharged.

Hill against Wadmore.

DEfendant, an Infant about fixteen Years of Age, being charged in Execution at Plaintiff's Suit, for 60 l. Damages and 30 l. Costs, total 90 l. recovered against him by Plaintiff, in an Action for driving a Waggon upon Plaintiff, whereby his Arm was broken, petitioned the Court to be discharged upon the Lords Act; which was oppofed by Wynne for Plaintiff; who urged, that this is not a Debt within that Act of Parliament, which was made for the Ease and Relief of Prisoners willing to satisfy their Creditors as far as they are able, and doth not extend to Actions for Torts, Negligences, &c. It appeared on the Trial, that though Defendant was called to, and might have stopped his Waggon, yet he obstinately drove on; and Plaintiff was a poor Waterman, having a Wife and fix Children, three of whom he maintained by his Labour, which he can hardly do fince his Arm was broken by Plaintiff. Per Cur': The Damages and Costs recovered are become a Debt, and Defendant must have the Benefit of the Act of Parliament; but We have Power to moderate the Allowance by Plaintiff. Let the Defendant be remanded, upon Plaintiff's allowing him 6 d. a Week.

Tompkins, Attorny, against Woodley, Mich. 16 Geo. 2. 27th November 1742, in the Treasury.

Defendant, a Prisoner in the County Gaol for Devon, before the End of the second Term, viz. on Sunday 4th July, three Days before the End of Trinity Term last. Defendant insisted, that this Delivery (being on a Sunday) was void, and applied for a Supersedeas; which, upon hearing the Agents on both Sides, the Judges resused to grant. Defendant hath not made Affidavit that he did not receive the Declaration, nor had it on the Day after the Delivery. The Act of Parliament touching Arrests, &c. on Sundays, 29 Car. 2. cap. 7. doth not take in this Case.

Dalrymple and his Wife against Baynham. Easter 16 Geo. 2.

Efendant being discharged by the Lord's Act, assigns his Effects to Plaintiss. Afterwards he is charged in Execution upon a second Judgment, obtained by the same Plaintiss; and on his Discharge, the second Time, the Court directed another Schedule to be made, containing the same Effects as the First; taking Notice, that they had been Vol. II.

Prisoners.

306

already affigned; and then a fecond Affignment to the same Plaintiffs, to make the Effects subject to the last Execution, in case they should be more than sufficient to satisfy the First.

Sandys against Spivey. Trinity 16 & 17 Geo. 2.

Tefendant brought into Court by the Sheriff of Middlesex from Newgate (the County Gaol) by Habeas Corpus ad Satisfaciend'; and Plaintiff's Counsel moved. that he might be charged at Plaintiff's Suit for 300 l. and upwards, recovered by Judgment, (the Roll being in Court) and committed to the Fleet Prison in Execution. The Counsel for the Crown opposed the Motion. It appeared that Defendant was charged with Process from the Court of Exchequer by the Crown for 30,000 l. for running Goods: That the Profecution against him was commenced in March 1742, and the Informations were at Issue. That Plaintiff's Debt was by Bond dated in September, and a Warrant to enter Judgment thereon in December 1742, the Judgment was figned, and the Habeas Corpus ad Satisfaciend, the first Process at Plaintiff's Suit, issued 4th June 1743. Per Cur': The King and his People are one. The Prerogative of the Crown is incorporated with the Law of the Land. Defendant

is not intitled to this Habeas Corpus; it is brought by the Plaintiff, and the Contest is merely between the King and the Plaintiff. The King, by his Prerogative, hath a Right to fue in what Court he pleases, and to imprison his Debtor in the Gaol for the County or Liberty where he is arrested. If this Court should have inadvertently committed Defendant to the Fleet, by the Practice of the Court of Exchequer, the Attorny General might have had a new Habeas Corpus, and that Court would have fent Defendant back to Newgate. The Priority of Suit is in the Crown; though neither it, nor the Priority of the Debt, but the Choice of the Prison, is the only present Question. The Demand of the Crown is always to be preferred before that of any private Person. The Escape Warrant Act extends not to the Crown, because before that Act the King had a Right to confine his Debtor where he pleased. The Court have no discretionary Power in this Defendant was remanded. Plaintiff may charge him with a Ca, sa. in Custody of the Sheriff of Middlesex. French's Case, Salkeld 353. Stiles 363. Counsel were heard for the Warden of the Fleet, who objected against receiving a Prisoner charged by the Crown with fo large a Sum. Skinner and Prime for the King; Wynne and Hayward for the Plaintiff; Birch and Willes for the Warden of the Fleet.

Pools

Poole against Cook. Hilary 17 Geo. 2.

Efendant, a Prisoner, applied to be discharged by Supersedeas, for Want of being charged in Execution within two Terms after Judgment. Plaintiff excused himself by the Delivery of a Capias ad Satisfaciend' to the Gaoler within due Time. But the Court held that to be insufficient. The Capias ad satisfaciend' ought to have been delivered to the Sheriff, and the Sheriff's Warrant to the Gaoler. Rule absolute for Supersedeas. Hayward for Defendant; Willes for Plaintiff.

Hedley against Brown. Trinity 17 & 18 Geo. 2.

FTER a Writ of Inquiry executed, Defendant moved to stay the Proceedings; Plaintiff, since the Action brought, having been discharged by the Insolvent Debtor's Act, and having assigned his Debts and Effects for the Benefit of his Creditors, the Court refused to make any Rule; the Action brought before the Discharge, must proceed. Prime for Desendant.

Mich. 18 Geo. 2.

by two feveral Creditors, and applying to be discharged upon the Lords Act, was opposed by both Creditors, and remanded; upon both Creditors giving him a joint Note to allow him 2 s. 4 d. per Week.

Dawson and others against Braper. Mich. 18 Geo. 2.

Eclaration delivered against Defendant, a Prisoner in the Fleet, in Hilary Term last, and Rule to plead then given; in Easter Term following Plaintiffs, without giving a new Rule to plead, figned Interlocutory Judgment, and executed a Writ of Inquiry in Easter Vacation; but the Attorny for Plaintiffs finding himself to be irregular, in the Beginning of last Term obtained a Rule to quash the Writ of Inquiry and Inquisition, waived his Judgment, and 26th May in last Term, which Term began 25th May, gave a new Rule to plead. May 31st Defendant pleaded a Sham Plea, and Plaintiff replied, concluding ad Patriam; eight Days Notice of Trial, inclusive, for the last Sitting within last Term. Defendant joined Issue; but objected to the Notice of Trial, refusing to accept short Notice; where-Х 3 upon upon Plaintiff countermanded, and gave new Notice for the Sitting after last Term; when Plaintiff obtained a Verdict on a Promisory Note, without Defence. Defendant now applied for a Supersedeas, for Want of Plaintiff's proceeding to Final Judgment, within three Terms after Declaration, inclusive, And the Court was of Opinion, that Defendant was intitled to a Supersedeas. Defendant is not to be prejudiced by the Mistake of Plaintiff's Attorny; which cannot be confidered in the same Light as an accidental Omission was, in the Case of Ashley and Sutton, Hill. 12 Geo. 2. Defendant is within the Words of the Rule, which is to be construed in Favour of Liberty. But it appearing, that Defendant was detained in Custody by three other Actions, and being liable to be immediately charged in Execution in this Action, the Court thought it nugatory to grant a Supersedeas; and the Rule to shew Cause why a Supersedeas should not be issued was discharged. Wynne for Plaintiff; Skinner for Defendant.

Childs against Prows. Hilary 18 Geo. 2.

JUDGE THIN two Terms after Final Judgment, Plaintiff, instead of charging Defendant in Execution, charged him with a Declaration in an Action of Debt on the

Pzisoners. 311

the Judgment. The Court held this Declaration vexatious, and no Cause against a Supersedeas; and the Rule to shew Cause why a Supersedeas, was made absolute. Gapper for Desendant; Wynne for Plaintiff.

Abdy, Administrator, against Hop-kins, Widow. Abdy, Assignee, &c. against The Same.

Laintiff had two different Causes of Action against Defendant, one as Administrator, the other as Assignee. Defendant was arrested at Plaintiff's Suit, as Administrator; but in the Title of the Affidavit for Bail, Administrator was omitted, though put into the Writ. Defendant remained in Custody for Want of Bail. Plaintiff did not declare as Administrator, agreeable to his Writ, which was a Testat' out of Middlesex into Surry, but made a new Affidavit of his other Demand as Affignee, and delivered a Declaration in Surry for it, indorfed for Bail. Rule to shew Cause why Supersedeas, in the first Cause, made absolute, the Affidavit being a Nullity; but the Arrest is not void in the second Cause. The Rule discharged.

312 Prisoners.

Parsons, Widow, against White. Easter 19 Geo. 2.

Efendant, arrested by a Capias at Plaintiff's Suit, as Executrix of her late Husband, removed himself to the Fleet. Plaintiff finding her Action wrong as Executrix, made a new Affidavit for Bail, and charged Defendant with a new Declaration in her own Right. Defendant moved for a Common Appearance and Supersedeas; infisting, that as his Imprisonment was wrongful ab origine, Plaintiff ought not to graft upon it. No Oppression appears, but the Nature of the Demand was mistaken. If there had been two different Causes of Action, the second Declaration would have been a good Charge; but there being but one and the fame Cause of Action, Rule absolute to set aside Proceedings and Judgment, without Costs. Bootle for Defendant; Prime for Plaintiff.

Stannard against Fleet.

Peremptory Rule being served on Sheriff of Suffolk to bring Defendant's Body into Court, the Sheriff, instead of putting in Bail above (as usual) brought the Defendant in Person into Court. The Court committed him to the Fleet, charged with the

the Writ of Capias ad respondend' at the Plain-tiff's Suit.

Pryme and others against Moore. Hilary 20 Geo. 2.

Efendant, whilst at large, was served with a Copy of Process, with Notice to appear; but before Declaration became a Prisoner in the Fleet. Plaintiff, by Virtue of an Affidavit of Service, entered an Appearance for Defendant, left a Declaration in the Office, and gave Defendant Notice thereof. Defendant moved to fet afide the Declaration and fubfequent Proceedings; infifting, that as he was a Prisoner at the Time of the Declaration, it ought to have been delivered to the Turnkey of the Fleet. It was urged for the Plaintiff, that as the Proceeding was regularly commenced under the Statute, they had a Right to pursue the Method prescribed by the Rule of Court to establish the Practice thereupon; but Defendant being disabled from coming abroad to take the Declaration out of the Office, and there having been no Method to charge a Prisoner with a Declaration, but by Habeas Corpus, till the Statute of King William the Third, the Court thought the Declaration should have been delivered at the Fleet, and made the Rule absolute. Willes for Defendant; Bootle for Plaintiffs.

Culme

Culme against Dingle. Trinity 21
Geo. 2.

Gaol for Devon, charged by the prefent and other Plaintiffs. Plaintiff discontinued his Action, and paid Costs; and then ferved a Copy of a common Capias, with Notice to appear, on Defendant in Custody; and, on Affidavit thereof, entered an Appearance pursuant to the Statute, lest Declaration in the Office, and gave Notice thereof to Defendant; and for Want of a Plea signed Judgment, and executed Fieri facias.

Defendant obtained a Rule to shew Cause why the Proceedings should not be set aside; insisting, that he ought to have been charged with the Declaration as a Prisoner. But as Plaintiff, since the Act to prevent vexatious Arrests, had no other Way of charging Defendant with a common Capias than as above, the Method Plaintiff has taken is re-

gular.

The Notice of the Declaration was dated 28th January, to plead within eight Days; and the Judgment figned 5th February. Objected, That the Judgment was figned a Day too foon; but over-ruled. The Words of the Notice are not, from the Day of the Date, but from the Date, which is the Delivery. Rule discharged. Draper for Defendant;

Gapper

Gapper for Plaintiff. This Case differs from Prime and others against Moore last Hilary Term, where Defendant was arrested when at large, and became a Prisoner in the Fleet before Declaration.

Meredith against Barry, Esquire, commonly called Lord Buttevant.

AFTER Defendant was supersedable for Want of Prosecution, Plaintiff applied for Leave to discontinue; which was ordered without Prejudice; and after the Discontinuance, Defendant was superseded, but being detained in the Fleet by other Causes, Plaintiff makes a new Affidavit of his old Debt, (adding another small Demand not bailable) and charged Defendant with a new Declaration indorfed for Bail. The Court determined, That Defendant ought not to be held to Bail for the old Cause of Action, as to which he had been superseded, and ordered him to be discharged as to the new Declaration, on entring a common Appearance. Willes for Defendant; Skinner for Plaintiff.

Leeke against Leighton, Baronet.

Efendant, a Prisoner in the Fleet, was charged twice in Execution at Plaintiff's Suit, once before and once after 1st January

316 Prisoners.

January 1747. Defendant moved to pay Principal, Interest, and Costs on the Judgment, whereby he was charged before 1st January, to prevent Plaintiff's compelling him to deliver up his Estate and Essects, pursuant to the insolvent Debtors Act. The Rule to shew Cause was made absolute, Skinner and Willes for Defendant; Prime and Poole for Plaintiff.

Watt against Alanson. Trinity 22 & 23 Geo. 2.

Efendant, who was charged in Execution 5th January 1748, petitioned the Court the last Day of last Term, for a Rule to be carried before the Judges at next Northumberland Affizes, in order to be discharged under the Lords Act, and had a Rule to shew Cause; which was now discharged. The Petition came too late; it should have been preferred, as required by the Act, before the End of last Easter Term. Bootle for Plaintiff.

White against Hawkes. Easter 23 Geo. 2.

Daintiff having complained to the Court against Mr. Carter, his Attorny, for not attending at Oxford Affizes, to oppose Defendant's Discharge under the Lords Act;

and Carter, for Answer, having made Affidavit that he did attend the Nife prius Court for that Purpose, ready to pay Defendant 2 s. 4 d. and to give him Plaintiff's Note for 2 s. 4 d. per Week, in Order to keep him in Custody, as directed; but that Defendant was accidentally discharged on the Crown Side, without Carter's Knowledge: And before he got out of Custody, or an Order for his Discharge was drawn up, Notice was given to Wiseman the Gaoler, that the Discharge was obtained by Surprize, and the Order stopped by the Judge; a Tender of 2 s. 4 d. and Plaintiff's Note was made Defendant, who refused to accept the same, and infisting on his Liberty, Wiseman let him go. The Court made a Rule on Wiseman to shew Cause why an Attachment should not be made against him. But the Fact coming out to be, that Defendant had made an Affignment of his Effects to Plaintiff, previous to his Discharge in the Crown Court, where the Gaoler attended, and heard the Plaintiff called in the usual Manner; and no Contrivance in Defendant's Favour appearing in the Gaoler, the Court discharged the Rule, and left Plaintiff to his Action for an Escape; not thinking it proper to punish the Gaoler in this summary Way, or to assist him a-gainst an Action. The Order seems requifite to be drawn up; the Gaoler cannot defend himself without it. The Practice has **fometimes**

318 Prisoners.

fometimes been to discharge Prisoners of this Sort in the Nisi prius Court, and sometimes in the Crown Court, if the Bufiness there be first finished; but then Notice thereof should be always publickly given in the other Court. The Affignment should always be previous to the Discharge. Where a Prifoner is not ordered to be discharged, but remanded on Plaintiff's undertaking to pay him 2 s. 4 d. per Week, his Effects ought not at that Time to be affigned, (as has been the Practice, in order that after Failure in Payment, Defendant may be intitled to apply to the Court from whence the Execution issued, for his Discharge there;) but if Plaintiff should fail to pay the weekly Allowance, Defendant may either apply to be brought into Court at the Affizes, to be difcharged there for that Caufe, and then make an Affignment; or to be discharged by the Court above, shewing an Affignment executed, by Affidavit. Willes for Wiseman; Prime for Carter; Belfield for Plaintiff.

Parker, one, &c. against Harvey. Easter 23 Geo. 2.

DEfendant, who had been brought into Court at Lincolnshire Assizes by Rule, pursuant to the Lords Act, and remanded to Prison, on Plaintiff's undertaking to allow him 2 s. 4 d. per Week, applied to this

Court to be discharged for Nonpayment of his weekly Allowance. The Undertaking appeared to be dated 1st March 1749, for Payment of 2 s. 4 d. on Monday in every Week. Plaintiff had not made regular Payments; when four Weeks were due, 2 s. 4 d. only tendered, after five Weeks due, 7 s. only tendred; after the first Default, no Tender of the Mony due on Monday was made till the Saturday following. A Mistake is not to be taken Advantage of, if the Tender be recent; but in the present Case, the Omissions are not to be dispensed with. Rule absolute to discharge Defendant. Prime for Defendant; Willes for Plaintiff.

Pennington against Welch. Trinity 24 Geo. 2.

Efendant being brought into Court, by Virtue of a Habeas Corpus ad Satisfaciendum directed to the Warden of the Fleet, to be charged in Execution on a Judgment obtained by Plaintiff, infifted, That as he had been supersedable for two Years past, for Want of Plaintiff's proceeding to Judgment within three Terms after Declaration, he ought not to be charged in Execution. Whereupon the Court remanded him uncharged in Execution, but detained at other Plaintiffs Suits.

Peck

Peck against Adams.

returnable in Michaelmas Term last, and remained in Custody after the End of last Hilary Term; Defendant became superfedable for Want of Plaintiff's declaring against him; but not applying for a Supersedeas, and staying in Prison till last Easter Term, Plaintiff then discontinued his first Action; and after tendring Desendant 6 s. 8 d. Costs taxed on the Discontinuance, charged Desendant in Custody of the Sheriff of Hertfordshire, with a new Writ for the old Cause of Action. Rule absolute for Supersedeas, on entring a common Appearance. Discharged as to Costs. Bootle for Desendant; Wynne for Plaintiff.

Tracy against Garmston and another. Trinity 24 Geo. 2.

Efendant Garmston was arrested by Process returnable last Michaelmas Term; but the other Desendant (who absconded) could not be taken; and Plaintiff not being in a Capacity to declare in this Joint-Action till the other Desendant was brought into Court, or outlawed, endeavoured to excuse himself for not declaring within two Terms, by alledging that he was proceeding to outlaw

law the other Defendant. Lord Chief Justice thought, that Plaintiff ought to be allowed a reasonable Time to outlaw the other Defendant; but in this Case, he has not shewn that he used all Diligence, as he ought to have done. Rule absolute to supersede Defendant Garmston for Want of a Declaration, Hayward for Defendant; Willes for Plaintiff.

Price against Everett. Mich. 24 G. 2.

Efendant having been brought into Court in pursuance of the Lords Act, and remanded to the Fleet on Plaintiff's undertaking in Writing to allow him 2 s. 4 d. a Week, was afterwards made a Turnkey of the Prison Gate, (a Place of Profit.) Plaintiff moved the Court, and obtained a Rule to shew Cause why the Allowance should not be reduced to 6 d. per Week, or fuch other Sum as the Court should think fit, or Defendant be removed from his Place of Turnkey. On shewing Cause, the Court thought that Defendant ought not to suffer by his good Behaviour, which had merited the Warden's Favour, and preferred him to a Place of Trust and Profit; and that the weekly Allowance having been once determined at 2 s. Ad. cannot be lowered, though at first it might have been fettled at a smaller Sum. The Rule was ordered to be discharged. Willes for Plaintiff; Agar for Defendant. Smith Vol. II.

Smith against Peronet. Hilary 24 Geo. 2.

Efendant obtained a Supersedeas for Want of Profecution; but having, whilst in Custody, drawn a Bill of Exchange on a third Person, in Plaintiff's Favour, for Part of Plaintiff's Original Debt, which Draught was refused to be accepted, Plaintiff, as Defendant was going out of Prison, caused him to be arrested, and held to Bail, as the Drawer of faid Bill. Defendant swore, that by Agreement between him and Plaintiff, the Draught, if not accepted, was to be delivered back to Defendant. The Court thought, that by this Draught, which, if accepted and paid, would have pro tanto difcharged Part of the Original Demand, no new Debt was created, ordered a Supersedeas to the new Action, on entring a common Appearance. Willes for Defendant; Prime for Plaintiff.

Gibbs against Tupigny de Maily. Trinity 24 & 25 Geo. 2.

Efendant, a Prisoner in the Fleet, being supersedable for Want of Plaintiff's proceeding to Judgment within three Terms after Declaration, summoned Plaintiff before Mr. Justice Birch; whereupon Plaintiff (having

ving obtained Judgment after the three Terms were expired) immediately brought a Habeas Corpus ad Satisfaciendum, and charged Defendant in Execution. Defendant then applied to the Court, and obtained a Rule to shew Cause why he should not be superseded, for Want of Plaintiff's proceeding to Judgment within Time; which Rule was afterwards made absolute. The Court being of Opinion, that Defendant had been wrongfully detained in Custody from the Time he became supersedable; and that Plaintiff ought not to graft a good Charge on a wrongful Imprisonment. Prime for Defendant; Willes for Plaintiff.

Linthwaite against Bigbie and Allardyce. Trinity 25 & 26 Geo. 2.

Cause why he should not have Time to declare against Allardyce, who was in Custody, (Bigbie absconding, Plaintiss was proceeding to Outlawry against him.) A Case quoted from Secondary Townsend's Notes, Fisher against Tucker and another, Hilary 2 Geo. 2. where one of Desendants being in Custody, was superseded in Favour of Liberty, though Plaintiss could not declare till the other Desendant, who absconded, was brought into Court or outlawed. Vide Tracy against Garmson and another, Trin. 24 Geo. 2. where

324 Pzisoners.

Lord Chief Justice thought, that if Plaintiff proceeds with reasonable Speed to outlaw the absconding Desendant, the other Desendant, pending that Proceeding, ought not to be superseded. Rule absolute, without Prejudice to Desendant Allardyce's Application for a Supersedeas.

Roquett against Roquett. Trinity 26 & 27 Geo. 2.

Efendant, an infolvent Debtor was brought into Court the first Time by Rule, in pursuance of the Lords Act, and discharged, making an Assignment of his Effects. A promisory Note was offered Defendant for Payment of 2 s. 4 d. per Week, given by Plaintiff at Paris, where he refided, but no regular Affidavit of Plaintiff's figning the Note being produced, fworn before a Judge or Commissioner of this Court, Defendant cannot be compelled to accept it. Plaintiff's Attorny offered his Note for 2 s. 4 d. per Week; but such Notes have been often refused. Plaintiff's Attorny defired further Time; but as Defendant's Application was made last Term, and Plaintiff's Attorny had agreed that Defendant should have the Benefit of the Act this Term, further Time was denied.

Process, Service thereof, Rules, &c.

Walker against Haryes, an Attorny, per Bill. Mich. 14 Geo. 2.

A. fa. returnable at a general Return, viz. Tres Mich. and not a Day certain, as it ought to have been, was quashed, and Defendant ordered to be discharged by Supersedeas with Costs, Defendant confenting to bring no Action. Per Cur': Defendant cannot take Advantage of this Matter by Writ of Error; and if he could, it would be unreasonable to keep him in Custody till the Determination thereof. Willes for Desendant; Birch for Plaintiff.

Dixon against Goodman.

RIT of Inquiry of Damages was executed before one Ewens, verbally appointed by the Coroners of Norwich, to whom the Writ was directed. The Objection was, that this Appointment was infufficient, and ought to have been in Writing, under Hand and Seal. It appeared that Defendant's Attorny attended, challenged a Juryman, cross examined Plaintiff's Witnesses,

and did not make the Objection now infifted upon, till after Plaintiff had gone through his Evidence. The Court held the verbal Appointment no Authority; but the Objection is waived by making Defence. The Rule to shew Cause why the Inquiry should not be set aside, was discharged. Urlin for Defendant, Prime for Plaintiff.

Kerry against Cade.

Person of full Age, by Affidavit pursuant to the Statute, and proceeded to Judgment. Desendant brought a Writ of Error; and it being disclosed to Plaintiff that Desendant was an Infant, and intended to assign Nonage for Error in Fact, Plaintiff moved, and obtained a Rule for Desendant to shew Cause why the Appearance in Person should not be struck out, and why Desendant should not appear by Guardian, or in Desault thereof, why Plaintiff should not do it for him. The Court thought Plaintiff's Application came too late, and discharged the Rule. Birch for Plaintiff; Draper for Desendant.

Grice against Allen. Easter 14 Geo. 2.

Efendant objected, that the Name of the Plaintiff's Attorny was not fet upon the Sheriff's Warrant, as required per Stat. 2 G. 2. for Regulation of Attornies, &c. and obtained a Rule to shew Cause why Proceedings should not be stayed. Upon shewing Cause it appeared, that the Attorny's Name was put on the Writ, though not on the Warrant; and by Stat. 12 George 2. the Law is altered with Respect to the Warrant, though not as to the Writ. The Sheriff, under the later Act, is required to fet the Attorny's Name upon the Warrant, under a Penalty of 5 l. and if it be omitted, the Penalty may be fued for. The Warrant is the Sheriff's Act, and not the Party's. The Plaintiff's Proceedings ought not to be stayed by Reason of this, the Sheriff's Omisfion; but Defendant may take his Remedy for the Penalty. The Rule was discharged. Draper for Defendant; Urlin for Plaintiff. Per Cur': The Practice of this Court in some Instances has been found to be wrong, and must be exploded. Where an Act of Parliament requires a Thing to be done generally, (without requiring it to be done by any Officer, &c. under a Penalty) and doth not fay that for Want of the Thing required, a Y 4

Writ, &c. shall be void, it has been said, that fuch Act is directory only, and not making the Writ, &c. void. Proceedings ought not to be stayed; but if a Thing required by Rule of Court be omitted, it is constantly held to be irregular, and Proceedings are stayed: And furely an Act of Parliament should have as great Force, at least, as a Rule of Court. It has been held, that a Rule to bring a Prisoner into Court upon the Lords Act, ought to be personally served on the Creditor, which is often impracticable, and no fuch Thing is required by the Act. It has been the Practice, on Complaints against Sheriffs Officers, &c. for Extortion contrary to the Statute 2 Geo. 2. to grant a Rule to shew Cause why an Attachment on the first Application; the Rule ought to be to answer the Matters contained in the Petition and Affidavits.

Langley against The Bailiffs and Burgesses of East-Redford. Hilary 15.

Efendants were fued in their Corporate Capacity by common Capias ad respondend, and upon Affidavit of Service, an Appearance was entered by Plaintiff fecundum Stat'; and Plaintiff entered Declaration in the Office, reciting, that Defendants were attached to answer, (which cannot be.) Defendants

fendants moved to fet afide the Capias and Proceedings thereon; objecting, they ought to be fued by Pone and Distringas. And the Court were of Opinion, that as Defendants are fued in a Corporate Capacity, the Capias ad respondend is null and void; and the Rule to shew Cause was made absolute. It was agreed, that had Defendants themselves appeared, the Objection had been waived. Bootle for Defendants; Skinner for Plaintiff.

Chapman against Ryall and others. Trinity 16 Geo. 2.

AFTER Appearance entered by Plaintiff on Affidavit of Service of Process, Motion by Defendants to stay Proceedings, no Attorny's Name being fet upon the Copy of the Process served on Child, one of the Defendants, as required per Stat. 12 George, and Rule to shew Cause was made absolute. Per Cur': The Statute is compulfory, and for Defects in Notices to appear subscribed to Copies of Process served, nothing more frequent than to stay the Proceedings; and where the Defect is in the Copy of the Process, the Reason is the same. Though the Writ itself be right, yet the Copy served is defective, and Proceedings must be stayed. There is nothing in Stat. 5 Geo. 2. cap. 22. sett. 5. Stat. 12 Geo. 2. cap. 23. sect. 22. or any other subsequent Statute, whereby the Statute

Statute 12 Geo. is altered or repealed in this Particular. Prime for Defendant; Agar for Plaintiff.

Foot against Hume. Hilary 16
Geo. 2.

HE Process was served on the Return Day at _____, at five o'clock in the Afternoon, with Notice to appear that Day, which was the Return Day, 20th January, on which Day the Proclamation for Effoigns had been made, and the Judge was gone out of Court before Noon; so the Return was expired. - moved, and obtained a Rule to shew Cause why Proceedings should not be stayed; which was made absolute on Affidavit of Service, no Cause being shewn. The Court declared, That Defendant count to have a reasonable Time to appear after Service, which is the plain Intention of the Act of Parliament directing the Notice; and that the Notice ought to be ferved before the Return Day.

Marquand

Marquand against The Mayor and Burgesses of the Borough of Boston in Com' Lincoln'. Easter 16 Geo. 2.

SPECIAL Original sued out in Com' Lincoln', and Defendants appeared. Plaintiff declared in Com' Middlesex; Defendants appeared; resusing to accept the Declaration, it was left in the Prothonotary's Office, and taken out and paid for by Desendant's Agent. Plaintiff sued out a new Original in Middlesex. The Court held the Taking the Declaration out of the Office to be a Waiver of the former Proceedings, and discharged the Rule to shew Cause why Proceedings in Middlesex should not be stayed. Note; An Essoign had been cast and adjourned before Desendant's Appearance; but the Court did not hold that material.

Gentleman against Bright. Mich. 17 Geo. 2.

RULE for the Bailiff of the Dutchy of Lancaster to return the Sheriff's Mandate on a Fi. fa. discharged, the Warrant having been directed to Officers of Plaintiff's Nomination, and at his Peril, and not to the Officers

Officers of the Bailiff of the Dutchy. Prime for the Bailiff; Skinner for Plaintiff.

Mallom against Gent.

Non omittas Capias ad respondend' should not be quashed, discharged. The Objection to the Writ was, that it recited a Mandate to have been issued forth by the Sheriss to the Bailiss of a Liberty, without naming what Liberty, but leaving a Blank for the same. The Court held the Objection to be valid, and that the proper Way to take Advantage of the Desect is by Motion; but it appearing that Bail was put in to this Writ before a Judge, the Objection now comes too late. Skinner for Plaintiss; Prime for Defendant.

Wright against Obeden.

Efendant was protected by Baron Hoffman, a publick Minister, and the Protection was registered in the Sheriff's Office,
according to the Act of Parliament. A Capias
ad respondend' was delivered to the Sheriff
of Dorsetshire, who durst not execute it, by
Reason of the Protection, and the Penalty
in the Act. Plaintiff served the Sheriff with
a Treasury Rule to return the Writ, which
Rule

Rule was discharged by the Court. Eyre for Plaintiff; Draper for the Sheriff.

Ogier, Qui tam, &c. against Hayward. Trinity 19 & 20 Geo. 2.

OPY of Original ferved, with Notice to appear (as Process to arrest) irregularly. After Plaintiff's Attorny discovered his Mistake, he applied to the Cursitor, who altered the Return of the Original from Octabis Hilarii to Octabis Purificationis, and refealed it; then Defendant was summoned by the Sheriff, and being returned summoned on the Original, and not appearing, a Pone issued. Upon Application to stay Proceedings, the Court made a Rule to shew Cause; but before they determined the Question, thought a Motion should be first made in Chancery, which was done; and Lord Chancellor, on hearing Counfel on both Sides, ordered the Original Writ to be superseded quia improvide emanavit, with Costs; because having been once executed (by Service of a Copy, with Notice to appear) though improperly, it could never afterwards be made use of for any other Purpose. Rule made absolute to stay Proceedings, without Costs. Several Cursitors attended the Court, but did not agree; they reported the Practice differently. Skinner and Bootle for Defendant

fendant; Prime, Willes, Draper and Leeds for Plaintiff.

Mason against Obrien, Esquire, Earl of Inchiquin in the Kingdom of Ireland, having Privilege of Parliament. Mich. 20 Geo. 2.

Summons returnable Tres Mich. Distringas returnable 31st October, Alias Distringas returnable 7th November, 40 s. Iffues returned. Bootle, for Plaintiff, moved to increase Issues on the Pluries Distringas to a good Sum, producing an Affidavit that the Debt was 152 l. The Practice here has hitherto been to double the Issues returned from Time to Time, and not farther to increase the same; but the Courts of King's Bench and Exchequer having done more, this Court, conformable to the Practice of the other Courts, ordered Issues to be returned on the Pluries Distringas to 20 l.

Gladman against Bateman.

Ommon Capias served on Defendant, an Infant, with Notice to appear by his Attorny, in the Form prescribed by the Statute; Defendant appeared by his Attorny, and insisted, that having appeared agreeable to the Notice served, he had done all that could

could be required of him, and refused to appear by Guardian. Plaintiff moved, according to the Course of the Court, for a Rule, That unless Defendant should appear by Guardian within four Days, Plaintiff might have Leave to name a Guardian for him, to appear and defend this Action. Defendant opposed the Motion, and his Counsel argued, That the Statutes 12 Geo. 2. c. 29. and 15 Geo. 2. c. 27. relating to Service of Process, did not extend to Infants, nor to all Actions not bailable, but only to Actions of Debt and on fimple Contracts; and that the Plaintiff's Cause of Action being for an Assault, was out of the Statutes, and Defendant should have been arrested, as before the Statutes. The Court made the Rule as prayed by Plaintiff, which is the constant Practice after an Appearance by Attorny, where Defendant is an Infant. The Form prescribed by the Statutes cannot be altered. No Notice is taken of the Party's being an Infant, or not in the first Proceeding. Infancy is to be Rule the fame now as before the Acts to appear by Guardian; because the Appearance by Attorny would be Error after a Verdict. If otherwise, no Action could be brought against an Infant. If this Question had been made recently, soon after the Statutes, it might have been doubtful whether they extended to all Causes of Action not bailable, or not; but all the Courts, ever fince

fince the Acts, have taken them so to do, and Custom and Practice must prevail. The General Rule is, that a defective Appearance must be set right. Skinner for Plaintiff; Agar for Defendant.

Wingfield against Beard, alias Farmer. Trin. 21 Geo. 2.

OPY of Process served in June, with Notice to appear at the Return, being the 15th Day of June, without inserting the Word (next), or the Year (1747.) Rule absolute to stay Proceedings. Prime for Defendant; Willes for Plaintiff.

Valentine against Hawkins. Easter

URRER, the Father, Plaintiff's Attorny, in Favour of his Son, Currer junior, Filazer of Suffolk, and in Prejudice of the Filazer of the County of Kent, tho' Plaintiff and Defendant both dwelt in Kent, where the Cause of Action arose, and had never any Dealings together in Suffolk, sued out a Testat' Ca' from Suffolk into Kent, out of his Son's Office, in the Name of one Mulliner, an Attorny, instead of a Capias in Kent from the proper Filazer. The Court held this to be unwarrantable and irregular, and set aside the Proceedings, with Costs, to

be paid by Currer senior, to both Parties. C. Valentine, a Bailiff, complained of by Defendant, denied the Charge; and as to him the Rule to shew Cause why an Attachment, was discharged. Skinner and Poole for Plaintiff and the two Currers; Prime and Draper for Defendant; Wynne for C. Valentine the Bailiff.

Green against Littleton, Esquire. Trinity 21 & 22 Geo. 2.

Daintiff's Debt appeared by Affidavit to be 230 l. eighty Shillings Issues had been returned on the Alias Distringus. Rule that the Sheriff of Middlesex shall return 20 l. Issues on the Pluries Distringus. Draper for Plaintiff.

Ridley against Wilson.

for the Omission 101. on the Officer, per Stat. Wil. 3: Rule to stay Proceedings made absolute. Poole for Defendant; Skinener for Plaintiss.

Wortley, Esquire, against Pitt, Esquire. Mich. 22 Geo. 2.

Laintiff's Debt appeared by Affidavit to be 1950 l. Forty Shillings Issues had been returned on the first Distringas. Rule that the Sheriff of Middlesex shall return 20 l. Issues on the Alias Distringas. Bootle for Plaintiff.

Holt junior against Hawkes. Trinity
22 & 23 Geo. 2.

HE Capias ad respondend was made returnable before the King's Justice, instead of Justices, at Westminster; and there were six Days only, instead of sisteen, between the Teste and Return. Proceedings stayed, with Costs.

Wortley, Esquire, against Pitt, Esquire.

BOOTLE, for Plaintiff, moved to increase the Issues on Pluries Distringues, (Debt sworn to be 2000 l. and upwards), last Issues 20 l. now five Times as much (the usual Way here) 100 l.

Wortley, Esquire against Pitt, Esquire. Mich. 23 Geo. 2.

N Pluries Distringus Issues increased from 100 l. to 500 l. Bootle for Plaintiff.

Highmore against Barlow, in Ejects ment. Trinity 24 Geo. 2.

DULE to shew Cause why the Time for returning a Certiorari to the Mayor's Court of London should not be enlarged, and the Gertiorari quashed. The Practice appearing to be, that in Ejectment a Writ of Habeas Corpus is the proper Process to remove the Plaint (under which the Defendant must appear in this Court, and enter into the common Rule, and Plaintiff must declare de novo) and not a Writ of Certiorari, as in Replevin, whereby, after the Record removed, the Parties are to proceed upon it, and not to begin de novo. Fitz. Nat. Brev. 557. Letter L. Rule absolute to quash Certiorari, Habeas Corpus to be taken out. Poole for the Mayor, &c. Bootle for Plaintiff.

Philmore and others against Sir William Stanhope.

HE Debt sworn to be 290 l. and upwards. On the Alias Distringas 4 l. Issues were returned. The Court ordered, that on the Pluries Distringas the Sheriff should return Issues to 20 l. Draper for Plaintiff.

Boswell against Roberts. Trinity 24
Geo. 2.

Bjections, That no Writ was sued out, and that the Copy of a pretended Writ was delivered to Defendant, inclosed in a Letter. But it appearing, that the Writ had been signed by the Filazer before served, and the Delivery of the Copy made Service by Defendant's opening the Cover and taking out the Copy; there being no Occasion to shew the original Writ at the Time of Service. The Rule to shew Cause why Proceedings should not be stayed was discharged. Prime for Plaintiff; Poole for Defendant.

Philmore and others against Sir William Stanhope. Mich. 24 Geo. 2.

HE Issues returned on the Pluries Di-fringas were 20 l. Rule that the Sheriff shall return 100 l. Issues on the next Distringas. Debt sworn 290 l. and upwards. Draper for Plaintiffs.

Bax against Culmer. Hilary 24 Geo. 2.

ULE absolute to stay Proceedings on Process directed to the Sheriff of Kent, ferved at Hastings within the Cinque Ports, without Costs. The Sheriff of Kent has no Jurisdiction within the Cinque Ports; the Writ should have been a Testatum Capias directed to the Constable of Dover Castle. Prime for Defendant; Poole for Plaintiff.

Potter against Colsworthy. Trinity 25 & 26 Geo. 2.

Reafury Rule for the late Sheriff of Reatury Kute for the late Of Capias

Devonshire to return a Writ of Capias ad respondendum discharged. Terry, late Under-Sheriff (as usual in Devonsbire) had intrusted Plaintiff's Attorny with blank Warrants, to be directed to bound Bailiffs only; and he had filled up a Warrant on this Writ, Zz

342

and directed and delivered it to a bound Bailiff, pursuant to his Trust. But it appearing that this Writ, though returnable in Easter Term 1751, was not carried to the Sheriff's Office, or tendered to the Under-Sheriff, till April 1752, the Court thought it unreasonable to oblige the Sheriff to make a Return. Prime for the late Sheriff; Poole for Plaintiff,

Dixon, one, &c. against Atkinson. Easter 26 Geo. 2.

POOLE, for Plaintiff, obtained a Rule to shew Cause why Plaintiff should not have Leave to take out a separate Attachment of Privilege, to warrant his Judgment against this Defendant only, nunc pro tunc, agreeable to a joint Attachment of Privilege against Defendant and others, returnable in Hilary 22 Geo. 2. wherewith Defendant having been ferved, and not appearing, Plaintiff had appeared for him, according to the Statute; and after Judgment, Defendant had brought a Writ of Error. Willes, for Defendant, shewed Cause; infisting, That an Attachment of Privilege is always confidered as an Original Writ, is amendable only in Point of Form, by the Instructions given for it: That Plaintiff purchased a joint, and not a separate Writ, originally by his own Election; and that the Court of Chancery where an Original is bad, will not grant a good Original;

nal; though in some Cases that Court will order an Original where one was fued out before. Quoted Chase against Sir John Etheridge, 2 Vent. 130. Massingburn against Durrant, 2 Vent. 49, Poole, for Plaintiff, urged, That as Plaintiff has obtained a regular Judgment for a just Debt, unimpeached, it is reasonable for the Court to interpose, in Cases of Common Process, after Judgment by Default, Plaintiff fues a Special Original to warrant it. That Attachments of Privilege are not always confidered as Original Writs, appears by General Rule Hilary 11 Geo. 2. whereby four Defendants Names (and no more) may be put into one and the same Attachment. The Court were of Opinion, That an Attachment of Privilege is, strictly, neither an Original Writ, nor a Capias; it answers the Purposes of both; it warrants the Proceedings, as well as brings the Party into Court. The Rule Hilary II Geo. 2. must have considered an Attachment of Privilege as mesne Process. There is no Precedent of a new Attachment to warrant a Judgment. If Defendant had appeared, the Court probably would have ordered a new Attachment (if necesfary); but by the Appearance entred according to the Statute, nothing is helped or admitted. By the Practice of this Court, the old Joint-Attachment feems to be good, and sufficient to warrant Proceedings thereon a- \mathbf{Z}_{4} gainst

gainst Defendants severally, as will be reported to the Court of King's Bench, if they desire to be informed what is the Practice here. The Rule discharged.

Hand, one, &c. against Grosvenor, one, &c. Plaintiff and Defendant both Attornies of this Court.

by Capias should not be set aside; Defendant objecting that he ought to have been sued by Bill: But Desendant having appeared to the Capias before the Motion, has cured the Mistake. He may plead his Privilege. The Rule discharged.

Pzohibition.

Maltom against Acklom, in Prohibition. Hilary 20 Geo. 2.

Daintiff had obtained a Rule to shew Cause why a Writ of Consultation should not be granted, for Want of Plaintiff's proving his Suggestion by two Witnesses within fix Months, as required by the Statute; and why Plaintiff should not pay double Costs, Upon Cause shewn it appeared, that the Declaration had been, by Rule, ordered to be made agreeable to the Proceedings in the Spiritual Court, and thereupon a Prohibition to issue. And the Court being of Opinion that the Time for proving the Suggestion ought to be computed from the Time of the Amendment, and not farther back. The fix Months were not expired, and the Rule was difcharged. Bootle for Defendant; Agar for Plaintiff.

Replevin.

Davis against Prince, in Replevin. Trinity 26 & 27 Geo. 2.

RULE absolute to stay Proceedings, on Payment of 47 l. Rent distrained for, and Costs, after Declaration, but before Avowry. Willes for Plaintiff; Prime for Defendant.



Scire Facias.

Wright against Treweeke. Mich. 20 Geo. 2.

RULE to shew Cause why Proceedings on a Scire facias quare Executio non, brought by Spincke, Executor of the deceased Plaintiff, pending a Writ of Error, should not be stayed. On shewing Cause it appeared, That the Record of the Judgment was not transcribed into the King's Bench; and the Scire facias out of this Court was held to be regular. The Executor may revive, but cannot take out Execution pending the Writ of Error. After a Transcript, the Scire facias quare Executio non should go out of the Court of King's Bench. Plaintiff in Error, if defirous to proceed, might (after a Transcript) have a Scire facias ad audiend' Errores out of the King's Bench against the Executor or Administrator of the Defendant in Error. The Rule discharged. Bootle for Plaintiff's Executor; Willes for Defendant.

Supersedeas.

Roe against Whitehead. Hilary 17
Geo. 2.

Judgment brings a Writ of Error, put in Bail thereon, and applied to be discharged by Supersedeas. Plaintiff's Counsel objected, that if the Writ of Error should be non-pross'd for Want of transcribing the Record, the Bail would not be liable. But the Court held, that though the Record should not be transcribed, yet the Bail being bound to prosecute the Writ of Error with Effect, will be liable; and made the Rule for a Supersedeas absolute. Agar for Desendant; Bootle for Plaintiff.

Grub against Crick. Hilary 19 Geo. 2.

AFTER a Superfedeas ordered for Want of Plaintiff's proceeding to Judgment within three Terms after Declaration; and before Defendant could be discharged, the same Plaintiff caused him to be charged with a new Declaration; which the Court held regular, being for a different Cause of Action; and the Rule to shew Cause why a Superse-deas

deas, notwithstanding the Declaration, was discharged. Prime and Hayward for Plaintiff; Skinner for Defendant.

Bell against Simpson. Trinity 26 & 27 Geo. 2.

Efendant in Custody for Want of Bail: The Acetian was for 40 l. Debt; the Declaration in a Plea that Defendant render to Plaintiff 40 1. which, &c. The Count fingle for 22 l. Rent, without any additional Count on a Mutuatus, or otherwise, for the Refidue of the 40 l. Now to prevent a Supersedeas (after the second Term from Delivery of Declaration expired) Plaintiff defired Leave to add a fecond Count, whereby to make his Declaration good from the Delivery, which is a Favour not to be granted. Matters of Amendment are purely at the Discretion of the Court. Had Bail been put in. they would have been discharged, and so must Defendant's Perfon be. A Count cannot be added after the fecond Term. Rule, That if Plaintiff consents to a Supersedeas within fix Days after Term, he may amend, otherwise not. Willes for Plaintiff; Poole for Defendant.

Trials, Aerdia, &c.

Selman against Courtney. Trinity 13
& 14 Geo. 2.

THIS was an Action of Trespass Quare Clausum fregit. Defendant pleaded Clausum fregit. Defendant pleaded Not Guilty; and upon the Trial before Mr. Baron Carter Defendant offered to give in Evidence, that the Place in which, &c. was the King's Highway; but the Judge refused to admit that Evidence to be given, and Plaintiff recovered a Verdict. Defendant moved for a new Trial, and a Rule to shew Cause was granted, on Payment of Costs. Upon shewing Cause, several Cases were cited on both Sides. And it being faid, that some Judges in the Circuit had been of different Opinions with respect to this Point, the Court thought it a Matter of so much Consequence, that it was proper to be confidered by all the Judges. After a Consultation, the Chief Justice declared it to be the Opinion of a great Majority of the Judges, That an Highway ought not to be given in Evidence under the General Issue, but ought to be pleaded specially; and the Rule to shew Cause was discharged. Skinner and Prime for Plaintiff; Belfield and Urlin for Defendant.

Cases cited for Plaintiff, Watson against Sparke, 1 Salk. 287. Sid. 106. Gee against Chief Justice, 282. B. Doct' Placitandi 197. Coget's Case, 8 C. 66. B. 1 Inst. 303. B. 5 C. 805. 6 Mod. 66.

For Defendant, James against Hayward, Cro. Car. 184. Morse against Bennett, 9 G.

B. R. 2 Ventris 297. and in Shower.

Frost against Whadcock, alias Avery and others, on the Demise of Avery, in Ejectment. Easter 14 Geo. 2.

Rule to shew Cause why the Trial flould not be at Bar, was founded upon an Affidavit that the Premisses in Question were of the yearly Value of 100 l. and upwards; and that a strict and careful Examination of the Title would be requisite. At the Time of shewing Cause it was also alledged on Plaintiff's Behalf, that he had a great Number of Witnesses to examine; and that the Point to be tried was Compos vel non in William Avery, at the Time of making his Will, under which the Defendant Whadsock claims his Right. And on Behalf of Defendant it appeared, that they had fome ancient and infirm Witnesses to examine, who could not travel to Westminster.

Per Cur': We are not, according to the Course of the Court, bound down by the Value of the Premisses in Question, which

is fworn to be 100 l. per ann. As to strict Examination, it is necessary in all Cafes, and is nothing with Respect to a Trial at Bar. Where a long Cause is to be tried, a Judge, upon Notice, will take a Day extraordinary at the Affizes, where an Examination of a great Number of Witnesses is most proper, and least Expensive. There is no Nicety in this Point, or Difficulty, fo as to require the Attention of the whole Courts Ancient Witnesses grow weaker every Day, and often are not able to travel to Westminfler. Let the Rule be discharged. Plaintiff prayed Leave to examine an old Witness before a Judge, upon Interrogatories: But per Cur': That cannot be done without Confent. A Cross Examination cannot be supplied by Depositions. If a Trial at Bar was ordered, it could not be till next Michaelmas Term; and before that Time the Affizes will be held. Birch for Plaintiff: Willes for Defendants.

Bond against Palmer.

BELFIELD for Defendant moved for a new Trial, suggesting the Verdict to be against Evidence, and relying upon the Judge's Certificate. Per Cur': As the Cause was tried before a Judge of another Court, an Affidavit of what passed at the Trial must be produced, as a necessary Foundation for this Motion.

Day against Samson. Trinity 14 & 15 Geo. 2.

PON shewing Cause against a Rule for putting off a Trial, it was objected to the Affidavit, ex parte Defendentis, that it was made by a third Person, and not by the Party himself; but this was over-ruled by the Court. There may be many Cafes where a third Person can swear another to be a material Witness, and the Defendant himfelf cannot; as where a Factor fells Goods for his Principal, and employs a Porter to deliver them; the Factor knows the Porter to be a material Witness, but the Principal does not, &c. The Court took another Objection to the Affidavit, which run thus: That A. B. and C. D. are material Witnesses for Defendant in this Cause, without whose Evidence Defendant cannot safely proceed to Trial, as Defendant is advised, and verily believes. The Belief feems to go through the Whole, as well as to A. B. and C. D. being material Witnesses. As to the other necessary Part of the Affidavit (that is) that the Party cannot fafely make Defence without their Testimony, though the former Part (that is) A. B. and C. D. being material Witnesses, ought to be positively sworn; Belief, as to it, is not sufficient; but as to the later Part it is. These two Requisites ought not to be Vol II. coupled, Aa

354 Trials, &c.

coupled, but disjoined. The Court inlarged the Rule that the Affidavit might be amended; which being done, a Rule was made to put off the Trial. Skinner for Defendant; Wynne for Plaintiff.

Tutton against Andrews.

of Inquiry of Damages, admitted improper Evidence to be given by Defendant, whereby the Damages were lessened; the Court ordered the Inquisition to be set aside, and gave Plaintiss Leave to execute a new Writ of Inquiry. A Notion has prevailed, that where Damages are excessive, a new Trial, &c. may be granted, but not where Damages are less than they ought to be, tho' there is as much Reason for a new Trial, &c. in the one Case as the other. Burnett for Plaintiss; Gapper for Desendant.

Hankey, Knight, who as well, &c. against Smith. Hilary 15 Geo. 2.

RULE to shew Cause why the Postera should not be amended, by returning the Verdict on the third instead of the first Count, according to the finding of the Jury, was made absolute, upon the Report of Mr. Baron Carter, before whom the Cause was tried. It was ordered, That the Associate do amend

amend the Postea in Court; that Defendant have four Days after the Amendment to move in Arrest of Judgment; and that Plaintiff do pay Defendant Costs of this Application. Prime for Plaintiff; Bootle for Defendant.

Cross against Skipwith, Baronet. Trinity 16 Geo. 2.

AFTER a Common Jury returned in Middlesex, and the Cause made a Remanet by Consent; at the Sitting after last Term Desendant moved for a Special Jury, offering to take Notice of Trial for the second Sitting within this Term, and obtained a Rule to shew Cause; which was discharged. Per Cur: This has been done between Assizes and Assizes, but we cannot delay the Plaintiff in this Case, without Consent. Death or other Accidents may happen. Skinner and Eyre for Plaintiff; Wynne, Ketelbey and Hayward for Desendant.

Fisher against Kitchingman. Mich. 16 Geo. 2.

Mr. Justice Burnett, the Question was, Whether the Postea in a former Action, produced by the Associate, was sufficient Evidence to prove that such former Action was tried, and referred, as alledged in the Declaration

ration in this Action; or whether the Postea ought not to have been returned to the Court, and an Entry made upon Record that a Juror was withdrawn, and a Copy of that Entry given in Evidence? The Court was of Opinion, That according to the Thing alledged, viz. that the Cause came down to Trial upon an Issue joined in this Court, the Postea, which is a Transcript of the Record, and authenticated by the Seal, was sufficient Evidence; and the Rule to shew Cause why the Verdict should not be set aside, was discharged. Skinner and Bootle for Plaintiss; Agar and Draper for Defendant.

Absolon against Knight and Barber, in Replevin. Easter 16 Geo. 2.

A Vowry for Rent in Arrear, and Issue thereon. Plaintiff had given Notice, with his Plea in Bar, to set off a mutual Debt against the Rent, and offered to give Evidence of it at last Berks Assizes, before Mr. Justice Denison, who resused to admit the same. The Question was, Whether such Evidence ought to have been received, or not? And the Court were of Opinion, that such Evidence was properly rejected. This Case is neither within the Letter nor the Intention of the Statute. The Issue is Special and not General. It is not an Action upon a Personal Contract. The Rent savours of

the Realty, and the Remedy is by Distress. Replevin is a mixed Action. The Judgment, if for the Avowant, must be a Return of the Cattle. To take the Benefit of the Statute. Plaintiff and Defendant must plead properly. In Debt on Bond, Defendant cannot set off under Non est factum, or Solvit ad diem; but must plead specially. Perhaps by Way of Special Plea to the Avowry, Plaintiff might have pleaded a mutual Debt of more than the Rent. There could not have been a Set-off by Defendants under Non cepit; nor can there be for Plaintiff under Riens in Arrere. The Rule to stay the Entry of Judgment upon the Verdict for the Avowants, was discharged. Belsield and Agar for Plaintiff; Skinner for Avowants.

Proctor, Spinster, against Bury. Trin. 16 & 17 Geo. 2.

SPECIAL Action on the Case, wherein Plaintiff declares, that she being single and unmarried, Desendant, affirming himself to be single and unmarried, prevailed upon Plaintiff to marry him, when in Truth he had been before married to another Woman, A. B. still living, whereby Plaintiff lost her Chastity, &c. And on Trial, Plaintiff recovered 2000 l. Damages. Desendant, on Plaintiff's Prosecution, had been convicted of Bigamy, and burnt in the Hand. Prime A 2 3

258 Trials, &c.

and Wynne moved in Arrest of Judgment, infisting, that this Crime is made Felony by Statute fac. 1. That the Charge in the Declaration plainly amounts to Felony; and that this Action is merged in the Felony. The Court directed the Entry of Judgment upon the Verdict to be stayed till further Order.

Richardson against Frank and another. Mich. 17 Geo. 2.

Daintiff's Goods distrained were not replevied, but, by Consent of the Attornies on both Sides, remained in the Distrainer's Hands, and without any Writ of Re. fa. lo. or Appearance in this Court. Plaintiff declared; Defendants avowed; and after long Special Pleadings, some of which terminated in Issues joined, and others in Demurrers; and after Trial of the Issues at the Assizes, and a Verdict for Plaintiff, the Avowants moved to fet afide all the Proceedings; and the Rule for that Purpose was made absolute. The Court held the Agreement to be void, a Fraud upon the Revenue and the Officers, and an Abuse of the Court and the Bar, That they had no Jurisdiction, and consequently could not give Judgment, Draper and Bootle for Avowants; Willes for Plaintiff.

Mead

Mead against Robinson.

Point was referved at Nish prius; and by Rule, if the Opinion of the Court should be for Plaintiff, the Postea was to be delivered to him; if for Defendant, Plaintiff was to pay the Costs of a Nonsuit. The Court declared the Form of the Rule to be wrong; it ought to be, If the Opinion be for Defendant, that the Verdict be entred for him ex Assensite Juratorum. This Method of reserving Points of Law came in lieu of a Special Verdict, and ought to make a final Determination on each Side in all Cases, except Ejectment, where the Party may begin again at his Pleasure.

Hart against Whitlocke.

AFTER the Cause called on, and made a Remanet by Consent, Defendant moved to put off the Trial, by Reason of the Absence of a material Witness. It appearing this Witness being material was a Matter that did not come to Defendant's Knowledge Time enough to move two Days before the last Day appointed for Trial, the Rule was made absolute to put off the Trial. Skinner for Desendant; Willes for Plaintiff.

Aa4

Marlow

Marlow against Weekes, in Trespass, for assaulting, beating and wounding Plaintiff's Mare. Mich. 17 Geo. 2.

AFTER a Verdict for Plaintiff, Defendant moved in Arrest of Judgment, objecting, that an Action of Assault and Battery is not applicable to a dead Thing, or a brute Beast, but to one of the Human Species only. The Objection was now overruled, and the Order Niss Causa discharged. Assault upon a Ship (a dead Thing) bad; but for an Injury to a Beast, a Writ in Trespass Vi & Armis appears in the Register; the Beating and Wounding are found by the Jury. Draper for Desendant; Wynne for Plaintiff.

Hall against Douglas, in Trespass and Assault. Trinity 17 & 18 Geo. 2.

AFTER a Verdict for Plaintiff, Defendant moved in Arrest of Judgment; objecting, that the whole Declaration was a meer Recital, and nothing positive was averred, the Word [Whereas] being inserted in the Beginning of the Count; and obtained a Rule Nisi Causa, which was now discharged. The Court were of Opinion, that they ought

ought to get over the old Cases, and not through this Nicety set aside the Verdict, and defeat Justice. The Recital of the Original helps, and the Conclusion of the Declaration whereby, from whence, by Reason whereof (the true Translation of the Word unde), the Plaintiss is endamaged, is an Averment, though not in common Form. Upon a Special Demurrer, the Declaration would be bad, but after Damages sound by Reason of the Assault, which is the Thing done, the Desect is aided. Draper for Plaintiss; Prime for Desendant.

Lucas against Marsh. Mich. 18 Geo. 2.

as Indorsee of a Promisory Note, and on Trial the Note was produced endorsed by the Drawee, but not superscribed. And the Question on the Point reserved was, Whether or no, after the Objection taken, the Indorsement to Plaintiff could be supplied in Court. Held per Cur', That the Words, Pay the Contents, &c. may be put or set over the Name endorsed in Court. The Property is transferred by the Endorsement; and where the Endorsement appears to be superscribed, the Court never inquire when the Superscribed, the Court never inquire when the Superscription was written. This Determination is in Favour of Justice, Honesty and Trade; and

the Practice was settled per Pengelly, Lord Raymond and Lord Hardwick at Niss Prius. A Release to make a Man a Witness (which is a stronger Case than this) is constantly suffered to be executed in Court. No Inconvenience will arise by this Practice. In Case of a Set-off, where an endorsed Note is set off by a Desendant against a Plaintiff's Demand, it must be proved that the Name of the Indorsor was written before the Plea pleaded. Rule that the Postea be delivered to Plaintiff. Skinner for Plaintiff; Draper for Desendant.

Norman against Beaumont, in Trespass and Assault, in Norfolk. Mich. 18 Geo. 2.

Related Geater, summoned and returned as a Nish prius Juror, did not attend the Affizes; but one Richard Sheppard, a Free-holder, who was verbally summoned to serve as a Juror on the Crown Side, and never had been at the Affizes before, did attend both Courts (as he imagined himself in Duty bound to do;) when Richard Geater was called on the Nish prius Side, Richard Sheppard (thinking himself called) answered, and was sworn as a Juror. Defendant insisted, that the Verdict was null and void, the Trial not having been by twelve, but by eleven Jurors only. Neither Party knew anything of the Mistake till

till after the Trial. It was urged for Plaintiff, that Defendant ought to have challenged Sheppard; that after recording the Verdict, no Averment can be admitted against the Record. That Sheppard's Place of Abode was different from that of Geater, which would have been good Matter of Challenge. And if Defendant could aver against the Record, yet the Defect is cured by the Statute 32 H. S. c. 30. The Verdict was for Plaintiff, Damages One Shilling; and Lord Chief Justice Lee, who tried the Cause, had certified. to entitle Plaintiff to Costs. Per Cur': By the Statute 3 Geo. 2. all the twelve Jurors ought to be drawn out of the Box, and the Name of Richard Sheppard was never put into the Box. The Court are not bound by the Record. Here has been no Trial. is not Matter of Challenge, nor is the Defect cured by the Statute 32 H. 8. The Rule on Richard Sheppard to shew Cause why an Attachment, was discharged. The Rule to shew Cause why the Verdict should not be fet aside, was made absolute. Prime for Plaintiff; Bootle for Defendant; Leeds for Richard Sheppard.

Wrey against Thorn. Mich. 18
Geo. 2.

HIS was an Action for breaking and entring Plaintiff's Close, &c. Defendant justified in Right of a Way. Plaintiff replied extra Viam; whereon Issue was joined; and a Special Jury and View applied for and granted. The Name of Henry Luppincott of Alverdiscott, in Com' Devon', Esquire, was taken out of the Freeholders Book, and he stood as a Juryman, and was returned among the other Jurors, in the Panel annexed to the Writ of Venire facias; and was fummoned, and did attend both on the View and at the Trial. After a Verdict for Plaintiff on the Merits of the Cause, Defendant moved to fet afide the Verdict, Mr. Luppincott's Christian Name being [Harry] and not [Henry]; and produced an Affidavit thereof from two Persons. Per Cur': This Affidavit ought not to be received in a Motion for a new Trial. The Record, and all the Jury Process, are uniform. Mr. Luppincott is the real Person returned and intended to be a Juror, and there is no Pretence that the Verdict is unjust. It is commonly understood that Henry and Harry are the same Name; or that Harry is the same Name as Henry corruptly spelled. The Rule to shew Cause why the Verdict should not be set afide,

fide, was discharged. Belsteld for Plaintiff; Hussey for Defendant.

Roe against Doe, in Ejectment, on the Demise of Cholmondly and his Wife, for a considerable Estate in Yorkshire, late Sir Butler Wentworth's, deceased. Hil. 18 Geo. 2.

DULE for Tenants in Possession to shew Rule why Issue to be joined should not be tried at Bar next Term. Objected on the Part of Lady Wentworth the Landlady, Sir Butler's Widow, That a Trial at Bar cannot be moved for by Plaintiff till after Appearance, and the Time to appear will not expire till four Days after this Term. Two Rules of the Court of King's Bench produced, one by Consent, the other not by Consent, except as to Nifi prius Costs, where Trials at Bar had been ordered before Appearance. Rule absolute for Trial at Bar on 8th May next. If Plaintiff's Motion had not been received before Appearance, no Trial at Bar could be appointed till next Michaelmas Term. Lady Wentworth's Counsel prayed the Conditional Rule, and to defend for Part; which was granted, and fix Weeks Time to describe the Part defended for. Prime & al' for Lessors of Plaintiff; Skinner & al' for Lady Wentworth.

Kemp, qui tam, &c. against The Hundred of Strafford and Tickhill. Easter 18 Geo. 2.

A T Yorkshire Affizes a Verdict was taken for Defendants, and a Point referved by Rule for the Opinion of the Court. The Rule of Nisi prius was made a Rule of Court, on the Motion of Plaintiff's Counsel; which Rule the Court discharged as new and unprecedented. Whenever a Point is reserved, the Verdict must always be for the Plaintiff. Bootle for Defendant; Prime for Plaintiff.

Russell against Ball, in Assumption.

Efendant paid twenty-five Pounds into Court on the Common Rule; Plaintiff refused to accept the Mony, proceeded to Trial; and on a full hearing of the Merits, had a Verdict for 25 l. the exact Sum paid into Court, (in Consequence whereof Plaintiff, not having recovered more, was, by the Rule, liable to pay Costs to Defendant: To avoid which, Plaintiff moved to set aside the Verdict, objecting, that the Cause was tried by eleven Jurors only. It appeared that one John Pearce, summoned on the Jury, did not appear, but his Son of the same Name, not qualified, attended the Asilizes:

fizes, and when the Father was drawn and called, answered for him, and was sworn on the Jury. Plaintiff also objected to the Smallness of Damages found. Per Cur': Attaint will not lie against Jurors for finding too small Damages. Where a Demand is certain, as by Promisory Note, the Court will set aside a Verdict for too small Damages, but not where the Damages are uncertain, as in this Case, for curing a Wound. But the Verdict by eleven Jurors only is no Verdict; it is null and void. Rule absolute to set aside the Verdict, without Costs. Vide Norman against Beaumont, Mich. 18 George 2. Belsield for Plaintiff; Draper for Defendant.

Stanynought against Cosins, one, &c. Hilary 19 Geo. 2.

ACTION of Trespass for mesne Profits, brought by the Nominal Plaintiff, the Lessee in Ejectment, against the Tenant in Possession, after Judgment by Desault against the Casual Ejector, for Want of the Tenant's Appearance. No Possession in Plaintiff proved at the Trial; Postea stayed; and Point reserved. The Question is, What ought to have been proved? Per Cur': The Title need not be proved. The Tenant is so far privy to the Suit, he has been served with a Declaration, and is thereby concluded as to the Title, though he does not appear. The Judgment

ment must be supposed to be right; if not, Tenant might move to fet it aside. After Action brought for mesne Profits, Tenant not having entred into the Common Rule, is not concluded, either as to his own Poffession, or as to Plaintiff's being in Possession at the Time of the Demise, which possibly might have been laid eighteen Years back. and a Tenant at Will might have been only three Days in Possession. Damages ought to be given for no longer Time than Defendant is proved to be in actual Possession. Plaintiff's Possession ought also to be proved, and from that Time only Damages to be recovered. In Case of a Lease sealed on the Land (the old Way) where the Poffession is vacant, Plaintiff cannot recover for mesne Profits. If Tenant enters into the Rule to confess Lease, Entry and Ouster, the Title must be proved before the Demise laid. nant privy and Party is to be bound by what himself confesses, though in the Rule only, and not at the Trial. Trespass is a possessory Action, only to be brought by Person in Possession, and from Time of Possession; and though Ejectments are Creatures of the Court, the Action for mesne Profits is like Trespass with a Continuando. As Plaintiff did not prove his Possession, he ought to have been nonsuited. The Postea ordered to be delivered to Defendant, &c. prout. Rule of Asfizes, 1 Sydersin 239. Where Tenant enters into the Common Rule, and the Action for mesne Profits is brought by the Lesson in Ejectment, Plaintiff's Possession must be proved; if by the Lessee, his Entry and Possession is confessed, and need not be proved. No other Difference in Action brought by Lesson or Lessee, (1 Salk. 246. wrong.) Tenant concluded as to Entry, when confessed, except an Entry to avoid a Fine. Skinner for Plaintiss; Willes for Desendant.

Love and Appleton against Jarrett. Easter 19 Geo. 2.

Order, rejoining gratis. Plaintiff delivered a Paper-Book, containing a bad Replication, and an Issue joined by Defendant. Desendant's Agent's Clerk received and paid for the Paper-Book; but his Master perceiving the Replication to be bad, returned the Book to Plaintiff's Agent, and gave Notice of the Mistake, notwithstanding which Plaintiff went on to Trial, and had a Verdict, without Desence. Rule absolute to set aside the Verdict, without Costs. Skinner for Plaintiff; Draper for Desendant.

Vol. II.

Вь

Goodtitle

Goodtitle, on the Demise of Symons, Esquire, against Clarke, in Ejectment. Mich. 20 Geo. 2.

AFTER the Merits of the Cause had been determined at the Affizes by a Special Jury, after a Trial of twenty Hours, Defendant moved to fet aside the Verdict. upon Affidavit that Plaintiff's Shewer at a View, pursuant to a Rule of Court previous to the Trial, had mifbehaved himself, by telling the Viewers, This Place is called Abrahall's Yat, and this Conygree-hill; (which were not the Places in Question;) and saying, These Cottages pay Mr. Symons 5 d. or 6 d. a-Year Rent. Defendant infifting, that nothing more than the Place in Question, which was one fingle Cottage, should have been shewn to the Viewers. Upon hearing Counsel on both Sides, the Court discharged the Rule, being of Opinion, That on a View the Shewers may shew Marks, Boundaries, &c. to enlighten the Viewers; and may fay to them, These are the Places which on the Trial we shall adapt our Evidence to. Jury could have no Light from looking at the Cottage only. The Question to be tried was, Whether it stood within Mr. Symons's Manor, or not? Had an ancient Man been produced to the Viewers, and he had acquainted them

them that he had known the Place many Years, and given an Account of the Boundary, &c. this would have been improper, because it is giving Evidence before the Trial. Belfield for Defendant; Bootle and Eyre for Plaintiff.

Hicks against Young, in Replevin. Mich. 20 Geo. 2.

Defendant brought down the Record, and his Counsel insisting strongly on a Verdict, Mr. Baron Reynolds, before whom the Cause was tried, complied, and a Verdict was found for Defendant, though Plaintiff did not appear. Upon Application by Plaintiff to set aside the Verdict, the Court, after hearing the Judge's Report, ordered the Postea to be amended, and a Nonsuit to be returned instead of a Verdict for Defendant; and that Defendant should pay Costs of the Motion. Prime for Plaintiff; Draper for Defendant.

Chandler against The Hundred of Sunning, on the Statute of Hue and Cry. Hilary 22 Geo. 2.

N a Case made on a Point reserved at the Trial, where a Verdict was found for Plaintiff, subject to the Opinion of the Bb2 Court,

372 Trials, &c.

Court, Mr. Justice Abney and Mr. Justice Birch delivered their Opinions, That though Plaintiff cannot recover the Value of Bank-Notes of which he was robbed, to the Value of 960 l. for Want of a sufficient Description thereof in his Advertisement in the London Gazette, yet he ought to recover for what is fufficiently described, (viz.) his Watch and Mony, Value 101. the Words of the late Act being to be taken distributively. Lord Chief Justice and Mr. Justice Burnett were of Opinion, that nothing can be recovered. The Words of the late Act are, That Plaintiff shall not maintain his Action, unless he describes the Robbers, &c. together with the Goods and Effects of which he was robbed; twenty Days before the Advertisement are given to the Person robbed to recollect a particular Description. The Party robbed ought to discover, as well as he can, all the Goods he loft, to give Light to the Hundred to take the Robbers. The Person robbed gets nothing by the taking; the Publick indeed are benefitted. A Person robbed of a large Sum of Money, probably cannot farther describe it than that it was in Gold and Silver; but perhaps can describe other particular Things then loft; which he ought to do. The Description of Bank-Notes by Numbers, Dates and Sums (which in this Case were omitted) are highly useful for Difcovery. No two have the same Marks. Plaintiff

Plaintiff, at the Time of his Advertisement, had not known the Numbers, &c. but recollected them afterwards, the Action would lie. But on the Trial he acknowledged that he knew them, and they were all particularly entred in his Pocket-Book at the Time of the Advertisement. The Court being divided, no Judgment could be entred on the Verdict.

Moyse, Widow, against Cockledge. Hilary 22 Geo. 2.

THE Action was Trespass Vi & Armis for breaking and entring Plaintiff's House, and taking and carrying away her Goods. Defendant pleaded the General Issue, and at the Trial shewed, that the Goods were taken as a Distress for Non-payment of a Poor's Rate (which Plaintiff obstinately refused to pay), and fold, and after Payment of the Rate, and deducting 1 s. for the Expence of the Distress and Sale, the Overplus was restored to Plaintiff. Defendant went through every Requisite under the Statute 43 Eliz. to shew the Regularity of the Distress and Sale, and the Jury were ready to give a Verdict in his Favour; but at the preffing Instance of Defendant's Counsel, a Verdict was given for Plaintiff, Damages 1 s. and the following Point referved for the Opinion of the Court, (viz.) Whether, as no Provision is made by the Statute for retaining the neceffary Expence of the Diffress and Sale, Defendant could justify deducting 1 s. for the fame. Which Point having been argued, the Court, after Confideration, delivered an unanimous Opinion, That as the Act gives a Right to distrain and sell, all Incidents neceffary to obtain that Right are included. If the Thing distrained cannot be fold without Expence, such Expence is necessary, and given by the Statute. The Jury were to judge of the Reasonableness or Extravagance of the Expence; the Court must now take the Expence to be necessary and reasonable. If Defendant could not have justified the Expence to be necessary, yet an Action of Trefpass Vi & Armis would not lie for the 1 s. retained, but an Action on the Case for Mony had and received for Plaintiff's Use. The Postea ordered to be delivered to Defendant, The Rule of Nifi prius was drawn up in the old Way, viz. That if the Court should be of Opinion for Defendant, the Verdict for Plaintiff be fet afide, and Plaintiff pay Costs of a Nonsuit; which is a bad Form: It should be, That Judgment of Nonfuit be entred; otherwise Defendant could have no Remedy in Case of Plaintiff's Death. Prime for Plaintiff; Draper for Defendant,

Woeden, on the Demise of Long, against Saunders, Widow, and others, in Ejectment. Easter 23 Geo. 2.

HE Venire facias was awarded by Mistake, returnable on the Morrow of the Ascension, instead of Eight Days of the Purification. Defendants, though their Witnesses attended the Assizes, made no Defence at the Trial, but confessed Lease, Entry and Ouster, and suffered Plaintiff to take a Verdict, relying on the Mistake in awarding the Venire, returnable at a Day subsequent to the Affizes, till after which Return, and Default by Jurors, there could be no Nifi prius. The Jury Process was made returnable at the proper Days. The Court held the Variance material, on the Authority of two Cases cited by Plaintiff's Counsel, Bastard & al' against Bartlett, Trinity 3 Geo. 2. Dale against Holmes, Mich. 4 Geo. 2. in B. R. Verdict fet aside on Payment of Costs. Prime for Defendants; Draper and Wynne for Plaintiff.

Hawys, one, &c. against Rix. Mich. 24 Geo. 2.

POINT referved at the Trial and argued in Court was, Whether the Placita in the Record, referring to a Time more than a Month after Plaintiff's Bill of Costs delivered,

Bb 4 be

be sufficient to support his Action for Fees, &c. charged in his Bill? Or that, in Order to shew the Commencement of the Suit, Plaintiff ought not to have produced his Attachment of Privilege (the Original Writ) or an examined Copy, the Statute 2 Geo. 2. requiring fuch Bill to be delivered a Month before Action brought? The Bill was proved to be delivered 25th September 1749; Placita was of Hilary Term then next, the Term of which Issue was joined. The Court were of Opinion, that Plaintiff ought to make out his Case by the best Evidence the Nature of the Thing will admit. The Placita is not conclusive; the Writ may correspond with it, and yet bear Teste the first Day of Michaelmas Term 1749, which is before the Month expired; nor is the Placita the best Evidence, because Plaintiff might have had the Writ. Judgment for Desendant Nish Causa ante Clausum Termini. No Cause shewn. Willes for Plaintiff; Bootle for Defendant.

Dobson against Stevens. Hilary 24
Geo. 2.

Special Jury, as of Course; but before the Rule drawn up, the Secondary doubting, prayed the Direction of the Court; and it appearing that Common Jury Process had been awarded, issued and returned, and that the

the Cause stands as a Remanet in Lord Chief Justice's Paper, the Court refused to grant a Special Jury. Though in Country Causes, between Affizes and Assizes, the Practice is otherwise. Wynne for Plaintiff.

Bartlett against Spooner. Easter 24 Geo. 2.

THIS was an Action of Trespass, to which Defendant, by Leave of the Court, had pleaded three Pleas, viz. Not guilty, and two feveral Justifications. On the Trial, Defendant proved his fecond Plea to the Satisfaction of the Court, and obtained a Verdict on the first and second Issues; but as to the third Issue, no Proof was gone into, nor any Verdict found relating to it. Belfield, for Plaintiff, objected, That the Verdict was incomplete, imperfect and uncertain, nothing being found as to a material Fact put in Issue; and therefore, as to the third Issue, a Venire facias de novo ought to be awarded. On shewing Cause, Prime, for Defendant, observed, that by the first Plea, (Not guilty) the Whole is put in Issue; that by the fecond Plea, the whole Trespass is covered; and therefore the Verdict is compleat. It is found thereby, That Plaintiff has no Cause of Action, and the Judge who tried the Cause, did not think it needful to go farther. As Plaintiff has no Cause of Action,

Trials, &c. 278

he can have no Damages. Contingent Damages in Case of Issue and Demurrer, and Isfue tried before Argument, are not necessary to be found at the Trial on Plaintiff's Verdict, but may be afterwards supplied, if Judgment for Plaintiff on the Demurrer. Cur': Here is enough found for the Court to give Judgment upon. No Venire facias de novo ought to issue. It was not the Business of Defendant, but of Plaintiff, to have the third Issue determined, if he imagined that thereby he might be intitled to Costs, or any other Advantage. The Rule discharged.

N. B. Plaintiff gave no Evidence on the

Not guilty.

Britton, who as well, &c. against Peirce. Mich. 25 Geo. 2.

HIS was an Action brought on the Statute 13 Eliz. for fetting up a fraudulent Judgment, wherein Plaintiff on Trial obtained a Verdict for the Penalty of 45%. besides which, Corporal Punishment, and Imprisonment for fix Months, are inflicted by the Statute. Agar, for Plaintiff, moved. for Leave to compound, pursuant to Statute 18 Eliz. ch. 5. But per Cur': That Statute extends only to Actions brought by common Informers; this Action is brought by the Party injured. The Defendant is convicted by the Verdict, and after Conviction Leave

is never given in any Case to compound. No Rule. The Judgment to be entered under the Court's Direction. Vide Cooke's Entries, fo. 149.

Jones, on the Demise of Rayner, against Sandys and others, in Ejectment. Hilary 26 Geo. 2.

Point reserved at the Trial, Whether a Bond, in the Condition whereof a Mortgage-Demise was contained, stamped with a treble Sixpenny Stamp, read in Evidence for Plaintiss, ought to have been admitted, or not, for Want of its being stamped with two treble Sixpenny Stamps? It being insisted on, by Plaintiss's Counsel, that per Stat. 12 Ann. cap. 9. sect. 21 & 24. every Indenture, Lease or Bond, are separately charged, and consequently this Instrument, being both Bond and Lease or Demise, ought to have paid twice the treble Sixpenny Duty.

The Court thought the Act of Parliament darkly penned. The Revenue Acts are generally framed by the Officers concerned in the feveral Branches, without being laid before the Attorny or Solicitor General. The Act is ambiguous. It is fafeft to follow a long Series of Construction. This is one Bond, of which there is one Execution. A Feoffment, with a Warrant for Livery of Seisin, Bargain and Sale, operating as a Covenant to

stand seised, or (being inrolled) as Lease and Release, Demise and Redemise, Mortgage with a Covenant to pay the Mony, constantly thought to be fingly charged only, and the Practice has been consonant. A different Construction of the Act would make great Confusion in Purchase - Deeds and Settlements, often relating to Freehold, Leasehold and Copyhold Estates in one and the same Deed. Every Copyhold Surrender, and every Admittance, seem to be charged separately, and yet one Stamp of 2 s. 3 d. has been held sufficient for both Surrender and Amittance: and so is the Practice. The Subject's Property, as well as the King's Revenue, is to be protected. If the Deed in Question be not Evidence, it is the same Thing as void: For though the Commissioners of the Stamp-Duty may (tempted by a large Sum of Mony) order a Stamp to be added, yet they are not obliged so to do. The proper Time for the Objection was when the Bond was offered in 2 Lord Raymond 1445. Rule, That the Postea be delivered to Plaintiff, to fign Judgment. Prime for Plaintiff; Poole for Defendants.

Smith against Gregg, in Yorkshire. Easter 26 Geo. 2.

HE Record was offered to be entred at last Assizes, a little out of Time, and Defendant's Attorny, then present, had resused refused to consent that it should be received. On Application by Defendant for Judgment as in Case of Nonsuit, the Court refused to give Costs of the Application, but ordered Plaintiff to pay Costs for not proceeding to Trial, and peremptorily to proceed to Trial at next Assizes. *Poole* for Defendant; Willes for Plaintiff.

Fitch, qui tam, against Nunn.

MOTION, per Draper for Defendant, for a new Trial, after Verdict for Plaintiff, in an Action upon a Penal Statute, (wherein no Defence was made at the Trial) founded on a Variance between the Islue delivered and the Record of Nish prius, the Words following, (viz.) And thereupon the jaid Plaintiff, by George Boldero his Attorny faith,) being omitted in the Issue delivered, though put into the Record. This was admitted not to be a material Variance affecting the Merits, and in Civil Actions helped by the Statute of Jeofails, but not in an Action on Penal Statute. In Actions brought by Original Writ, the Method is to recite the Writ, and then to Count; here is nothing but Recital, without any Count. Stat. 18 Eliz. a particular Method is prescribed to the Profecutor; he must declare in Person, or by Attorny. Plaintiff in this Case may, possibly, be under twenty-one Years

of Age, and, if so, cannot support this Action, wherein he cannot declare by his Prochein Amy.

The Court, after hearing Prime pro Quer', did not incline to think the Variance material, or to favour the Distinction made per Draper. But as Plaintiff's Agent had made a Blunder, and the Merits had not been tried, ordered a new Trial, and Costs to attend the Event.

Holland against Heron. Trinity 26 & 27 Geo. 2.

HE Sheriffs and Coroners of London being interested in the Question to be tried, Agar for Plaintiff moved, that Defendant might shew Cause why a Special Jury should not be struck and returned by Elizors to be appointed by the Court. Per Cur': The Special Jury may be moved for of Course, after Elizors appointed. The first Rule was to shew Cause why it should not be referred to Prothonotary Cooke, to confider of two fit Perfons to be Elizors, and to report; which Rule being made absolute, without Opposition; and the Prothonotary having named John Wakelin and Elisha Biscoe, the next Rule was to shew Cause why they should not be appointed Elizors by the Court; which Rule was also made absolute, without Opposition.

Whitehill against Carr. Mich. 27
Geo. 2.

HIS was an Action for Words, to which Defendant, by Leave of the Court, had pleaded four several Matters, the fourth Plea an Accord and Satisfaction; Plaintiff's Agent delivered an Issue, made up a Record, and proceeded to Trial, after Isfues joined on the three former Pleas, but without replying, or taking any Notice of the fourth Plea. Defence was made, and Plaintiff obtained a Verdict. Defendant moved for a new Trial. It appeared that some Evidence had been given on Defendant's Part to make out his Case upon the fourth Plea, which fell short of the Fact pleaded, though that Evidence was declared by Mr. Serjeant Eyre, before whom the Cause was tried, to be improper. Rule, that Plaintiff do either demur, or reply iffuably to the fourth Plea. If he demurs, that Proceedings be stayed till after Argument; if he replies issuably, that a new Trial be had at next Affizes; and Costs of former Trial and Motions attend the Event. Wynne and Wilson for Defendant; Prime and Draper for Plaintiff.

Fitch, who as well, &c. against Nunn.

THIS was an Action brought on one of the Penal Statutes made to preferve the Game, wherein Defendant obtained a Verdict; Plaintiff moved for a new Trial, and the Judge before whom the Cause was tried reported the Verdict to be contrary to Evidence. Notwithstanding which, the Rule to shew Cause why a new Trial should not be had, on Payment of Costs, was discharged; because no Instance could be shewn where in an Action on a Penal Statute, in which a Verdict was found for Defendant, a new Trial had ever been granted. Willes and Agar for Plaintiff; Wynne for Defendant.

Corish against Kennedy.

Was to put off a Trial) suffered Affidavits to be read, taken before a Vice-Consulabroad. Such Affidavits are constantly received and read at the Counsel-Board. It is not reasonable to expect that such Sort of Affidavits should be taken before Persons appointed Commissioners. Poole for Desendant; Wynne for Plaintiff.

Menue and Menire Facias.

Clarke against Sheppard. Trinity 13 & 14 Geo. 2.

Plaintiff sued out a Venire facias, whereupon the Common Panel was returned, this Writ and Return were filed, and a Writ of Habeas Corpora Jur' was issued forth. Plaintiff afterwards obtained a Rule for a Special Jury, as a Matter of Course; which Rule was discharged. After the Venire facias and Return filed, the Motion for a Special Jury comes too late. Belsield for Desendant; Skinner for Plaintiff.

Cook against Shone and others.

Defendants, Surveyors, &c. of West-minster-Bridge, for taking away and destroying Plaintiff's Timber to the Value of 500 l. and by the Act of Parliament for building the said Bridge, Plaintiff is confined to bring his Action within six Months, and to lay it in Middlesex; by Mistake of Gillman, Plaintiff's former Attorny, who now absconds, the Action was laid in London, instead of Middlesex, and the Mistake was not discovered Vol II.

till after Plea pleaded and Issue joined; the Fact appeared to be committed on the 22d August 1739, and the Action to be commenced within the six Months. Plaintiss now moved for Leave to change the Venue from London to Middlesex; which was ordered, upon Payment of Costs. If the Amendment could not be made, Plaintiss must lose his Remedy; he is too late to bring a new Action. In an Action upon a Penal Statute, the Court probably would not interpose; but in the Case of a Remedial Law, the Amendment must be made. Skinner for Plaintiss; Prime for Desendant. 3 Lev. 347. Bearcrost against The Hundred of Burnham.

Richardson against Walker and others. Trinity 14 & 15 Geo. 2.

A Rule to shew Cause why the Venue should not be changed from Cumber-land into Lancashire, was discharged. The Venue is never changed into a County Palatine. Beotle for Plaintiff; Birch for Desendant.

Lewis against Askham. Hilary 15 Geo. 2.

A GAR moved to change the Venue from Yorkshire into the City of York. Denied per Cur'.

Dennis

Dennis against Fletcher.

RULE to shew Cause why the Venue should not be changed, was discharged, because before the Motion there had been a Judge's Summons for Time to plead, and an Attendance thereon, but no Order was produced. Per Cur': It must be so, as the Practice stands at present, but shall end here. For the future, a Judge's Summons, or Order for Time to plead, shall be no Bar to a Motion to change the Venue. Prime for Plaintiff; Willes for Defendant.

Davis against Jordan. Easter 15 Geo. 2.

VILLES, for Defendant, moved to change the *Venue* from London into Kent, the adjacent County, upon Affidavit that the Cause of Action accrued within the City of Canterbury. Denied.

Hayward against Wells. Trin. 16 G. 2.

LENUE changed from London into Berks, though the Motion for the Rule to shew Cause was not made till the last Day of last Term, the Writ was returnable the fecond Return of that Term, and the Declaration delivered so late that Defendant could C c 2

388 **Uenue**, &c.

not move it sooner. Gapper for Plaintisf; Draper for Desendant.

Rickaby against Wilson, Esquire. Mich. 16 Geo. 2.

HIS Action was brought by Plaintiff, an Inn-keeper at Appleby in Westmoreland, against Defendant, one of the Knights of that Shire, for a large Demand for Wine, &c. provided at the last Election. Defendant moved, upon the Common Affidavit, to change the Venue from Yorkshire into Westmoreland (where the Assizes are held but once a Year.) It appeared that one of Plaintiff's Witnesses was going to Ireland, and would not return for two Years; and that Plaintiff's Creditors, of whom he had bought Wine, &c. were very preffing upon him. Per Cur': Upon these Occasions, the Court acts according to Discretion, and the general Rules of Justice, and the particular Rules of Practice in Being. The Practice is fettled, that a Venue cannot be changed into Hull, Canterbury, &c. because it is not known when an Affizes will be held there; nor into the City of Worcester or Gloucester, out of the County at large; because the Assizes for the City and for the County at large, are held at the same Place. In Easter or Trinity Term the Venue may be changed into a City or County, where the Affizes are held but once a-Year.

Aenue, &c. 389

a-Year, as Bristol, Cumberland, &c. In Michaelmas and Hilary Term there is no certain Rule, but the Court should change the Venue then, if it can be done without manifest Inconvenience. This Action is laid in the next County to that where the Cause of Action accrued; had it been laid in Middlefex, or any distant Country, the Court probably would not have obliged Defendant to bring his Witnesses (some of whom appeared to be aged and infirm) fo far; but in this Case, it would be Injustice to deny a Trial at next Yorkshire Assizes. The Rule to shew Cause why the Venue should not be changed, was discharged. Prime and Willes for Plaintiff: Skinner and Bootle for Defendant.

Jeremain against Ridley, in Trespass, for taking and carrying away Goods, a Transitory Action. Easter 16 Geo. 2.

RULE made to shew Cause why the Venue should not be changed. Draper for Defendant.

C c]3

The

The Duke of Bedford against Bray. Mich. 17 Geo. 2.

RULE to shew Cause why the Venue should not be changed, was discharged, the Declaration containing, inter alia, a Count on a Promisory Note; Plaintiff consenting, at the Peril of a Nonsuit, to give Evidence on the Promisory Note. Prime for Plaintiff; Skinner for Desendant.

Bradley against Adey. Mich 18 Geo. 2.

ACTION of Covenant on Deed for Non-payment of Rent for Lands in Kent, laid in Middlefex, Motion to change the Venue denicd. If local Defendant will have Advantage, if transitory, the Venue cannot be changed, the Action being on a Specialty. Wynne for Defendant.

Everest against Sansum, in Case, for a Deceit by warranting an unsound Horse. Hilary 19 Geo. 2.

DEfendant moved to change the Venue, on the Common Affidavit. Plaintiff's Counsel insisted, that in Actions for Deceit, Escape on mesne Process and Custom of the Realm,

Realm, the Venue cannot be changed; and to that Purpose quoted 1 Syders. 87. No 3. Trials per Pais, (third Edition) sol. 90, 91, 92. Attorny's Practice in the King's Bench, sol. 79. History Com' Pleas, so. 68. The Court held, that the Venue may be changed in all Actions in their Nature transitory, except in Cases of Privilege, Specialty, Promifory Note or Bill of Exchange. Rule absolute to change the Venue. Skinner for Defendant; Prime for Plaintiff.

Note; Deceit in Matter of Title to Land is Action on the Case. Vide Fitz-herbert's Natura Brevium.

Mayor, &c. of the Borough of Leicefter, against Green, alias Smith. Special Action on the Case. Trinity 19 & 20 Geo. 2.

RULE made absolute to change the Venue from London into Leicestershire, upon reading the Declaration, without the usual Affidavit, it appearing, that the Action was brought on a Custom of the Borough of Leicester, against Defendant, for exercising the Trade of a Watchmaker within that Borough, not being a Freeman, and not on a Market or Fair Day. Note; The Borough of Leicester is within the County at large. There is a Commission of Gaol-Delivery

Menue, &c.

392

every Assizes for the Borough, but no Commission of Nisi prius. Willes for Desendant; Bootle for Plaintiff.

Litson against Cooke. Action on a Promitory Note, and other Counts. Hilary 21 Geo. 2.

Plaintiff undertaking to give Evidence on the Promisory Note. Vide Duke of Bedford against Bray, Mich. 17 Geo. 2. Agar for Defendant; Draper for Plaintiff.

Herbert against Flower and others, in Trover. Trin. 24 & 25 Geo. 2.

Efendants, after a Rule to shew Cause why the Venue should not be changed, and before it was made absolute, put in their Plea. The Court held, That this Plea by Inadvertence is no Waiver of the Rule; gave Defendants Leave to withdraw the Plea, on Payment of Costs; and made the Rule absolute to change the Venue. Bootle for Defendants; Prime for Plaintiff.

TABLE

OFTHE

PRINCIPAL MATTERS.

Abatement.

See Bail, 18. Demurrer, 2, 3. Pleadings, 5, 8, 11, 16, 17.

Affidavit.

See Bail, 5, 6, 30, 34.
Inquiry, 7.
Inspection of Court Rolls, &c. 2.
Indogments, 12, 22.
Quitawry, 6.
Pleadings, 5, 16, 17.
Double Pleas allowed, 1, 2, 6, 8.
Do not allowed, 3.
Crial, 4, 5, 6, 31.
Genue, 4, 10.

1. Objection to Affidavits ex parte Defendentis, that they were sworn before Commissioners, who were sworn to be Clerks or Agents to Defendant's Attorny, overruled; aliter had they been Agents in this Cause, or menial Servants, Page 37

Amendment.

See Coffs, 19. Pzohibition, 1. Superledeas, 3.

1. Action of Trespass upon the Case, the Jurata at the Foot of the Record, Trespass only, helped by Statute of Jeofails, 3

2. Jurata amended by Habeas Corpora Juratorum, and Return of Venire facias, ib.

3. Return of Venire facias, if defective, within Statutes of Amendment, 4

4. Declaration amended by rejecting a Word as Suplufage, *ibid*.

5. Declaration amended, on Plaintiff's Motion, by changing Venue from London to Middlefex, after Plea pleaded and Issue joined, on Payment of Costs; it being on a Remedial Law, and confined to Middlefex, in other Cases not usual, 4, 17, 385

6. The Teste of a Writ of Certiorari amended by Consent, 5, 6

7. The Entry of a Writ of Habeas Corpus amended, 8

8. A

8. A new Record of Niji prius ordered to be
made out, and returned by Affociate agree-
able to his Minutes taken at the Trial, the
old one being loft, Page 9
9. Plea amended after Execution of Writ of
Inquiry, on Payment of Costs, and bring-
ing into Court the Damages found by the
Inquisition, 10
10. Judge's Order for Amendment of Declaration in the Particulars annexed to the
Order set aside, they ought to be inserted
in the Body of it, ibid.
11. Writ of Inquiry amended by striking
out a Defendant's Name,
12. The Title of a Bill against an Attorny
amended, 12
13. The Title of a Declaration in Ejectment
not amendable, there being nothing to
amend by, 12, 153, 154
14. Declaration against an Attorny amended
by inferting in the Memorandum the true
Day of proclaiming, on Payment of Costs,
&c. 12
15. Demise in Ejectment refused to be a-
mended in Point of Time, without Con-
fent, (Vide Vol. I. p. 12.) 13
16. The Teste and Return of a Writ of En-
try refused to be amended, there being no
Misprission of the Clerk, nor anything to
amend by, 14, 15
17. The Title of an Issue amended, by in-
ferting the Word George, 15
18. A-

18. Amendment (Plaintiff being of Age) by
striking out Prochein Amie, who was
fworn to be a material Witness, Page 15
19. A Final Judgment on Verdict amended
in particularibus, after Writ of Error and
Record transcribed, but the Transcript not
carried into the King's Bench, 16
20. Declaration amended, by adding a new
Count after the second Term, on Pay-
ment of Costs of Plea and Application.
and Defendant having Leave to plead de
novo, 17
21. Amendment of Plea, by adding two
new ones to those already pleaded by Leave,
denied, the Question being Matter of
Title, and the Cause to be tried at the
Sitting after Term, 18
22. Declaration amended by adding Pledges
and a Memorandum making the Declara-
tion agreeable to the Bill on Record, on
Payment of Costs, 18, 287
23. Recovery amended by striking out [it is
adjudged] and inserting [it is considered],
without Rule to shew Cause, 19, 23
24. Plea amended, so as to state Facts ne-
cessary to bring the Construction of an
Act of Parliament and the true Merits of
the Case before the Court, after Demurrer
to the Plea, Joinder and Argument, and
farther Day appointed, on Payment of
Costs, &c. 20
25. Plea amended by leaving out a Special
Impar-

Imparlance, and pleading a Tender as of
last Term, Declaration having been deli-
vered the last Minute, Page 21
26. Recovery amended by the Deed of Uses,
by putting the Name of a Vill into its
proper Place, 21
27. Avowry amended after Issue joined in the
last Term, by adding three Avowries for
Quit-Rent payable at different Times, on
Payment of Costs, rejoining gratis, and
taking short Notice of Trial, 22, 23
28. Recovery amended in the Prayer of Sei-
fin, and the Return of the Writ of Seifin
ordered to be perfected by the Clerk of the
Return-Office, 24
29. The Return of a Writ of Habeas Cor-
pus cum causa amended, by inserting a
Custom, at the Instance of the Court that
returned it, tho' another Rule touching the
Granting of a Procedendo was pending, 26
30. Declaration amended in the Conclusion,
from (and thereof they pray Suit) to (pray
Remedy), after Demurrer for that Cause,
by Confent, 143
31. Notice of Set-off cannot be amended,
244
32. Declaration amended after Issue joined,
Notice of Trial and Motion for Judgment,
as in case of a Nonsuit, upon Terms,
256
33. Postea ordered to be amended by the
Affociate in Court, Plaintiff paying De-
fendan

÷

fendant Costs of the Application, and Defendant having four Days after Amendment to move in Arrest of Judgment,

Page 354

Antient Demesne.

See Pleadings, 16, 17.

Appearance.

See Pzocels, 23. Trial, 11.

1. An Appearance cures all Errors and Defects in Process, 136, 142, 329, 344

Appearance common.

See Ball, 7, 22, 28, 29, 31, 47. Outlawy, 2, 14.

Arrest of Judgment.

See Judgment, 27, 31. Crial, 10, 13.

Attachment.

1. Attachment against a Witness for not attending to give Evidence after Service with a Subpæna, denied, [See 5.] 27
2. At-

2. Attachment granted against Plaintiff for Non-payment to Administrator of Costs accrued in Defendant's Intestate's Lifetime,

Page 28

3. Attachment of Contempt against High-Bailiff of Westminster, for not bringing in the Body of a Prisoner in the Gate-bouse, who was charged with a bailable Action, discharged; the Keeper not giving any Security to the High Bailiff, 28, 29

4. Attachment of Contempt against the Bailiff of a Liberty, for not returning Sheriff's Mandate on an Attachment of Privilege, without any Mandavi Ballivo antecedent to the peremptory Rule,

5. The Court in some Cases will grant Attachment against Witnesses for not attending Trials, 31, 32

Attorny.

See Costs, 29.
Motice, 7, 9, 11, 12, 19.
Prisoners, 21.
Process, 1, 2, 4, 14.
Warrants of Attorny. 1.

1. Writ of Privilege to excuse an Attorny from serving in the Trained-Bands of the City, the Service being personal, 33

2. An Attorny who had been, at his own Instance, struck out of the Roll, restored

\$.	The Table of Principal Matters.
	to his Privilege on Motion, Page 33 3. Attornies must sue each other by Bill, not by Process; and that as well where they are of different Courts as of the same.
	[Post 5.] 34, 36 4. An Attorny forejudged must be sued in the common Way by Original; and a second Forejudger obtained pending the first, set aside, 35
	fide, fue an Attorny of B. R. by Attachment of Privilege, and he shall not be intitled to Privilege, [Ante 3.] 6. Proceedings staid, Plaintist having been struck off the Roll, and not able to verify a pretended written Authority from ano-
	ther Attorny, 7. Attorny's Bill that has been paid, not to be taxed; and Rule to shew Cause clandestinely obtained, discharged with Costs,
	8. Attorny, Prisoner, commencing an Action on a Bail-Bond affigned after his Imprisonment, in an Action begun before it, not within Stat. 12 Geo. 2. c. 13. it being a Continuance of the former Suit, &c.
	9. Rule on an Attorny to reimburse the Bail on the Bail-Bond their Debt and Costs, which they became liable to by his putting in Bail in B. R. discharged, he not being

an Attorny of this Court, nor ever practifed in it,

Page 41

- to. Rule for an Attorny to shew Cause why he should not be struck off the Roll, on Complaint that he had imposed on the Judge who admitted him by salse Suggestions, discharged with Costs, being fully answered,
- 11. Proceedings against an Attorny in an Action Qui tam commenced by Original, irregular, and staid, 43
- 12. Attorny's Bill ordered to be taxed, as between Attorny and Client, 121
- Attorny for many gross Blunders ordered to pay Costs,
- ing Attornies who are Prisoners, relates only to prosecuting, and not to defending Suits,

Audita Querela.

See Judgment, 29.

Award.

See Coffs, 27.

any two of them, &c. Award made by two, the third having sufficient Notice and not attending, held regular, and their Authority sufficient,

Vol. II.

Dd 2. Verdict

2. Verdict for Security, Matters referred by Rule, made a Rule of Court, Award for Defendant to pay, &c. if Plaintiff elects to proceed upon the Verdict for Non-performance, &c. he must apply to the Court for Leave.

3. Rule for a subscribing Witness to an Arbitration-Bond to shew Cause why he should not make an Affidavit touching the Execution of the Bond, made absolute, 55

4. On Application for Leave to take out Execution for Non-performance of Award, Affidavit of the due Execution of the Award, or of a Demand of the Mony, as necessary as if Plaintiff had proceeded by Attachment,

5. Award of Costs, where uncertain, 140 6. Award of Costs to be taxed by the proper Officer, held good; and that where fo generally awarded, the fworn Officer may ascertain the Quantum, 140

Bail.

See Judgment, 28, 29. Dutlaway, 6. Prisoners, 16. Scire facias, 4. Supersedeas. 1.

1. Where Proceedings on Bail-Bond are staid, on Confent that it shall stand as Plaintiff's Security, it is always intended, and should

ine interest interest interest
be expressed, that Judgmant be given, and
Execution only staid, Page 56
2. Defendant held to Bail in an Action for
the Penalty of 100 l. for not delivering
Goods of 300 l. Value, within a certain
Time, pursuant to Agreement in Writing,
56
3. Bail to an Action upon a Judgment;
Judgment against Defendant, and Writ
against Bail, before the Return of the Writ,
on Motion, Proceedings against Bail staid
pending a Writ of Error to reverse the

Judgment in the Actions against them, 57
4. Bail on Reversal of an Outlawry; Motion by them to have their Recognizance discharged, Plaintiff having proceeded to Judgment, though new Original was not filed within two Terms, and Defendant brought Writ of Error, denied, and left to their Plea,

first Judgment, they consenting to give

5. Affidavit to hold to Bail made by a third Person, must be positive, except in case of an Executor, where Belief is sufficient,

65, 58

6. Affidavit that Defendant was indebted if the Ship Suffex was unavoidably loft, prima facie sufficient, otherwise there could be no Bail in Bottomree Bonds; but Affidavits controverting the Fact heard on both Sides,

58

Dd2

7. De-

7. Defendant held to Bail by a Judge's Or-
der, in an Action for meine Profits after
Ejectment, discharged by Consent on com-
mon Appearance, the Acetiam, by Mif-
mon Appearance, the Acetiam, by Mif- take, being in Case instead of Trespass only,
Page 59
8. Two Days Notice of Justification is the
general Rule in all Cases, and denied to be
inlarged, for Plaintiff to make farther In-
quiry, 60, 83
9. Exception to Bail must be entered in Fi-
lazer's Book, or on the Bail-Piece, and
Notice of it given in Writing to Defen-
dant's Attorny, 61, 83
10. Bail cannot surrender the Defendant be-
fore the Return of the Writ; but it ha-
ving been done by Mistake, he was brought
into Court by Habeas Corpus, and rendered
de novo, 62
11. No Bail in Counties Palatine under 20 l.
62
12. Where the same Bail are put in above
as to the Sheriff, and excepted to, taking
Affignment of the Bail-Bond is not a
Waiver of the Exception, 63
13. Proceedings on Bail-Bond never staid
where Plaintiff has been delayed of Trial,
but upon Payment of Costs, and Consent
that Bail-Bond shall stand as a Security,
66
14. Delivery of Declaration as de bene esse, after the Time for putting in Bail is ex-
pired,

,
pired, no Waiver of Exception. Page 66
[Vide postea 42.]
15. But the Demand of a Plea is, ibid.
16. Bail cannot be put in after final Judg-
ment, 67
17. Proceedings on a Bail-Bond taken on a
Capias of this Court, set aside, with
Costs, Plaintiff's Attorny having put it in
Suit in B. R. 67, 68
18. How Bail to be put in to fave the Ad-
vantage of pleading in Abatement, 70
19. In an Action on a Judgment in inferior
Court, Bail required here, though Bail
was filed in the Original Action below,
20. Infant liable to the Debts of his Wife of
21. Proceedings on Bail-Bond staid on Pay-
ment of Debt and Costs, &c. 73
22. Husband and Wife arrested, Bail put in
for both, and rendered to the Fleet, the
Wife discharged on common Appearance,
74
23. Where the Caption of Recognizance is
in another County, and afterwards inrolled
in Middlesez, Scire facias may be in either
County, 74, 75, 168
24. But where the Caption is in Middlesex,
Scire facias must be there also, ibid.
25. Filazer makes out the first Scire facias,
Prothonotary the fecond, 75, 76
DA_{\bullet}

The Table of Principal Matters.	The	Table	of	Principal	Matters.
---------------------------------	-----	-------	----	-----------	----------

26. Proceedings on Bail-Bond Itaid, Defen-
dant in Original Action dying before Judg-
ment could be had against him, Page 79
27. Not staid where there might have been
Judgment if he had put in Bail in Time,
80
28. Wife not discharged on a common Ap-
pearance, unless the Marriage is clearly
made out, 80
29. The producing a Duplicate of Defen-
dant's Discharge as a Fugitive, held suffi-
cient to intitle him to a common Appear-
ance, 81, 85, 88
30. Affidavit by a third Person, that Desen-
dant was indebted as appeared by a stated
Account, infufficient; but made good by
a subsequent one of Defendant's acknow-
ledging the Account, 81
31. Defendant producing his Certificate as a
Bankrupt, discharged on a common Ap-
pearance, 82
r ,
32. Justification before a Judge no Justifica-
tion but by Plaintiff's Consent, 82
33. The Rule of Court requiring Bail to be
perfected within four Days after Excep-
tion, intends the next four Days in Term,
83
34. Bail residing in the Country, who had
entered into a Recognizance before a Judge
in Town, on Exception justified by Affi-
davit, 84
35. Where

The	Table	of	Principal	Matters.
100	·(uvic	IJ	1 i incepai	TATARRACIO

The Table of Principal Matters.
35. Where Rule upon Sheriff to bring in the Body in fix Days, Justification before a Judge within that Time sufficient, un-
less Plaintiff excepts, Page 84
less Plaintiff excepts, Page 84 36. Proceedings on Bail-Bond staid upon Terms, Plaintiff having delayed himself,
37. Leave to enter an Exoneretur on the Re-
cognizance, Defendant, pending the Ac-
tion having become a Bankrupt, and ob-
tained his Certificate, 87 38. Proceedings staid as against one of the
Bail, two other having been justified in
Court after Exception, 87, 88
39. So as to the other, Process having been
ferved two Days only before the Return, 87, 88
40. Proceedings on Bail-Bond staid, Defen-
dant in Original Action having become a
Bankrupt, and obtained his Certificate,
41. Defendant cannot render himself, unless
Bail perfected in Time, 90
42. Where delivering Declaration is a Wai-
ver of Exception, ibid.
43. Recognizance is forfeited immediately af-
ter a Ca' sa' returned, 91, 92 44. Bail in Action of Debt on Judgment dis-
charged, there being Bail in the Original
Action, 93
45. In Covenant, Bail only where Damages
can be reduced to a Certainty, 94 D d 4 46. So
40.00

46. So in Action on Bond to fave harmless, Plaintiff must swear positively and certainly how and for how much he is damnified,

Page 97

47. A new Bail-Piece made out that Bail might furrender Defendant, the old one not being to be found on Filazer's File, on Affidavit of Defendant's Agent that it had been allowed and filed,

48. A common Appearance denied, the Matter alledged being improper to be discussed on a Motion.

49. The Rule to prevent Sheriffs Officers, and other Persons concerned in the Execution of Process, from being Bail, extends only to Process of this Court,

50. Seaman discharged on common Appearance, being in King's Service; and where such Service continues, though absent, 71

Bail on Habeas Coppus.

The Rule for Bail is not limited to any particular Time,

Bail in Erroz.

1. The Scire facias on a Recognizance of Bail on a Writ of Error, never fets forth the Condition of the Recognizance, 68
2. The

2. The Recognizance in Error on Judgment after Verdict in Ejectment, to be taken in the Value of two Years Profits, and double Costs,

Page 86

3. No Bail required in Writ of Error brought by Bail on Award of Execution against them on a Recognizance in Error, 161

4. Where Rule for better Bail ferved in Vacation, Defendant has not Time of Course to perfect his Bail till the next Term, but ought to justify before a Judge; and Execution sued out for want of it, held regular,

Bail=Bond.

See Bail, 1, 12, 13, 17, 21, 26, 27, 36, 40.

Bankrupt.

See Bail, 31, 37. Bony into Court, 17. Double Pleas not allowed, 7. Prisoners, 4.

1. Court is not required by Stat. 5 Geo. 2.
c. . to proceed in a summary Way as to the Goods of a Bankrupt, though they are as to his Person, 162, 165

Baron

Baron and Feme.

See Bail, 22, 28. Ejeament, 12. Execution, 5.

Bills against Attornies, &c.

See Amendment, 12. Attorny, 3, 5.

Bills of Attorny.

See Attomy, 7, 12. Cons. 1.

Bills of Erchange and Promisory Notes.

See Executors, &c. 1, 2. Anguiry, 5. Arial, 15. Aenue, 9.

Certiozari.

See Amendment, 6.

Commission.

Commission.

1. Commissioners Names, according to 12

Ann. to examine touching secret Trusts
for Papists, struck by Prothonotary, and
Interrogatories settled by him,

Page
1, 276

Commitment.

See Pabeas Coppus, 4, 6. Pzisoners, 3.

Composition.

See Trial, 24.

Continuance.

See Execution, 3. Imparlance, 8. Pleadings, 1.

Cofts.

See Attachment, 2. Attorny, 9, 10, 13. Award, 5, 6. Ejeament, 1, 5. Imparlance, 6.

Costs.

See Inquiry, 3.
 Indogment, 3, 5, 20, 32.
 Dony into Court, 1, 6.
 Noncuit, 1.
 Outlawly, 2, 9, 14, 15.
 Pleadings, 2.
 Plocess, 14.
 Replevin, 1.
 Orial, &c. 24.

in his Bill, the Court will confider the Sum accepted as his Demand; and if Deduction from that does not amount to a fixth Part, he shall not pay the Costs of taxing,

Page 98

2. No Costs against Plaintiff Administrator, where Conversion in Intestate's Life-time, 99

Aliter where in his own Time, 106

3. A new Affignment no Special Pleading to intitle Plaintiff to more Costs than Damages, under 22 & 23 Car. 2.

4. Doubted if Administrators, Plaintiffs in Prohibition, ought to pay Costs for not proving their Suggestion within six Months,

g. Costs of Suit in Prohibition commence from the Suggestion,

6. In Prohibition, where a feigned Islue was directed to try a Fact for the Information

				N.		
The	Table	of	Pri	incipal	Matt	ers.
JC 17 V	_,,,,,,,	J			-,	
the	Court	, on	a	Verdic	t for	Plaintiff,

J
of the Court, on a Verdict for Plaintiff,
Costs given him, Page 101
7. Executor Plaintiff not liable to Costs on
a Nonfuit, according to Statute, 102
8. Costs in one Cause refused to be set against
Costs in another, the Parties not being the
fame, 102
But granted where the same, 128
9. Defendant cannot move for Judgment
as in Case of a Nonsuit, after having ob-
tained a Rule for Costs for not proceeding
to Trial, 103, 251, 253
10. Where several Defendants in Ejectment,
and one acquitted, how he is to have
Cofts,
11. No more Costs than Damages in Action
for Words, unless the Words are not ac-
tionable in themselves, but only with re-
fpect to the special Damage, 104, 111, 124
12. Though the Plea confessed the Trespass,
yet Issue joined, and Trial, and Verdict for
Defendant, but Court gave Judgment for
Plaintiff; and Writ of Inquiry being executed, how Costs given him, 106
13. Plaintiff shall not pay Costs for not pro-
ceeding to Trial according to Notice, where
his Default is not wilful,
14. Ejectment in this Court staid till Costs
in a former brought in B. R. paid, 107
15. Where Plaintiff intitled, or not, to more
Costs than Damages, the Damages under
40 s. 108, 109, 110, 127
16. Cofts

The	Table	of	Principal	Matters.
		•		

y
16. Costs denied for not executing Writ of
Inquiry before a Judge of Affize, pursuant
to Notice, Page 111
17. From what Time treble Costs upon in-
folvent Debtors Act are to be computed,
112
18. How Costs to be taxed, where Defen-
dant pleads feveral Pleas by Leave of the
Court, and some are found against him,
[Vide post. 25, 26.] 112, 120, 121
19. Costs of an Amendment paid Plaintiff's
Agent after Plaintiff's Death, ordered to
be returned,
20. In Prohibition Costs given pursuant to
Stat. Will. 3.
21. In Trover against three, and two ac-
quitted, no Costs for them, 118
22. In Quare impedit no Costs, 118
23. How Costs where Issue and Demurrer
joined, and Verdict on one for Plaintiff,
and on the other Judgment for Defendant,
122
24. Executors and Administrators liable to
Costs in no Actions which they cannot
bring in their own Right, 122
25. Assault and Battery against two, who plead several Matters, Verdict for one Defendant in one Plea, but Costs denied;
plead several Matters, Verdict for one De-
fendant in one Plea, but Costs denied;
4 & 5 Ann. not extending to the Case,
126
26. So doubted if it extends to Replevin,
121, 126
27. Though

27. Though Arbitrators award Costs of Suit and Reference, yet Prothonotary only to tax to the Reference, Page 54

28. Where Countermand of Trial is regular, Costs cannot be allowed for a Witness who set out before it,

29. Costs ordered to be paid by Attorny both to Plaintiff and Defendant, for pleading fraudulently two Judgments without Defendant's Order or Privity, 290

Covenant.

See Mony into Court, 4, 13. Pleadings, 9.

Courts of Conscience.

1. Leave given to enter a Suggestion on the Roll, (pursuant to Stat. 1 W. & M. erecting Courts of Conscience at B. and G.) that the Parties are both Inhabitants of G. and the Debt recovered under 40 s. 282

Damages.

See Inquiry, 3. Iudgment, 32. Crial, 7.

1. Inquisition resused to be set aside for Smallness of Damages, 129 Decta-

Declaration.

See Amendment, 4, 5, 13, 20, 22, 30, 32.

Bail, 14, 42.

Demurrer, 6.

Ejeament, 4, 8.

Erecutors, &c. 3.

Imparlance, 3, 4.

Iudgment, 13, 21, 23, 26, 27.

Notice, &c. 13, 16, 20.

Prisoner, 14, 15.

Supersedeas, 2, 3.

Crial, 14.

Uenue, 5, 7, 10.

- 1. Where Plaintiff delays himself, by not delivering Declaration de bene esse, Page 66
- 2. Pledges need not be put into the Declaration, 134
- 3. Action of Debt on Judgment laid in Essex,
 Declaration held bad on Demurrer, it
 should have been in Middlesex, 139
- 4. Declaration well delivered from Time of Notice only, 186
- 5. Declaration by the Bye cannot be regularly delivered after the Term in which the Writ was returnable, 270
- 6. Declaration in Trespass reduced from five to two Counts

 294
 7. The

7. The particular Place of taking Goods, &c. ought to be inferted in every Declaration in Replevin, Page 281

Demurrer.

See Mony into Court, 11. Pleadings, 14. . Heir, 1.

- 1. Declaration of Trinity, Imparlance to Michaelmas; Defendant obtains Time to plead till 15 Dec. Plaintiff has a Right to continue Imparlance on the Roll, according to the Fact,
- 2. Plea in Abatement traversing the Inhabitancy, bad, 133
- 3. Not bad though beginning with "Comes and defends the Injury when, &c." ibid.
- 4. Leave to withdraw Demurrer on Payment of Costs, to pay 10 l. into Court upon the common Rule, and plead the General Issue, 134
- 5. Motion for a *Concilium* before Delivery of Paper-Book, irregular, and what the regular Practice, 135, 138
- 6. Demurrer to a Replication fetting forth an Attachment of Privilege, for that no Return General or Special appeared, held, Vol. II. E e that

that the Words in the Declaration " was " attached by Writ, &c." refer to the Return, whenever it was, Page 135

7. Rule relating to Demurrer-Books to be delivered to the Judges, 136

8. A Demurrer not an issuable Rejoinder within Judge's Order, [See Judgment 19.]

Discontinuance.

1. Whether Plaintiff in Replevin may difcontinue, 145

2. Application by Plaintiff to discontinue after Motion by Defendant for Judgment as in case of a Nonsuit, wrong, 254

Distress.

See Trial, 24.

Dower.

See Inquiry, 6. Imparlance, 9.

Ejeament.

Cjeament.

See Amendment, 15.
Ball in Erroz, 2.
Colfs, 10, 14.
Execution, 7.
Judgment, 17.
Process, 17.
Charrant of Attorny, 2.

Lesson Nonsuit for want of confessing, &c. Lesson of Plaintist having taken out a Fi' fa' against Desendant's Goods for Costs, instead of proceeding on the common Rule, Fi' fa' set aside, with Costs to be paid by him and his Attorny, &c. Page 146

2. Proceedings staid on Payment to Plaintiffs, Assignees, of Mortgage-Mony and Costs, but not of a Bond, &c. due to them in their own Right,

3. Where Landlord made Defendant does not appear to confess, &c. how Execution to be taken out, 148, 152

4. What good Service of Declaration in Ejectment, 148, 152

5. Rule for Infant Lessor to name a good Plaintiff, or give Security for Costs, 140

6. Proceedings staid on Payment to Plaintiffs; who were both Devices and Execu-E e 2 tors;

Th	e :	Table		of Principal			al A	Matters.	
S.	Re	ent	đυ	e t	0	them	as	Devisees.	but

tors, Rent due to them as Devisees, but
not as Executors, &c. Page 150
7. Judgment arrested for Uncertainty, the
Ejectment being for a Messuage in the Pa-
rishes of J. and M. or one of them, 150
8. Rule for Judgment in Michaelmas, unless
Appearance within four Days after Notice,
denied, where Declaration was intitled of
Trinity 17th instead of 16th & 17th,
153
9. Leave to take out Execution, neither Te-
nants nor Landlord added to them, &c.
having appeared in Time, 154 10. Service of Declaration where Tenants
abscond or secrete themselves, 157
jectment against a Person of the same
Name with the cafual Ejector: Proceed-
Name with the casual Ejector; Proceedings staid, and Rule for the Attorny to
fhew Caufe why he should not pay the
Costs, discharged, 158
12. Motion by Lessor of Plaintiff, that the
conditional Rule entered into by his Wife
by another Name, might be fet aside,
denied; Court thinking the Validity of
the Marriage a fit Matter to be tried, 160
13. Actions for mesne Profits tend to create
double Expence; Plaintiff should be ready
at the Trial of the Ejectment to prove his
Damages, 59 14. The Rule as to the Time from which
mesne Profits are to be recovered, ibid.
Elizors.
Q11.5/46%1

Elizors.

See Jury, 2, 3.

Erroz.

See Bail, 3.
Bail in Erroz, 1, 2, 3, 4.
Execution, 7, 12, 13, 14.
Judgment, 31.
Outlawry, 13.
Scire facias, 1, 2.

Nonpros figned for want of transcribing the Record, set aside, because no final Judgment was entered, Page 161
 Writ of Error no Supersedeas from the Sealing, but from the Delivery to the Clerk of the Errors, 164, 170

Evidence.

See Habeas Cozpus, 2. Inquiry, 5, 9. Pleadings, 15. Crial, 1, 8, 9, 19, 26, 29, 33.

Erecutions.

See Award, 4. Cjeament, 1, 9. Pzocels, 1.

1. After Execution executed, though Judg-
ment for a Penalty, Court has no Power
to refer to Prothonotaries to examine into
Sum due, &c. and to order Restitution of
Overplus, Page 162
2. Rule to shew Cause why Fieri facias and
Venditioni exponas should not be set aside,
they not having issued from same Office in
which Judgment was figned, discharged;
Application being made too late, 163
3. Ca' fa, iffuing after more than a Year
from the last, without Continuance on the
Roll, set aside, notwithstanding a written
Agreement, 165
4. Ca' sa' iffued after a Year and a Day from
the Judgment, without Scire facias to re-
vive, set aside, [sed vide 172.] 166
3. Action by Husband and Wife, who fail
in the Action, Wife only taken in Execu-
tion, discharged, 167
6. Execution set aside, the Scire facias to
revive having iffued into a wrong County,
167
. After Verdict for Plaintiff, Leave to take
out Execution on the Judgment against
the
·

The Table of Principal Matters. the casual Ejector, non obstante a Writ of

the calual Ejector, non objeance a Will of
Error brought by Defendant, denied, Page
169
8. Where Plaintiff brings Action on a Judg-
ment, he cannot take out Execution on
the Judgment till he has discontinued the
Action, 160
9. In case of a Test' Fi' fa', Court will not
inquire nicely when the Fi' fa' in the ori-
ginal County was fued out; it is fufficient
if it be produced returned, 169,
171, 174
10. Judgment in a Joint Action against se-
ven Defendants, Fi' fa' sued out against
the Goods of one only, 172
11. A Bill of Sale is a Removal of Goods
taken by a Fi' fa', and a Year's Rent or-
dered to be paid the Landlord, 174
12. Certificate from Clerk of the Errors that
no Bail is put in, is not necessary before
taking out Execution, 175
13. If Defendant's Person be taken by Ca
fa', and Bail in Error afterwards perfected,
the Person shall be discharged; but in case
of a Fi' fa', the Proceedings, so far as the
Sheriff has gone, must stand, 175
14. Executor may revive, but cannot take
out Execution pending Writ of Error,
347

Executors and Administrators.

See Coss. 2, 4, 7, 24. Gjeament, 6. Execution, 14. Pony into Court, 15.

- 1. Executors and Administrators may indorse Promisory Notes and Bills of Exchange, Page 127
- 2. Indorsee of Administrators may declare without *Profert* of Letters of Administration, 137
- 3. In Action against Administrator it is sufficient to call him Administrator of the Goods, &c. without alledging that Administration had been granted to him, 142
- 4. After a Rule by Consent to refer to the Prothonotary, Plaintiff died before Report, his Executor, upon Application, made Party to the Rule, and Prothonotary directed to proceed without Consent of Defendant to this Rule,
- 5. Motion for Executor to pay Defendant a Sum of Mony, reported by Prothonotary to have been levied by Plaintiff more than was due, denied, 228

Fines

Fines and Recoveries.

See Amendment, 16, 23, 26, 28.

Fine by Infant Trustees by Order of the Court of Chancery, how passed, Page 176
 Fines taken at Hamburgh, how passed, 176

Habeas Coppus.

See Amendment, 7, 29. Bail, 10. Bail on Habeas Corpus, 1. Prisoners, 2, 3, Process, 17.

1. Habeas Corpus ad testissicandum for two Prisoners in Execution in the Fleet, denied, for want of the Consent of the Warden, 178, 179

2. So Rule for their being examined on Interrogatories, and their Depositions read in Evidence at the Trial, denied, for want of Defendant's Consent, ibid.

3. Where Defendant is to be charged in Execution on feveral Judgments, there must be a Habeas Corpus on every Judgment,

4. In what Causes Court has Jurisdiction to commit

commit Prisoner, brought up by Habeas Corpus, to the Fleet, Page 180

5. Where Prisoner removed by Habeas Corpus, in what Court Plaintiff must declare,

300

6. Commitment (on an Habeas Corpus returnable before Chief Justice) by another Judge, regular, without Amendment of the Return, 19.

Beir.

1. Debt on Bond against Heir on 3 & 4 W. & M. c. 14. on Demurrer, Judgment for him, the Testator's Estate being devised for Payment of Debts, 136,

Imparlance.

See Demurrer, 1. Pleadings, 10.

1. There can be no Imparlance after peremptory Rule to plead, 181, 208

2. Imparlance ordered, Defendant being a Lunatic. 181

3. Though Writ returnable the first Return, Imparlance granted, Declaration not having been delivered with Notice to plead, according to the general Rule, 182, 183

4. But denied where a Notice had been ferved,

ved, though not indorfed on the Declaration, Page 182, 183, 185

5. By Virtue of a Rule for Leave to file a Bill to warrant Proceedings, Plaintiff may, as a necessary Consequence, enter an Imparlance on the Roll, 184

6. But where not entered in Time, Plaintiff paid Costs, &c. ibid.

7. Time to plead and an Imparlance are the fame Thing, 269

8. Imparlance, how to be entered and continued on the Roll, ibid.

9. Imparlance not to be given in real Actions,

Infant.

See Bail, 20. Fines, &c. 1. Process, 12.

I. After proceeding to Judgment against Infant as of full Age, it is too late to apply for Rule to shew Cause why Appearance in Person should not be struck out, and Defendant appear by Guardian, or in Default Plaintiff to do it for him,

Inquiry.

Inquiry.

See Amendment, 11. Coffs, 16. Damages, 1. Judgment, 23. Potice, &c. 1, 4, 14, 17, 18, 19.

1. Motion to fet afide Writ of Inquiry, it having been executed before a Deputy appointed by Under-Sheriff, Page 187, 188

2. So for its having been altered before the Return, but denied, it having been refealed, and not made Use of before, 189

3. Inquiry set aside on Payment of Costs, &c. for excessive Damages, 189

4. Objections to the Regularity of an Inquiry, cured by Defendant's making a Defence,

190, 246, 325

5. On executing Inquiry, a Note and Indorfement must be produced and proved; not pleading is not a sufficient Admission of them,

190, 192

6. On executing Inquiry in Dower, how, and to what Time the Jury are to compute the Third Part and Costs, 191

7. Rule absolute for executing Inquiry before a Judge of Assize, though no Assidavit produced to support the Rule, 193

8. Verbal Deputation for executing Writ of Inquiry

Inquiry infufficient; it should be in Writing, under Hand and Seal, Page 325

9. Inquisition set aside, and Leave for Plaintiff to execute a new Writ of Inquiry; the Sheriff, on Execution of the Writ, having admitted improper Evidence for Defendant, whereby Damages were lessened,

354

Inspection of Court-Rolls and Books.

1. Rule absolute for Defendant, a Brewer, to inspect the Company's Books, and take Copies, though no Member, 194

2. Defendant a Copyholder of the Manor, denied Leave to inspect and take Copies of the Court-Rolls, &c. for want of Affidavit that Application had been made to the Lord, or his Steward, who had refused,

194

Interrogatories.

See Habeas Cozpus, 2. Commission, 1.

Maue.

See Amendment, 17. Judgment, 3. Motice, &c. 6. Monpros, &c. 11. Dper, 3. Rules, 3. Trial, 27, 30.

Judgments.

See Amendment, 19. **Ball**, 16. Ciemment, 7, 8. Infant, 1. Mony into Court, 9. Monpros, &c. 2.

i. Judgment-Roll where received and filed nunc pro tunc, Page 196, 198

2. Motion to set aside the Doquet of a Judgment as void, by 4 & 5 W. & M. denied, there appearing no Fraud, but that the Roll was accidentally mislaid,

3. Judgment figned for want of paying for Iffue-Book, fet afide without Costs; Plaintiff having demanded more than was due, 199, 220, 221

4. Where Defendant, under Order to plead an issuable Plea, pleaded in Abatement, I

held

The	Table	of	Principal	Matters.

Zio Zinoto of Zitonofin ziminoto.
held Plaintiff was regular in figning Judgment, and not obliged to apply to the Court to fet aside the Plea, Page 200 5. Judgment set aside, without Costs, Defendant, on craving Oyer, not having had a perfect Copy of the Bond, &c. given him,
9. On Issue of Nul tiel Record, how the Rule for Judgment to be drawn up, 202 7. Judgment set aside on Terms, though Time to plead was out; Judge's Summons for further Time having been served before Judgment could regularly be signed, 204
8. Plaintiff died the 1st December, Judgment figned the 6th, held good by Relation, the Roll having been filed before the Essoign-Day of Hilary, 205, 208, 209, 212 9. Where a Judge's Order for two Days Time to plead, Judgment cannot be figned till the third Day in the Asternoon,
Plaintiff, notwithstanding the Verdict against him, the Plea having confessed the Trespass, 206 11. How such Verdict and Judgment to be entered, ibid. 12. Judgment signed for want of Assidavit on a Parol Demurrer, put in by an Infant, set aside, it not being requisite, 206 13. Judgment resuled to be set aside, because
Decla

Declaration was delivered, and Pleas de-
manded, in the Country, Page 207
14. Motion to fet afide Judgment, Proceed-
ings having been upon Statute for prevent-
ing vexatious Arrests, which was expired,
216, 217
15. After Judgment figned, it is too late to
complain of Irregularity of Process, 211
16. Where Defendants plead several Pleas,
and there is Judgment for Plaintiff on one,
the other Pleas must be tried before Plain-
tiff can recover, 211
17. Judgment against Casual Ejector signed,
for want of a Plea in Form set aside, with-
out Costs, 212
18. Judgment on Warrant of Attorny figned
the Day after Defendant's Death, refused
to be set aside, 212
19. Defendant, under Judge's Order to plead
issuably, rejoin gratis, &c. instead of rejoin-
ing, demurred; Plaintiff figned Judgment,
and held regular, [See Demurrer 8.] 213
and held regular, [See Demurrer 8.] 213 20. A regular Judgment set aside, on Pay-
ment of Costs, and pleading an issuable
Plea, without confining Defendants to the
General Issue, 214, 298
21. Judgment set aside; Plaintiff, after Su-
persedeas of Exigent having delivered a
Declaration, without Notice to plead in-
dorsed, and figning Judgment in four
Days, when Defendant was intitled to eight
214
2 Judg-

· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
22. Judgment figned for want of new Pleas
after Amendment of Declaration, fet aside.
Defendant may, or may not, plead de no-
vo. as he thinks proper Page 217
vo, as he thinks proper, Page 217 23. Judgment and Inquiry set aside, Decla-
ration being intitled of Michaelmas instead
of Hilary Term, 219
24. Judgment for Plaintiff on Nul tiel Re-
cord, though objected that the Record
produced was for Damages and Costs, and
the Declaration for Damages only, 219
25. A regular Judgment set aside, on Pay-
ment of Costs and pleading the General
Issue, 221
26. Judgment set aside for want of a De-
mand of a Plea in Writing, the Demand
of a Plea indorfed on Declaration delivered
not sufficient, 222
27. Motion in Arrest of Judgment for Un-
certainty, Declaration in Trespals being
for taking, &c. divers Quantities of China
Ware, &c. but denied, 222
28. Judgment, and all subsequent Proceed-
ings against Bail, set aside, it not having
been figned till about two Months after
the Death of the original Plaintiff, 223
29. Where a Judgment is erroneous in Fact,
if it may also be deemed irregular, and
the Application to fet it aside be recent,
Bail ought not to be put to Audita
Querelâ, 224

30. On Motion to fet afide a Judgment by Warrant of Attorny, suggested to be on an usurious Contract, an Issue directed to try the Fact,

Page 224

31. The Entry of Arrest of Judgment must be made before Plaintiff can bring a Writ of Error, or maintain a new Action, 226

32. Regular Judgment and Inquiry fet aside, and Plea amended, on Payment of Costs, and bringing the Damages sound into Court,

Jurata.

See Amendment, 1, 2.

Jury.

See Trial, 16, 17, 21.

t. Where a Special Jury may be moved for by Defendant, after Cause made a Remander, 355, 376

2. Special Jury, where to be struck and rerurned by Elizors, 382

3. Elizors, how to be chosen, 382

4. Motion for Special Jury too late after Venire facias and Return filed, 385

Wony

Mony into Court, &c.

See Demurrer, 4. Pleadings, 6.

Ì.	The Form of the Common Rule altered
2.	and made obligatory upon Defendants to pay Costs, Page 227 Common Rule obtained from Secondary for Payment of Mony on a Bill penal, with a Count added on Mutuatus, wrong, but refused to be set aside after Verdist in
3•	but refused to be set aside after Verdict in Desendant's Favour, 228 Rule to shew Cause why on Desendant's bringing into Court Curtains, &c. Proceedings should not stay, discharged, they
4.	having been altered, &c. 220 Money brought into Court in Covenant, where the Breach was affigned in a Sum
5.	Money brought in by Defendant, ordered to be paid Plaintiff, tho' Judgment arrested,
6.	Where Plaintiff, after Refusal, applies for Leave to take Mony, he must pay subsequent Costs to Defendant, 230, 235, 289
7 •	Leave to bring Mony, &c. refused in Action on a Bond, conditioned for Bailiff's Good Behaviour, and for his paying

Mony for the Sheriff's Use,

Ff2

23I

8. Sø

Potice and Countermand.

See Amendment, 31.

Award, 1. Colls, 28. Declaration, 4. Imparlance, 3, 4. Judgment, 21.
1. Same Notice necessary of executing Scire fieri Inquiry as of an Inquiry of Dama-
ges, Page 237 2. Where Commission-Day of Assizes was Monday, and Countermand on the Satur-
day before, held regular, 237 3. Verdict fet aside for want of sourteen Days Notice of Trial, Defendant residing above
forty Miles from London, 238 4. Notice of executing Inquiry given in the Country, good, 239
5. Notice of Trial given to the Attorny in the Country, good, ibid.
6. But where given on the Issue-Book, must be to the Agent in Town, ibid.
7. All Notices where the Party hath a known Attorny, must be given to the Attorny, or his Agent, and not to the Party himself,
8. Proceedings staid, Notice on Process being to appear on 27th of October next, instead of this instant October, 240, 243, 246

Ff3

9. Where

9. Where Defendant beyond Sea, and his
9. Where Defendant beyond Sea, and his Attorny dead, what sufficient Notice,
Page 241
10. Where there have been no Proceedings
for a Year, a Term's Notice must be given,
242
This does not extend to Motions to end
Proceedings, 244
11. Where the Attorny cannot be found,
Notice may be ferved on the Party him-
felf, 242
12. Where neither Attorny nor Party can be
found, the Court must be applied to, 242
13. Notice of Declaration served on a Sun-
day, bad, and an Imparlance granted, 245
14. Notice of executing Inquiry must be
certain as to the Place, 245
15. Proceedings staid, Notice having been
delivered after nine o'Clock, 246
16. Notice of Declaration left de bene esse,
without indorfing the Declaration, not
fufficient, 247
17. Notice of executing Inquiry mistaking
Plaintiff's Name, bad, and Inquiry, &c.
fet afide, 247
18. Notice of executing Inquiry before Judge
of Affize, should be general, and not for
a particular Day,
19. Inquiry set aside for want of sourteen
Days Notice, though Defendant an Attor-
ny, he living forty Miles from London,
203
20. Notice

20. Notice of Declaration left under Door of Defendant's House, where good, Page 225

Monpros and Monsuit.

See Coffs, 9. Discontinuance, 2. Ejedment, 1, 2. Erroz, 1. Crial, 22.

1. Nonsuit set aside on Payment of Costs, 248

Contra, 255

Judgment as in case of a Nonshit how

2. Judgment as in case of a Nonsuit, how to be moved for, 248, 255

3. What Cause held sufficient to prevent Nonsuit, 249, 250, 252, 256, 381

4. Where the Court admits the Caufe shewn sufficient, they will appoint a future Day for the Trial,

5. Rule to shew Cause why Judgment as in Case of a Nonsuit, on what Terms discharged, 249, 253, 254

6. Application for Judgment as in case of a Nonsuit, when to be made, 250

7. Nonpros figned, Plaintiff in Replevin, though under Order to plead issuably, having demurred, held regular, 250

Regular Nonpros, on what Terms fet a-fide, 250

Ff₄ 9. Actions

9. Actions Qui tam, &c. within the Statute for Judgment as in case of a Nonsuit, Page

253

10. So Replevins,

257

11. Nonpros for want of entring Issue figned a Day too foon, set aside, 257

Mul tiel Recozd.

See Judgment, 6, 24.

Dziginal.

See Process, 6, 10.

Dutlawzy.

See Bail, 4. Judgment, 21.

1. Proceedings on the Exigent post Ca' sa' staid, Defendant after the Teste and before the Return becoming a Prisoner in the Fleet,

2. So in like Case Outlawry reversed, without Payment of Costs to Plaintiff, on Defendant's entring a common Appearance, 259

3. Defendant waived specially on mesne Process, as a single Woman, after the Exigent and before the Outlawry, married, Court resulted to interpose, 259

4. In

4. In case of a total Absconding, no En	ıdea-
vours to arrest are necessary, Page	260
5. Capias, Alias and Pluries may be	fued
out together,	260
6. On Process to Outlawry no Affidavi	
	ibid
7. Date to fuch Process not usual.	ibid
7. Date to fuch Process not usual,8. Return of the Proclamations, where	finf.
ficient,	261
9. After Return of the Exigent, but w	
in the Hands of the Sheriff, a Super	eden
allowed on Payment of Costs,	
10. Motion to set aside Outlawry after J	
ment, for want of a Proclamation,	
nied,	262
•	
11. Proceedings refused to be staid, w	/11616
Plaintiff died after the Day of Outla	
but before the Return,	262
12. Motion for Outlawry to be reverse	
Plaintiff's Expence; Defendant's v	
Exigent issued, and still being beyond	-
D'C ' ' O ' ' '	263
13. Discretionary in Court to relieve by	
tion, or put Parties to a Writ of E	
	264
14. Outlawries in Trespass Quare clausum	fre-
git Defendants have a Right to rever	
their own Expence, on entring com	mon
Appearances and Payment of Costs,	264
15. What Costs to be paid,	ibid
	mor.

Dyer.

See Judgment, 5.

1. Oyer must be demanded before Time for pleading expires, Page 165, 208

2. Where Oyer demanded, Defendant intitled to a Copy of the Whole, 200

3. Where Defendant craves Oyer, and has it, but makes it no Part of his Plea, Plaintiff may make up the Issue with Oyer, 262

Pleadings.

See Amendment, 9, 21, 24, 25, 27.

Bail, 15.

Coffs, 3, 18, 25, 26.

Demurrer, 4, 8.

Imparlance, 1, 7.

Judgment, 4,13,14,20,22,25,26,32.

Mony into Court, 11, 14, 16, 17, 18.

Dyer, 1.

Trial, 20.

Cenue, 11.

1. Plea Puis darrein Continuance, 269

2. Leave to withdraw the General Issue, and plead Special Justification, granted upon Payment of Costs, 270

3. Claim of Cognizance comes too late after Plea pleaded and Replication tendering an Issue, 270

4. Leave for Defendant to withdraw his Avowry, and avow Property in a Stranger, 273

5. Plea

The Table of Principal Matters. Plea in Abatement fet aside, both the Plea

g. Flea in Abatement let ande, both the Flea
and Affidavit to verify it being wrong in-
titled, Page 274
6. Leave to withdraw Plea of Tender, plead
General Issue, and pay Mony into Court
upon the common Rule, denied, 275
7. Leave to plead a Tender after the first four
Days, where granted, 279, 281, 284,
288, 291, 295, 296
8. Cepit in alio Loco is a Plea in Bar, and
not in Abatement, 281
9. In Covenant, General Performance of Co-
venants not an issuable Plea under Judge's
Order, and fet afide, 284.
10. Too late to plead a Tender after a Ge-
neral Imparlance, 284
11. Coverture, where not a good Plea in A-
batement, 285
12. Leave to plead several Matters must be
given by the Court, it cannot be done by
a Judge's Order, 288
13. Defendant pleads a Tender, Plaintiff re-
plies, and afterwards takes the Mony brought
in, and enters an Acquittal; held he
could not enter an Acquittal without Ap-
plication to Court and Payment of Costs
to Defendant, 289
14. On Motion to plead double, unless pri-
mâ facie the Pleas appear to be frivolous,
the Court will not confider whether they are
material or not; Plaintiffs may demur, 292
15. Difference between Pleading Non Assump-
fit

fit and Non Assumptit infra sex Annos, as to the Evidence which may be given under them,

16. Leave to plead Ancient Demesse, on Affidavit that the Premisses in Question were reputed to be such,

17. Ancient Demesse must be pleaded within the first four Days of the Term,

18. All Pleadings should be entered according to the Truth of the Term of which they were,

Double Pleas allowed.

See Mony into Court, &c. 10, 14, 17.

1.	Plene Administravit and a Set-off,	with-
	out an Affidavit,	272
2.	So Non Assumpsit and Plene Administra	
	without Affidavit,	273
3.	Not guilty, and a General Release,	
	Not guilty, and 4 l. 4 s. paid Plair	
•	Satisfaction of all Trespasses to s	uch a
	Time,	274
ζ.	Ne unques Executor, and Plene A	
	~	5, 286
~	Y 1, 00 400 1 1 0 (1)	·

6. Non cul', Son Assault demesse, and Molliter Manus imposuit, on Assidavit, Rule absolute to plead first and last, 279

7. Non est factum and Ne unques Executor, 279 8. Non cul' and Son Assault demesse, on Af-

fidavit, 280

9. Not

9. Not guilty, Son assault demesne, and	Sa-
tisfaction for all Trespasses, Page	280
10. Non cul', Son Assault demesne, and M.	_
ter Manus imposuit,	
	285,
12. Non est factum and Duress.	•
13. Non Assumpsit, a Set-off, and a Te	292
as of last Term,	293
14. A Tender of Mony to the first Co	293 Dun t -
and Non Assumplit to the Relidue,	
<i>y</i> 13	9 -
Double Pleas not allowe	d.
	_
1. In Quare impedit, Rule to shew Cause	-
Defendant should not plead nine diff	
Matters, denying all the Matters in	i the
Declaration, discharged,	270
2. Non cul', and Liberum Tenementum	
nied, it not being necessary; and in	wnat
Cases it is necessary, 3. Not guilty, and a Licence, without	A CF
davit, denied; and where Affidavits	11111-
ceffary or not,	278
4. Not guilty, and a Release of a parti	
Trespass, never granted,	178
5. Stat. 4 Ann. for pleading double doe	
extend to Suits where the King is a I	arty,
unless for Debt immediately or	
10.	, 282
6. Not guilty, and a Tender, denied,7. In Trover, Not guilty, and that Pl	29 I
7. In Trover, Not guilty, and that Pl	aintiff
	ecame

became a Bankrupt, and his Effects were affigned, denied, Page 292

Pledges.

See Declaration, 2.

Postea.

See Amendment, 33.

Pzisoners.

See Attorny, 8, 14. Habeas Corpus, 1, 3, 4, 5, 6. Dutlawry, 1, 2. Superfedeas, 1,

1. Where Prisoner arrested by B. R. Process is removed immediately to the Fleet, Application for Supersedeas, where Plaintiff does not declare in Time, must be in this Court,

2. Prisoner in the Fleet by Process of this Court may be brought up by Rule, but if held by Execution of another Court, there must be a Habeas Corpus,

3. Prisoner at the King's Suit brought up by Habeas Corpus cannot be committed to the Fleet, without the King's Consent, 301, 306

4. Prisoner

4. Prisoner a Bankrupt taken in Execution
for a Debt accrued before Bankruptcy, dif-
charged, Page 302
5. Where Defendant intitled to Supersedeas
for want of being charged in Execution,
303, 308, 310, 322
6. Day-Rule for Prisoner and a Tipstaff to
take him to H. to treat with his Creditors,
denied, 303
7. Court may moderate the Allowance to
Prisoners under the Lords Act; Prisoner
remanded on an Allowance of 6 d. per
Week, 304
But where once determined at 2 s. 4 d.
cannot afterwards be lowered, 321
8. Where Prisoner intitled to Supersedeas for
want of Declaration in two Terms, 305,
311, 312, 320, 321, 322, 323
9. Prisoner discharged by the Lords Act, being charged in Execution on a second Judg-
ment by the same Plaintiff, discharged a-
gain on a second Assignment of the same
Effects, 305
10. Motion by Defendant to stay Proceed-
ings after Inquiry executed, Plaintiff ha-
ving been discharged by Insolvent Debtors
Act, and affigned his Debts, &c. to his
Creditors, 308
11. Prisoner remanded on a joint Allowance
of 2s. 4d. perWeek by two Creditors, 309
12. Where Prisoner intitled to Supersedeas
for

for want of Plaintiff's proceeding to final
Judgment, Page 300
13. Where, on Service of peremptory Rule,
Sheriff brings the Body into Court instead
of putting in Bail above, how Court pro-
ceeds, 312
14. Declaration and subsequent Proceedings,
which were as if Defendant was at large, fet aside, he becoming a Prisoner after
fet aside, he becoming a Prisoner after
Process served, 313 15. Prisoner charged with a common Capias,
and not with a Declaration, where regu-
lar, 314
16. Where a Prisoner is superseded, he can-
not be held to Bail for the old Cause of
Action, 315
17. Prisoner charged twice in Execution by
the same Plaintiff, on Motion allowed to
pay Principal, Interest and Costs on the
first Judgment, to avoid giving up his E-
state according to Insolvent Debtors Act,
315
18. Prisoner's Petition to the Court to be
carried to the Affizes to be discharged un-
der the Lords Act, when to be preferred,
216
19. Prisoner, how and where to be dischar-
ged under the Lords Act, 316, 317
20. Prisoner having been supersedable for
two Years past, for want of Plaintiff's
proceeding to Judgment, remanded un-
i charged

charged in Execution, but detained at others Suits, Page 319

der the Lords Act, must be signed by Plaintiff himself, one from the Attorny has always been refused,

Privilege.

See Attorny, 1, 2, 5.

Process.

See Appearance, 1.
Bail, 39.
Ejedment, 4, 10.
Judgment, 15.
Notice, &c. 8.
Outlawry, 4, 5, 6, 7.

1. Ca' sa' against Attorny returnable at a general Return, and not a Day certain, quashed, and Defendant discharged by Supersedeas, with Costs, 325

2. Motion to stay Proceedings, the Name of Plaintiff's Attorny not being set upon the Sheriff's Warrant, denied,

327

3. Capias ad respond, and Proceedings thereon against Desendants in a Corporate Capacity, set aside, they should be sued by
Pone & Distringus,
328
Vol. H. Gg 4. Pre-

4. Proceedings staid, no Attorny's Name be-
ing set upon the Copy of the Process serv-
ed on Defendant, Page 329
5. Proceedings staid, Process being served on
the Return-Day to appear that Day, 330
6. Special Original fued out in Lincolnshire
Plaintiff declared in Middlesex, Rule to
shew Cause why Proceedings in Middlesex
should not be staid, discharged, Defen-
dants having taken the Declaration out of
the Office, and thereby waved former Pro-
ceedings, 331
7. Rule for the Bailiff of the Dutchy to re-
turn Sheriff's Mandate, discharged, the
Warrant being directed to Officers of Plain-
tiff's Nomination, and not those of the
Bailiff, 331
8. Motion to quash Non omit' Capias, for
that it recited a Mandate by Sheriff to the
Bailiff of a Liberty, without naming it
but leaving a Blank for it. Objection good,
but Rule denied, Bail having been put in
332
9. Rule for Sheriff to return the Writ, dif-

charged, Defendant being protected by a Publick Minister, and the Protection registered,

though improperly, it cannot afterwards be made use of for any other Purpose,

333 11. Issues

11. Iffues on Distringas's, how increased,
Page 334, 337, 338, 339, 340, 341
Page 334, 337, 33 ³ , 339, 340, 34 ¹ 12. Infant, though Process served with No-
tice to appear by Attorny, compellable to
appear by Guardian in all Causes of Action
not bailable, 334
13. Proceedings staid, Copy of Process serv-
ed being uncertain as to the Time of Ap-
pearance, 336
14. Proceedings fet aside, with Costs, against
Plaintiff's Attorny, for suing out Testat'
Cap' from Suffolk into Kent, instead of
Cap' into Kent, 336
15. Rule to stay Proceedings, the Date of
the Writ being omitted, 337
16. Proceedings staid, Capias being return-
able before King's Justice, and there be-
ing only fix Days between Teste and Re-
turn, 338
17. In Ejectment, Habeas Corpus proper
Process to remove Plaint from Mayor of
London's Court; a Certiorari which had if-
fued, quashed, 339
18. Copy of Process sent by Letter, held to
be good Service by Defendant's opening the
Cover and taking out the Copy, 340
19. There is no occasion to shew the origi-
nal Writ at the Time of Service, 340
20. Proceedings staid, Process served within
the Cinque Ports being directed to the
Sheriff of Kent, instead of Testat' Capias
to the Constable of Dover-Castle, 341
Gg2 21. Rule

J
21. Rule for the late Sheriff of D. to return
a Writ of Capias, discharged, it not ha-
ving been carried to Sheriff's Office till a
Year after it was returnable, Page 341
22. Rule for Leave to Plaintiff to take out
a separate Attachment of Privilege, to war-
rant his Judgment against Desendant only,
nunc pro tunc, agreeable to a joint Attach-
ment against him and others, denied, as
unnecessary, 342
23. Defendant, an Attorny, moved to set
aside Proceedings, he being sued by Capias,
but denied, he having appeared, which
cured the Mistake, 344
24. Rule on Sheriff who absconded, how
ferved,
25. The Rules of Easter and Michaelmas
3 Geo. 2. extend to all Process returnable
the first or second Return, without Ex-
ception as to an Exigent, or any other par-
ticular Process, 215
26. Copy of Process being tendered Defen-
dant at his House, and he refusing to ac-
cept it, held leaving it there was good
Service, 225

Prohibition.

See Coffg, 4, 5, 6, 20.

1. The Time for proving the Suggestion, (where Declaration ordered to be amended) is to be computed from the Amendment,

Page 345

Quare impedit.

See Coffs, 22. Double Pleas not allowed, 1.

Recognizance:

See Bail, 23, 24, 37, 43. Bail in Erroz, 2, 3.

Record.

See Amendment, 8. Trial, 30.

Re. fa. 10.

See Replevin, 2.

Gg3 Remanet.

Remanet.

See Jury, 1.

Replevin.

See Coffs, 26. Orclaration, 7. Oilcontinuance, 1. Nonpros, &c. 7, 10. Orial, 11, 22.

1. Proceedings staid on Payment of the Rent distrained for, and Costs, after Declaration but before Avowry,

Page 346

2. In Replevin, the Re. fa. lo. is filed by the Filazer, in all other Actions by the Prothonotary, 177

Rules.

See Erecutors, &c. 4.. Prisoners, 2, 6. Process, 25. Trial, 12. Marrant of Actorny, 5.

1. In Rules for entering Issues the Day of Notice is exclusive; and Nonpros signed a Day too soon, set aside, 257

2. Ob-

2. Observations on several Rules, &c. Page 328

3. Rule, where Record made up, and Trial had, without Replication to or Notice taken of a fourth Plea of Defendants,

383

Scire facias.

See Bail, 23, 24, 25. Bail in Erroz, 1. Execution, 4, 6.

- not transcribed into B. R. the Scire facias out of this Court is regular, 166, 347
- 2. After Transcript it should go out of B. R. ibid.
- 3. Two Scire facias's quashed, the Ca' sa' against Principal and first Scire facias bearing Teste on one and the same Day,
- 4. Scire facias against Bail, in what County to be brought, 74, 167

Sheriff, Sheriff's Officers, &c.

See Attachment, 3.

Bill, 44.
Inquiry, 1.
Prisoners, 13.
Process, 7, 8, 9, 20, 21, 24.
Rules, 2.

1. Sheriff ordered to pay the Costs of Application against him, Bail not being perfected till after Paintiff was intitled to come for an Attachment,

Page 78

Soldiers and Seamen.

See Bail, 49.

Summons and Oders of Judges.

See Amendment, 10. Judgment, 4, 7, 9, 19. Pleadings, 12. Uenue, 3.

1. A Judge's Summons ferved after Rule to plead, &c. is out, held no Stay of Proceedings, 218

Supersedeas.

See Erroz, 2. Dutlawzy, 9. Pzisoner, 1, 5, 8, 12, 20.

z. Defendant Prisoner, after Judgment brought Error, put in Bail, and applied to be discharged on Supersedeas, which was granted; and held, Bail would be liable though Writ should be nonprossed for want of transcribing,

Page 349

2. After Supersedeas ordered for want of Judgment, Plaintiff charged Defendant with a new Declaration for a different Cause of Action, and held regular, 248

3. Where Declaration against a Prisoner wanted Amendment, not granted, unless Plaintiff consented to a Supersedeas within fix Days after Term,

Trials, Merdia, &c.

See Colls, 12, 13. Pony into Court, 2. Notice, &c. 2, 3, 5, 6.

1. On Motion for a new Trial, held, that an Highway ought not to be given in Evidence

The	Table	of.	Princi	pal:	Matt	ers.

The Table of Principal Matters.	
dence under the General Issue, but to	be
pleaded specially, Page 3	50
2. Trials at Bar, where, and for what Re	э за-
fons granted, or not, 251, 2	65
3. Leave to examine an ancient Witness !	oe-
fore a Judge upon Interrogatories, canr	ot
	52
4. Where Trial before Judge of anoth	ier
Court, on Motion for a new one, an A	\ f_
fidavit of what passed at the Trial must	be
produced, 3	52
5. Affidavit for putting off a Trial for wa	int
of a material Witness, may be made by	/ a
third Person, 3	53
6. What required to be set forth in the A	fi-
davit, 353, 3	59
7. New Trial granted, as well where I)a-
mages are less, as where greater than the	ey
ought to be, 354, 3	67
8. Held, that the Postea in a former Acti	
produced by Affociate, was sufficient E	vi-
dence to prove that such former Acti	on
was tried and referred,	55
9. In Replevin, Evidence offered by Plaint	titt
of giving Notice, with his Plea in Bar,	to
fet off a mutual Debt against the Res	nt,
held to have been properly rejected by t	he
	56
10. The Entry of Judgment on the Verd	ict
staid, Defendant, on Plaintiff's Prosec	
tion, having been convicted of Bigam	
	ná

The Table of Principal Matters. and this Action merged in that Felony.

and mis Action merged in that relong,
Page 358
11. Proceedings set aside after Trial of seve-
ral Issues, and a Verdict for Plaintiff, the
Goods distrained having never been reple-
vied, and by Confent, Plaintiff declaring
in this Court, without Re. fa. lo. or Ap-
pearance, 358
12. How the Rule of Niss prius to be drawn
up, where a Point is referved for the Opi-
nion of the Court, 359, 374
nion of the Court, 359, 374 13. Action of Trespass for assaulting, beat-
ing and wounding Plaintiff's Mare, Ver-
dict for Plaintiff in Arrest of Judgment;
objected, this Action is not applicable to a
brute Beast, but over-ruled, 360
14. Want of Certainty in the Declaration,
where aided after Verdict, 360
15. On Point reserved at Trial of Action on
a Promisory Note, held, that the Words
Pay the Contents, &c. may be put over
the Name indorfed, in Court, 361
16. Verdict set aside, one Person having an-
fwered to another's Name, and been fworn
as a Juror, 362, 366
17. Motion to set aside Verdict, because one
of the Jurors Christian Name was Harry,
and not Henry, as in the Panel, denied,
364
18. Whenever a Point is reserved for the O-
pinion of the Court, the Verdict must al-
ways be for the Plaintiff, 366
19. In

19. In Action of Trespass for mesne Profits.
brought by the Nominal Plaintiff against
the Tenant in Possession, after Judgment
by Default against the Casual Ejector, for
want of the Tenant's Appearance, what
ought to be proved, Page 367
ought to be proved, Page 367 20. Verdict set aside, Plaintiff's Replication
being bad, and he having proceeded to
Trial, after Notice given him of it by
Defendant, who made no Defence, 369
21. On a View, what may be shewed to the
Viewers, and what the Shewer may fay
to them,
22. In Replevin, Defendant brought down
the Record, and Plaintiff not appearing,
insisted to have a Verdict, which Judge
complied with; but Court set aside the
Verdict, and ordered a Nonsuit to be re-
turned, 371
23. On a Point reserved upon the Statute of
Hue and Cry, the Court divided in Opi-
nion, whether Plaintiff should recover for
what was well described in his Advertise-
ment, 371
24. Though by 43 Eliz. no Provision is
made for retaining the necessary Expence
of a Distress and Sale, yet the Defendant
may justify deducting for the same, 373
25. Verdict set aside, the Venire being re-
turnable at a Day subsequent to the Assi-
zes, 375
26. In

26. In Action by Attorny for Fees, held the
Attachment of Privilege, and not the Pla-
cita, is proper Evidence to shew the Com-
mencement of the Suit, Page 375 27. Where several Issues joined, if enough is
27. Where several Issues joined, if enough is
found for the Court to give Judgment up-
on, no Venire facias de novo ought to
iffue, 377
28. In Action Qui tam on 13 Eliz. for set-
ting up a fraudulent Judgment, Court can-
not give Leave to compound, 378
29. Point reserved at Trial, whether a Bond
in the Condition whereof a Mortgage-De-
mise was contained, stamped with a treble
Sixpenny Stamp, read in Evidence for
Plaintiff, ought to have been admitted, for
want of two treble Sixpenny Stamps, held
rightly admitted, 379
30. Motion for a new Trial, founded on a
Variance between the Issue delivered and
the Record, granted; (though Court did
not think the Variance material) the Me-
rits not having been tried; Costs to attend
the Event, 381
31. New Trial never granted in Actions on
a Penal Statute, where Verdict is found
for Defendant, 384
32. On Motion to put off a Trial, Affidavits
taken before a Vice-Conful abroad, suffered
to be read,
33. On a Point reserved, held, the Placita
iş

is no Evidence in case of a Tender, but an Original must be produced, Page_139

Trover.

See Coffs, 2, 21.

Mariance.

See Trial, 30.

Menue and Menire Facias.

See Amendment, 3, 5. Jury, 4. Trial, 25, 27.

1. Venue never changed into a County Pala-386 tine.

2. Denied from Yorkshire into the City of York.

3. Judge's Summon or Order for Time to plead, to be no Bar to a Motion to change the Venue,

A. Venue refused to be changed from London into Kent, upon Affidavit that the Cause of Action accrued within the City of Canterbury, 387

5. Venue changed, though Motion for Rule to shew Cause not made till last Day of last Term, Declaration being delivered so I

late

late that Defendant could not apply fooner,
Page 387
6. Venue refused to be changed from York-
shire into Westmoreland, 388
7. Refused, where Declaration contained
inter al' a Promisory Note, on which
Plaintiff undertook to give Evidence, at
Peril of a Nonsuit, 390, 392
8. Refused in Action of Covenant on Deed
for Nonpayment of Rent, 390
o. Venue may be changed in all Actions in
their Nature Transitory, except in Cases
of Privilege, Specialty, Promisory Note,
or Bill of Exchange, 389, 390
10. Venue, where changed upon reading the
Declaration, without the usual Affidavit,
391
11. After Motion to change the Venue, but
before Rule made absolute, Defendant by
Mistake put in Plea, held no Waiver of
the Rule, $\&c$. 392
.
and an about

Usury.

See Judgment, 30. Charrant of Attorny, 6.

Marrants of Attomy.

See Judgment, 18, 30.

ı.	Warrant executed by Defendant in Custo- dy, in Presence of an Attorny of B. R.
	fufficient, Page 36
2.	Rule to enter Judgment at Suit of Execu-
	tor, on a Warrant to enter, &c. at Suit
	of Testator, his Heirs, Executors, &c.
	36
3.	Warrant to enter Judgment at Suit of two, Motion to enter Judgment at Suit of the
_	Motion to enter Judgment at Suit of the
	Survivor, denied, 38
4.	But granted in B. R. and here fince, 43,
•	52
5	Where Leave to enter Judgment may be given by a Treasury-Rule, and where not,
-	given by a Treasury-Rule, and where not,
	41
6	Judgment and Warrant of Attorny on U-
	Surious Contract Set aside Esc.

FINIS.

SUPPLEMENT

To the SECOND VOLUME of

NOTES of CASES

I N

Points of PRACTICE:

Taken in

The Court of Common Pleas at Westminster.

Which contains all the CASES subsequent to the said SECOND VOLUME to the End of Hilary Term 1756.

Published,

By Leave of the JUDGES of the faid Court,
By H E N R Y B A R N E S,
One of the SECONDARIES.

In the SAVOY:

Printed by HENRY LINTOT, Law Printer to the King's most Excellent Majesty; for John Shuckburgh, at the Sun between the two Temple Gates, Fleetstreet, MDCCLVI.

Amendments.

Lord Demandant, Biscoe Tenant, Ayles Esquire, Vouchee. Trin. 27 & 28 Geo. 2.

ULE absolute to amend the Recovery, by transposing the Names of Demandant and Tenant, pursuant to the Deed making a Tenant to the Pracipe. Prime and Draper for Demandant, Tenant and Vouchee; Wills for Sir Thomas Rudge, the Remainder Man intended to be barr'd. By the Recovery Biscoe had been Demandant and Lord Tenant. By the Deed Lord was to be Demandant; and Biscoe Tenant.

Law against Salisbury one, &c. Mich. 28 Geo. 2.

RULE absolute to amend Bill filed and Declaration thereon against an Attorny, A 2 by

Amendments.

4

by striking out the Words [commenced and] next before the Word [prosecuted] on Payment of Costs. Per Cur': The Bill is in our Power, as an original Writ is in that of the Court of Chancery. Poole for Desendant; Prime for Plaintiff,

Craghill and others *Plaintiffs*; Pattinson and Wise and Nicholson and Wise and others *Deforciants*. Mich. 29 Geo. 2.

FINE levied in Trinity Term Anno primo Georgii Regis, was Ordered to be amended according to the Deed of Uses, by striking out [Parochiā] and inserting [Parochiis] instead thereof, and by inserting [et Meimerby]. Motion made on behalf of John Nicholson, who claims Title to a Messuage and several Lands and Hereditaments in Melmerby in Cumberland, under said Fine and Deed of Uses, as Nephew and Heir to John Nicholson, one of the Desorciants; opposed by Joseph Carleton, who claims Title to such Messuage, &c. (if not barred by the Fine) as Heir to Mary the Wise of said John Nicholson one of the Desorciants.

Thornley against Hughes. Hil. 29 Geo. 2.

Efendant by Leave of the Court pleaded two Pleas, Not guilty, and a Special Justification. On the former Plea Issue was join'd; to the later Plea Plaintiff replied, Defendant demurred to the Replication, and Plaintiff join'd in Demurrer; Plaintiff made up the Issue (awarding contingent Damages as usual) and before Argument of the Demurrer, proceeded to Trial of the Issue, and obtain'd a Verdict. Defendant this Term moved for, and obtain'd a Rule to shew Cause why he should not amend the later Plea on Payment of Costs. The Court thought that the Application for the Amendment came too late, especially as it appear'd, that, before the Trial (viz.) 16 June last, Defendant had applied for the same Amendment, and then had a Rule to shew Cause, which Rule Defendant's Agent had waived by a Note in Writing figned by him directed to Plaintiff's Agent. The last Rule to shew Cause discharged. Poole for Defendant; Wynne for Plaintiff.

Attachment.

Stretch and his Wife against Wheeler. East. 27 Geo. 2.

PULE for Richard James, to shew Cause why an Attachment of Contempt against him should not iffue for his not attending as a Witness on Defendant's Part at last Surry Affizes, pursuant to Subpæna served, and a fufficient Recompence tendered him, discharg-On shewing Cause it appeared, that, though Richard James was resident at Lambeth Marsh, and the Road from thence to Kingston (where the Affizes were held) extreamly good, yet he was very weak and infirm, 80 Years old, and afflicted with an Asthma and Dropfy. His Apothecary attended at Kingston ready to make Oath (as now he did) that Richard James could not attend the Asfizes without Danger of his Life. granting of Attachments in these Cases is purely at the Discretion of the Court; Defendant may come at Richard James's Evidence by Application here, to have him examined before a Judge upon Interrogatories, or to the Court of Chancery, by Bill to perpetuate his Testimony. Prime for Richard James; Wynne for Defendant.

Attornies.

Unwyn one, &c. against Robinson. Mich. 28 Geo. 2.

DOTH Parties were Attornies of this Court; Plaintiff fued Defendant by common Capias; Defendant moved to stay the Proceedings, infifting that he ought to have been fued by Bill, and that the Affidavit to hold him to Bail was intitled, Unwyn one, &c. against Robinson one, &c. which is not agreable to the Writ. Defendant had been formerly forejudged, but was restored to his Privilege before this Action brought. It appeared that Defendant had obtained a Judge's Order for Time to put in Bail, but that was not deemed a sufficient Waiver of his Objection to Plaintiff's Method of proceeding against him. Rule absolute to stay Proceedings without Costs. Poole for Defendant; Willes for Plaintiff.

į.

Bail and Bail Bonds.

Barnard against Mordaunt, Esquire. East. 27 Geo. 2.

ment, having been arrested and held to Bail before the Expiration of forty Days (Privilege claimed by the Commons) next after the Dissolution, applied to have the Bail Bond delivered up. In 2 Lev. 72. the Privilege is said to be twenty Days before and after Session and Prorogation. According to Pryn the Wages to Parliament Men continue no longer than three Days after the Parliament is up. Vide Pitt's Case, Comyns 444. By Consent Rule absolute for delivering up Bail Bond, on entring common Appearance. Prime for Desendant; Draper for Plaintiff.

Lovibond against Faikney. Trin. 27 & 28 Geo. 2.

Defendant put in Bail + 25th May (two Days before the End of last Term;) the

† See Vol. 2. p. 82. Fowlis Esquire, against Grasvenor, S. P. p. 173. De' Revose Executor against Hayman, contra.

Day

Day after the Term (28th May) Plaintiff excepted against the Bail, and for want of Justification before a Judge, took an Assignment of, and proceeded on the Bail Bond. Defendant 8th June (after the Bail Bond assigned) gave Notice to justify his Bail in Court on the first Day of this Term, which he did accordingly, and then applied for Stay of Proceedings on the Bail Bond. Rule absolute for that Purpose without Costs. Prime for Defendant; Willes for Plaintiff.

Filewood against Smith. Mich. 29 Geo. 2.

A Palace-Court Officer offered to justify himself in Court as one of Defendant's Bail: Plaintiff objected, that no Sheriff's Officer, Bailiff, or other Person concerned in the Execution of Process, can be Bail by the general Rule of Mich. 6 Geo. 2. Defendant answered, that, by a Case Baskerville, Esq; against Chaffey, in Error, East. 20 Geo. 2. The Court had determined that faid Rule related only to Bailiffs executing Process of this Court. The Court exploded the Doctrine of that Case, which was determined (as thereby appears) in the Absence of the Lord Chief Justice, and rejected the Bail offered. They held that the Rule extends to all Bailiffs, Officers, and others concerned in the Execution of Process. The Rule was made

10 Bail and Bail Bonds.

for the Benefit of Plaintiffs, not merely to prevent Impositions and Abuse on Defendants, as in said Case mentioned. An antient Rule of this Court Mich. 1654. says that no Attorny shall be Bail, and a Modern Rule Mich. 6 Geo. 2. says that no Attorny of this or any other Court, or any Person practising as such, shall be Bail; the Rule is the same with Respect to Officers executing the Process of this and all other Courts. Willes for Plaintiff; Davy for Defendant.

French against Knowles. Hil. 29 Geo. 2.

Efendant, after a Judge's Order for Time to put in and perfect Bail, put in Bail, and furrendred himself to the Fleet in Discharge of his Bail. Plaintiff's Attorny apprehending the Surrender, without previously perfecting Bail by a Justification, to be irregular, proceeded upon an Affignment of the Bail Bond; but the Court held fuch Proceeding to be wrong. Before a Surrender Defendant is delivered to his Bail, and supposed to be in their Custody; by the Surrender the Custody is altered, and Defendant is in Prison: the Worth and Substance of the Bail, who by the Surrender are discharged, is totally immaterial. Rule absolute to set aside the Proceedings on the Bail Bond without Costs. Davy for Defendant; Willes for Plaintiff.

Colls

Costs and Bills of Costs.

Mordecai against Nutting and others, in Trespass, &c.

[Omitted in Mich. 23 Geo. 2.]

Plaintiff sues four Defendants, gets a Verdict against one, and the other three are acquitted. On an Affidavit that Plaintiff is an itinerant Jew and poor, Defendants who were acquitted obtained a Rule to shew Cause, why their Costs should not be deducted out of what Prothonotary should allow Plaintiff for Costs against that Defendant who was found guilty. On shewing Cause the Court declared the Motion to be unprecedented, and discharged the Rule. Prime for Plaintiff; Leeds for Defendant.

Owston against O Bryan. Trin. 27 & 28 Geo. 2.

Efendant paid Mony (about 37 l.) into Court on the common Rule; Plaintiff proceeded to Trial, and recovered a larger Sum, and afterwards became a Bankrupt; the Affignees of Plaintiff's Effects under the Commission, moved to have the Mony paid out of Court

12 Costs and Bills of Costs.

Court to them; which was opposed by Mr. Ward Plaintiff's Attorny, who submitted Whether he who had been the Instrument of recovering the Verdict, ought not to be first paid his Bill of Costs? Rule to refer Ward's Bill to the Prothonotary to be taxed, Ward to allow 7l. 4s. received by him of Plaintiff in Part, and then to be paid out of the Mony in Court, Residue to be paid the Assignees. Prime for Ward; Poole for the Assignees.

Roberts against Biggs and others.

Rule be stayed, and that 171. 11s. Damages and Costs thereby recovered be allowed to Defendant Biggs, towards Payment of the larger Sum of Mony recovered in an Action brought by him [Biggs] against Roberts, wherein Defendant [Roberts] having been arrested by one Richard Bellamy, John Bradley Junior, and George Smithurst (as Bellamy's Assistants) for 411. 2s. od. upon Promise, was rescued by his Wise and one George Platts his Brother in Law, and thereby made his Escape to his own House; Plaintist and the Officers pursued but could not retake him, Defendant absconding, Plaintist sued out Process of Outlawry, Defendant appeared to the Exigent, and the Cause being at Issue was tried

Cotts and Wills of Cotts. 13

tried at Nottingham Spring Affizes 1754, wherein Plaintiff recovered for Damages and Costs 70 l. 10 s. 0 d. Roberts brought this Action against Biggs, Bellamy and Bradley, in Trespass, for that they (together with Smithurst) broke and entred his House, and disturbed him and his Family inhabiting therein; which Cause being at Issue was also tried at said Spring Affizes, and the Jury gave Plaintiff 1 s. Damages. Mr. Justice Birch, who tried the Cause, certifying, that the Trespass was wilful and malicious, Plaintiff Roberts became entitled to his Costs, which Damages and Costs amounted to 17 l. 11 s. 0 d. Willes for Desendants; Prime and Poole for Roberts.

Bright against Jackson, in Replevin. Hil. 28 Geo. 2.

HE Avowant applied, under the Stat. 42. Ann. for the Amendment of the Law, for Costs; some of the Issues joined on several Pleas in Barr to the Avowry pleaded by Leave of the Court being sound for him, and no Certificate by the Judge that such Pleas were material, the Word [Avowant] happens to be omitted in the Stat. though the Words [Defendant, Tenant, and Plaintiff,] are inserted; an Avowant is in the Nature of a Defendant, and plainly within the Meaning and Intent of the Statute. Rule absolute, that

14 Costs and Bills of Costs.

Prothonotary shall tax Avowant's Costs on the Pleas found for him, and that the same be deducted out of Costs allowed Plaintiff. *Prime* for Avowant; *Willes* and *Poole* for Plaintiff.

East against Nonelly, in Replevia. The same Case,

Goodright on Demise of Larener against Searle, in Ejectment.

of Plaintiff, a Rule was made. That Plaintiff's Attorny should shew Cause why Proceedings should not be stayed till some Person gives Security for Defendant's Costs, if any shall be adjudged to him. The Court, upon hearing Counsel on both Sides, thought Security ought to be given, and thereupon Mr. Limbrey Plaintiff's Attorny undertaking for Payment of such Costs, the Rule was discharged. Hewitt for Defendant; Poole for Plaintiff's Attorney.

Barker Esquire, and Cooke Esquire, against the Bishop of London, Lomax Esquire, and Bellamy Clerk. In quare impedit.

Bill of Costs delivered by Mr. Cooling A Bill of Costs derivered by Mr. as Attorny for Defendant Bellamy, amounting to 1651. 15 s. having, at the Instance of Defendant Bellamy, been referred to Mr. Prothonotary Wegg to be taxed, and less than a fixth Part, viz. 25l. 13s. 10d. having been deducted on Taxation, Cooling had moved for Costs of the Taxation, and the Rule for those Costs was drawn up absolutely. Defendant Bellamy applied to discharge that Rule; and upon hearing Counsel on both Sides, the Court discharged the former Rule, as unprecedented; it should have been drawn up to fhew Cause, not absolutely; but a new Rule was made, Ordering Defendant Bellamy to pay Cooling Costs of the Taxation. By Stat. 2 Geo. 2. if a fixth Part of an Attorny's Bill be deducted, the Court are not left to their Discretion, but are obliged to award Costs of the Taxation against the Attorny; where a fixth Part is not deducted, the Court are left to their Discretion. The Statute is a good Guide, what it directs in one Case seems to be a right Rule in the other; ever fince the Statute, Costs of Taxation have been reciprocally

16 Colls and Bills of Colls.

cally given to the Party charged, and to the Attorny, as a fixth Part has, or has not, been taken off. *Prime* for Defendant *Bellamy*; *Draper* for *Cooling*.

Lloyd Esquire, against Winton, in Replevin. Mich. 29 Geo. 2.

Laintiff declared for taking and detaining an Ox; Defendant avowed the Taking as a Seizure for a Heriot Custom, (claiming no Right to distrain.) After a Nonsuit Mr. Prothonotary Cooke had allowed Defendant double Costs, taking the Case to be within the Stat. 11 Geo. 2. giving Avowants double Costs; Plaintiff moved that the Prothonotary might review his Taxation. Rule for that Purpose made absolute. The Avowry not being for taking the Ox as a Distress is out of the Statute; for Heriot Service, Cattle, &c. are distrainable, for Heriot Custom not, Poole for Plaintiff; Wilson for Desendant.

Seed against Wolfenden, in Prohibition. Hil. 29 Geo. 2.

T was at Defendant's Instance made Part of the Rule, whereby a Writ of Prohibition was granted, That Plaintiff should declare in Prohibition; Defendant afterwards demanded a Declaration, and threatned a Non Pros

Colts and Bills of Colts.

Pros for want thereof; whereupon Plaintiff's Agent prepared a Declaration; when 'twas ready he was told by Defendant's Agent that he need not deliver it; but as he had been at the Trouble and Expence of preparing a Declaration, Plaintiff's Agent delivered the same to Defendant's Agent, and called for a Plea: Defendant pleaded nothing to the Merits, but only that he did not proceed in the spiritual Court after the Prohibition, gave a Rule to reply, and demanded a Replication; whereupon Plaintiff applied to the Court, and obtained a Rule for Defendant to shew Cause why he should not pay Plaintiff's Costs of the Proceedings in Prohibition; which Rule was now made absolute. The Court looked upon the Plea to be a sham nugatory Plea, not being to the Merits of the Cause; the Allegation that Defendant has proceeded contrary to the Prohibition, is and must be put into every Declaration of this Kind, but whether he has fo proceeded or no, is totally immaterial. The Stat. 8 & 9. Will. 3. Ch. 10. Sect. 3. gives Costs after Plea or Demurrer, but this is not a Plea within the Statute. Prime for Plaintiff; Poole for Defendant.

Demurrers, &c.

Pearson against Roberts and Groom, in Replevin. Easter 28 Geo. 2.

THIS was an Action of Replevin brought by Plaintiff against Defendants for their taking a Gelding of Plaintiff's, and detaining him against Gages, &c.

Whereto Defendants pleaded the general Iffue; and the Caufe came on to be tried before Mr. Justice Denison at Lent Assises for the County of Bedford, March 17, 1754.

Upon the Trial the Cafe appeared to be, that Defendants were Surveyors of the Highways in and for the Parish of Eaton Bray in the County of Bedford in the Year

1753.

That Plaintiff was in that Year an Inhabitant of fame Parish; and following the Trade or Employment of a Miller and Badger, occupied a Water Corn Mill and some Lands within faid Parish, of the yearly Value of 22 l. at and under that Rent only.

That Plaintiff in that Year kept and used in faid Parish two Carts, two Waggons, and ten Horses, in his Business of a Miller and 1

Badger,

Badger, and in carrying of Goods for hire,

and in Husbandry.

That fix Days were duly appointed, and due Notice thereof given for the Parishioners of said Parish to come into the Highways, and do their Duty therein respectively, pursuant to the Provisions of the several Statutes in that Behalf made.

That pursuant to such Appointment and Notice, Plaintiff duly attended in the Highways with one Wain or Cart, surnished after the Custom of the Country, (viz.) with three Horses and two Men, on every of said six Days.

But Defendants infifting that Plaintiff ought to have done Duty with two Wains or · Carts, furnished after the Custom of the Country, (viz.) with three Horses and two Men each, made Complaint to two of his Majesty's Justices of the Peace in and for faid County of Bedford against Plaintiff; For that he had attended in faid Highways with one Wain or Cart furnished after the Custom of the Country, (viz.) with three Horses and two Men only. And upon that Complaint, Plaintiff attending to answer for himfelf thereunto, faid Justices did adjudge Plaintiff to have been guilty of a Neglect of Duty in the Premisses, and for his said Offence to have forfeited the Sum of 31. Sterling (i. e.) the Sum of ten Shillings for every of B 2 faid faid fix Days, so as aforesaid appointed and notified.

And for levying of faid Penalty of 3 l. faid Justices issued their Warrant in Writing under their Hands and Seals, directed to Defendants, requiring them forthwith to levy faid Sum of 3 l. by Distress and Sale of the Goods and Chattels of Plaintiff.

Pursuant to which Warrant Defendants took and impounded, as a Distress, said Gelding of Plaintiff's, in order to sell same for the Purpose in said Warrant mentioned; upon which Plaintiff levied his Plaint in Replevin (wherein said Action was to be determined) without having first demanded in Writing the Perusal or Copy of said Warrant. The Questions for the Consideration of the Court were,

First, Whether Plaintiff was by Law compellable to go with or fend into the Highways, in Eaton Bray aforesaid, in said Year 1753, more than one Wain or Cart on every of said six Days abovementioned?

And if not,

Secondly, Whether Plaintiff, before the Commencement of this Action, ought not to have demanded in Writing a Copy or Perusal of said Warrant of said Justices?

If the Court should be of Opinion, that Plaintiff was not compellable to go with or send into the Highways aforesaid, more than one Wain or Cart, on any of said six Days above-

abovementioned; and that it was not necessary for Plaintiff to have demanded in Writing a Copy or Perusal of said Warrant; then Plaintiff was to have the *Postea* delivered to him, $\mathcal{C}c$. otherwise said *Postea* was to be delivered to the Defendants, $\mathcal{C}c$.

The Court gave Judgment on the first Point for Plaintiff, being of Opinion that Plaintiff was not compellable to fend into the Highways more than one Wain or Cart. He that has a Plough-Land (which by Stat. 7 & 8. Will. 3. Ch. 29. Sect. 57. is explained to be 50 l. per Ann.) is not obliged to fend more than one; Plaintiff farmed 22 l. per Ann. only. A Case in 3 Keble 567. had been cited by Defendant's Council between the King and the Inhabitants of Fulham, Mich. 27 Car. 2. and a Copy of the Proceedings were produced, to shew that the Court of King's Bench had determined in that Case, That every Person ought to send as many Wains or Carts into the Highways, as he keeps Teams; but upon looking into the Proceedings no fuch Determination appeared to have been made. A Case cited by Defendant's Council from Mr. Justice Raymond's Reports 186, was thought obscure, and to be no Authority. Vide Statutes relating to the Highways. 2 & 3 Phil. & Mary Ch. 8. 5 Eliz. Ch. 13. 22 Cha. 2. Ch. 12. 7 & 8 Will. 3. Ch. 29.

B 3 But

But on the second Point the Court gave Judgment for the Defendants, being of Opinion that Replevin is an Action within the Stat. 24 Geo. 2. And that before the Commencement of that Action against the present Defendants the Officers, Plaintiff ought to have demanded in Writing a Copy or Perusal of the Warrant; for want of which De-

mand his Action can't be supported.

Plaintiff's Council observed, That if Replevin is deemed to be an Action within faid Stat. 24 Geo. 2. which, where the Action is intended to be brought against the Justices of the Peace, requires a Month's previous Notice, great Inconvenience must arise; because the Cattle distrained would probably be starved and die before they could be replevied. To this the Court answered, That perhaps a mandatory Writ to the Sheriff, or a Plaint in Replevin in his Court, may not be looked upon as an Action within the faid Statute; but the Suit in this Court in Replevin for Damages, is an Action within faid Statute. Repleyin is called an Action in Stat. o Hen. 8. and a Suit in Stat. 17 Cha. 2.

The Postea was ordered to be delivered to

Defendants.

Ejedments.

Roe against Doe on the Demise of Fearnley and Tancred.

[Omitted in Hil. 26 Geo. 2.]

N Affidavit, that the Tenant Lydia Brooke Widow absconded to avoid being served; and also that she came into Possession furreptitiously, and of Service of Declaration in Ejectment on James Brooke her Son, who is her Servant and manages her Affairs, and lives in her Family; Rule, that she shew Cause why such Service on her Son and Servant should not be deemed good Service, and leaving a Copy of this Rule at her House good Service, made absolute; no Cause shews.

Doe against Roe on the Demise of Wright.

[Omitted in Trin. 26 & 27 Geo. 2.]

N Affidavit, that Mary Oliver one of the Tenants is a Lunatick, that one Major Eckburn lives with, and transacts her Business, and has the sole Conduct thereof, and B 4 of

of her Person; but would not permit the Deponent to have Access to her with Declaration in Ejectment; whereupon it was delivered to Cockburn. Rule, that she and Cockburn both shew Cause why this Service should not be good, and Service of this Rule on him to be deemed good Service thereof. Willes for Plaintiff,

Fenn on the Demise of Hildyard against Denn. Easter 27 Geo. 2.

Eclaration for an Entirety. Rule obtained by Arrundall Tenant in Possesfion to defend for two undivided Thirds only, and that for the Residue Plaintiff might take Judgment against the casual Ejector; General Judgment figned, and Writ of Possession agreeably. No Indorsement of what Part to take Possession (as might have been;) Possession of the whole Premisses taken, and afterwards two Thirds (according to a Partition made by Plaintiff's Lessor) restored; Goods removed from Tenant's House, Part of the Premisses, and some of them not brought back. The Court thought that a new general Rule should be made to alter the Practice of taking Judgment for the whole Premisses, when Part is appeared for; held that the Sheriff did right in taking Poffelfion of the whole, pursuant to the Writ. Rule

Rule to answer Matters in Affidavits by Sheriff's Officers discharged. Ordered Goods to be restored by Affidavit, and Possession of two Thirds of Premisses; Lessor of Plaintiff and his Attorny (who had principally conducted the Transaction in the Country) to pay the Tenant Costs of this Application. *Prime* and *Poole* for the Tenant; *Willes* and *Wynne* for Plaintiff's Lessor, his Attorny and Sheriff's Officers.

Goodtitle on the Demise of Gardner against Badtitle.

THE Plea of Marshall and others Landladies and Tenants in Possession, who had appeared with the Filazer and entred into the common Rule, was lest in the Prothonotary's Office, entitled with the true Name of the Cause, but by Mistake in the Body of the Plea, the Name of Plaintiff's Lessor was inserted (as the Person complaining) instead of that of the nominal Plaintiff. Plaintiff's Attorny looking upon this Plea as null and void, signed Judgment against the casual Ejector, which Judgment was set aside with Costs as irregular; the Plea is properly entitled and not a Nullity. Willes for Marshall and others; Prime and Wynne for Plaintiff's Lessor.

Fenn on the Demise of Knights against Dean. Trin. 27 & 28 Geo. 2.

N. Affidavit, That John Abbott Tenant in Possession, secreted himself to prevent his being ferved with a Declaration in Ejectment, and could not be ferved, though frequent Endeavours had been used; and that the Declaration was delivered to his Daughter who kept his House, (being a Publick House, Part of the Premisses in Question) and that she was acquainted with the Contents of the Subscription, The Court made a Rule for the Tenant to shew Cause why such former Service should not be deemed good Service, the Rule to be served on the Daughter at the House. This Rule was afterwards difcharged, because the Affidavit whereupon 'twas made appeared to have been sworn before Plaintiff's Attorny as a Commissioner, but for no other Reason; Prime for Plaintiff: Willes for the Tenant. I

Roe on the Demise of Agar against Doe.

THE Declaration was delivered to the Tenant in Possession without any Prothonotary's Name set thereon. Upon Affidavit of Service, the Court made a Rule for the

the Tenant to shew Cause, why upon Notice of the Prothonotary's Office Judgment should not be entred against the casual Ejector, unless he (the Tenant) appeared within the usual Time; which Rule on Affidavit of Service was made absolute. Willes for Plaintiff.

Holdfast on the Demise of Dyson and his Wise against Letgoe.

Declaration, with Notice to appear in this Term, had been ferved on the Tenant in Possession before the Essoign Day. but no Prothonotary's Name was fet thereon. Upon the Motion of Serjeant Hewitt for Plaintiff, The Court made a Rule, That unless John Riley Tenant in Possession, upon fix Days previous Notice of that Rule, and Notice that the Declaration is entred in the Office of Mr. Prothonotary Wegg, should appear and plead within four Days next after the End of the next Term (being the issuable Term, and this a Country Caufe) to a new Declaration at the Plaintiff's Suit, and enter into the common Rule for confessing Lease, Entry and Oufter, Judgment might be entred against the casual Ejector.

Goodtitle on the Demise of Cooper against Thrustout. Hil. 28 Geo. 2.

In the like Case (as next before) in a Country Cause, where the Declaration was delivered before the Essoign Day with Notice to appear in this Term; upon an Assidavit shewing the Service to be good in all Respects save the Want of Prothonotary's Name, the Court made the like Rule, unless T. M. and W. M. Tenants in Possession within six Days next after Notice of that Rule, and Notice that the Declaration is ented in the Office of Mr. Prothonotary Wegg, should appear, &c. Judgment might be entred against the casual Ejector. Prime for Plaintiff.

Roe on the Demise of Leak Widow, and others, against Doe. Mich. 29
Geo. 2.

WILLES for Joseph Simpson and Mary his Wife, who claimed Title to Part of the Premisses (of which Part Forwerson and Harrison were Tenants, and refused to appear) applied upon Assidavit of the Fact for Leave to appear for said Simpson and Wife as to said Part. Rule made to shew Cause; on shewing Cause it appeared, That the Lessors of Plaintiff and said Simpson and Wife claimed Title as Devisees,

vifees, the Leffors under one Will, and Simpson and Wife under another Will of the fame Testator; and the Question to be decided was, which Will should prevail. The Leffors of Plaintiff had got the Start of Simpfon and Wife; and by bringing their Ejectment first (the Tenants refusing to appear) would get into Possession without Defence, unless Simpson and Wife were permitted to defend. Per Cur': This Motion is founded on the late Act of Parliament, 11 K. Geo. 2. The Court have no Jurisdiction to admit any Person to defend an Ejectment inflead of the Tenant, except the Landlord only; And who is Landlord within the Act? Not every Person claiming Title; but one who is in some Degree of Possession, as receiving Rent, &c. the Clause of Forfeiture by Tenant, if he does not give Notice of Declaration to his Landlord, proves this. Davy quoted 2 Strange 1241. Jones on Demise of Woodward against Williams; where a Mortgagee was refused to be admitted to defend as Landlord; which Case (though not to reported) must be where the Mortgagee. had not got into Possession. Willes for Simofon and Wife; Prime and Davy for Lessors Plaintiff.

Execution.

Betts on the Demise of Robson against Egerton, in Ejectment. Hil. 28 Geo. 2.

LEWIS Monson Watson, Esquire, Defen-fendant's Landlord. Rule to shew Cause why Writ of Hab. fac. Poff. should not be fet afide, and Possession restored, &c. Plain= tiff obtained a Verdict at the Summer Affizes in Kent 1st July 1754. Defendant brought a Writ of Error, which was allowed 29 Oct. but entred into no Recognizance, nor put in any Bail thereon, Plaintiff not having got Costs taxed on the final Judgment, (without which the Measure or Quantum of the Recognizance could not be fixed) Plaintiff for want of the Recognizance required by the Statute, or Bail within four Days, took out a Writ of Hab. fac. Poff. and by Virtue thereof, on 4th November took Possession of the Premisses late in Question, which the Court held to be regular. Defendant should have applied to stay Execution, and then the Court would have obliged Plaintiff to have procured his Costs to be taxed; the Writ of Error Error is no Supersedeas without Bail. A Judge would have taken Bail if applied to. The Rule discharged. Vide Stat. 16 & 17 Cha. 2 c. 8. 2 Vent. 170. Sikes on Demise of Oates and others against Dawson. Hil. 18 Geo. 2. Vol. 2. p. 170. Prime and Wynne for Plaintiff; Willes and Poole for Desendant.

Fines.

Say and Smith and others. Trin. 27 & 28 Geo. 2.

INE taken before Prentice an Attorny, and Prentice a Tradesman, as Commissioners. Prentice the Attorny died without making Affidavit of the due Acknowledgment of the Fine. One of the Cognizors became a Bankrupt, absconded, and did not surrender within the 42 Days as required per Statute. Fine ordered to pass on Affidavit of the due Acknowledgment by Prentice the Tradesman; (notwithstanding the generall Rule requiring such Affidavits to be made by Attornies.) Prime for a Mortgagee for whose Security the Fine was taken.

Barber *Plaintiff*; Henry Nunn and Mary his Wife and others *Deforciants*. Eafter 28 Geo. 2.

THIS Fine was taken 13th May 1754, by Dedimus potestatem, Writ of Covenant tested 1st Day of Easter Term 1754, returnable from the Day of Easter in five Weeks (19 May,) 'twas compounded and the Prefine paid between the 17th and 20th May, and after passing the Return, Warrant of Attorny, and Custos Brevium Offices, was brought to the King's Silver Office 11th June, and the Clerk there then entred the King's Silver or Post-Fine in his Book, and on the Writ of Covenant; Mary Nunn the Cognizor died 27th May. A Caveat to prevent the compleating of this Fine was brought to the King's Silver Office 13th June (before the Record made up in Form) on behalf of John Nunn eldest Son and Heir of the Cognizors. Rule to shew Cause why that Caveat should not be withdrawn made absolute. The Court utterly exploded the Notion which prevailed (undoubtedly by Mistake) in Harneis and Micklethwaite and his Wife, Mich. 6 Geo. 2. and Gregory against Croucher and others, Mich. 7 Geo. 2. (viz.) that the King's Silver is the Pre-fine or Fine for Licence to alienate; certainly 'tis not; the King's Silver is the Post-Fine, or Fine for Licence to accord. 2 Inst. 411, 517. Dyer 246. The Return of the Writ of Covenant is agreed to be in the Life-Time of Mary the Cognizor; and from that Time the Crown has a Right to the Post-Fine, which was entred at the King's Silver Office before any Caveat against it; the making up the Record in Form is a ministerial Act, not necessary to be done previous to the Caveat; the Entry by the Clerk of the King's Silver as aforesaid is sufficient. 2 Roll. Abr. pl. 10. in Point. Poole for Plaintiff; Prime for John Nunn Son and Heir, &c. Vide Vol. 1. 144, 145.

Anthony Lister Gent. Plaintiff; John Lister and Johanna his Wife Deforcients. Trin. 28 Geo. 2.

F a Moiety of Lands, &c. in Yorkshire, Fine levied. Trin. 27 & 28 Geo. 2. Complaint was laid before the Court by Thomas Cust Gent. one of the Co-heirs of William Staines Esquire, deceased, supported by many Affidavits, setting forth, That Johanna Lister one of the Cognizors, Sister and the other Co-heir of the said William Staines, had for some Years past been disordered in her Senses, and was so at the Time when

this Fine was levied; the Court thereupon, o May in last Easter Term, made a Rule for faid John Lister to shew Cause why the Fine should not be vacated; and for John Hancock Gent. one of the Commissioners (who with two others took the Fine by Dedimus potestatem, and who made Affidavit of its due Acknowledgment, and the Capacity, &c. of the Cognizors) to answer the Matters in the Affidavits. Upon an Enlargement of the Rule, 31 May this Term, at the Instance of said John Lister and Hancock, the Court recommended it to them to produce said Johanna Lister (who resided in Yorkshire); and accordingly 18 June after the Affidavits, whereupon the Rule was made, and many Affidavits in Answer were read, she was brought into Court, and being examined by the Lord Chief Justice, appeared to be a Person of good Capacity, and very well to understand the Intent of this Fine, and the Deed declaring the Uses thereof; which was in Favour of her Husband, with whom she had lived many Years, and upon whom she was defirous to fettle her Moiety of her faid late Brother's Estate, and prevent its descending to said T.C. her Nephew, and Heir at Law. The Court discharged the Rule, with Costs of the Application to be paid by Cust to said John Lister and Hancock; and also Expences of faid Johanna's Journy to Westminster to be paid

paid by Cust to said John Lister, which Costs and Expences were to be taxed and ascertained by Prothonotary. Prime, Willes, and Poole for Cust; Eyre, Hewitt, and Davy for John Lister and Hancock.

Between Fleetwood Esquire *Plaintiff*; and Guisippe Calenda and Wise and others *Deforcients*. 27th February 1756.

- [Vacation after Hil. 29 Geo. 2.]

ORD Chief Justice, affisted by Mr. Justice Clive, made an Order, That this Fine should pass as to said Calenda and his Wife, two of the Cognizors, confidering the particular Circumstances of the Case; notwithstanding the same was not signed by them. Captain Peter Mauger one of the Commissioners attended, and made Oath, That this Fine was duly acknowledged before him and another Commissioner, by the faid Calenda and Wife at Naples in Italy; that these Parties were of full Age and good Understanding; and that the married Woman was examined apart from her Husband, and confented freely. The Fine being taken from these Parties beyond Sea, is not within the late Rule requiring an Affidavit, and the Signing of a Fine by the Cognizors is not an effential

36 Inspection of, &c.

effential Part. The former Lord Chief Justices of this Court have required the Parties acknowledging Fines before them, to sign Copies on Paper, which have been kept at the Chief Justices Chambers as a Check upon the Parties; the Fine on Parchment delivered out and passed through the Offices, was not formerly signed by the Cognizors, but at the Foot of the Caption by the Chief Justice only.

Inspection of Court Rolls, Books, &c.

Hobson Esquire against Parker Esquire and others, in Trespass. Hil. 29 Geo. 2.

Efendant Parker set up a prescriptive Right to Common from Lammas to Candlemas on the Locus in quo, whereon Issue was joined before, but not tried at last Assizes. Plaintiff appeared to be a Freeholder, and Defendant Parker to be a Freeholder's Tenant, within Lord Dartmouth's Manor of Lewisham; Defendant Parker moved for Leave to inspect the Court Rolls as to the Usage

Usage and Custom of Common Right. On shewing Cause by Defendant and the Lord of the Manor, it was urged, That though the Tenants of Copyhold or Customary Manors have a Right to inspect Court Rolls, which contain their Titles; yet as this is a Freehold Manor, and the Court not in Nature of a Court of Record as a Copyhold, but a common Court Baron, and the Rolls the Lord's private Property; the Freeholders within the Manor are not entitled to inspect the Rolls, which are the Lord's Title; especially as there's nothing in the Pleadings about the Custom of the Manor. For Defendant Parker it was faid, That though a Stranger has not, every Tenant has, a Right to inspect the Lord's Rolls; That no Title appears on the Rolls of a Court Baron; That a Court Baron can prefent and amerce, though not fine. That the Freeholders are Judges of the Court Baron, and have a Right to see its legal Proceedings. Rule absolute upon Mr. Pickering, Lord Dartmouth's Steward, for Leave to inspect, &c. ut supra. Draper and Wynne for Defendant; Parker, Willes, and Poole for Plaintiff and Lord Dartmouth.

38 Inspection of, &c.

Baldwyn against Tudge. Trin. 27 & 28 Geo. 2.

ACTION for an Amerciament at a Court Baron. Rule to shew Cause, why Defendant a Freehold Tenant should not have Leave to inspect Court Books, &c. generally, made absolute as to such Entries only as relate to Amerciaments. Poole for Defendant, Prime for Plaintiff.

The Mayor, Bailiffs, &c. of Exeter against Coleman. Hil. 28 Geo. 2.

In an Action for Petit Customs upon Hemp, Flax, and other Merchandize, founded on a prescriptive Right, Defendant moved for Leave to inspect the Corporation's Table of Rates and Account Books of Sums received; denied. This would be looking into the Plaintiff's Title, Defendant is a Stranger and no Member of the Corporation. *Poole* for Plaintiffs; *Prime* for Defendant.

Judgments.

Barnard one, &c. against Irwin. Trin. 28 Geo. 2.

A Ttachment of Privilege returnable Thurs-day next after 15 Hil. a Copy whereof was ferved on Defendant before the Return, and on the Return Day (30 January), a Declaration was left in the Office de bene esse, and Notice to plead ferved on Defendant; Defendant by the Statute having eight Days to appear after the Return of the Writ (i. e. exclusive of the Return Day) stayed till 7 February his last Day for appearing, and then entred his Appearance, and pleaded a Tender after his Time for Pleading given by faid Notice, but before the Rule to plead expired; Plaintiff looked upon this Plea as a Nullity, because pleaded after the Time for Pleading expired, and after the Rule to plead was out figned Judgment. Defendant infifted that this Plea ought to be received any Time before his Time for appearing expired, or any Time before Plaintiff was entitled to fign Judgment for want of a Plea. Interlocutory Judgment fet aside, Costs to attend the Event of the Cause. Prime for Defendant; Willes for Plaintiff. C 4 A onp.

Mony, Geods, &c. brought into Court.

Rogers Assignee against Stanford Assignee, in Covenant broken. East. 27 Geo. 2.

R ULE to bring Mony into Court upon the Breach affigned for Nonpayment of Rent made last Trinity Term; Plaintiff afterwards died (viz. in July last) before any Thing further done. Poole moved on the Part of Elizabeth the Wife of Armstead Parker Esquire, Plaintiff's Executrix, for Leave to take the Mony out of Court, with Costs to the Time it was paid in, which Plaintiff in his Life Time was entitled to. Draper for Defendant opposed the Motion; he objected not to the Mony's being paid out of Court to Plaintiff's Executrix, but to Payment of Costs; infisting that the Action was abated by Plaintiff's Death (as it certainly was); but when it came to be confidered, That if the Executrix took nothing by this Motion, she and her Husband would bring a new Action for the same Thing; and then Defendant must apply to have the Mony now in Court transtransferred to a Payment in the new Action, and must submit to pay Costs therein; Defendant's Council waived his Objection, and a Rule was made by Consent, That the Mony be paid out of Court to Plaintiff's Executrix with such Costs as Plaintiff would have been entitled to, if he had accepted the Mony at first; and that no Action should be brought by the Executrix for the same Cause for which the former Action was brought by the Testator.

Moss Administrator against Hardy. Trin. 27 & 28 Geo. 2.

A CTION on Bond to a Trustee, to secure an Annuity by Instalments to Defendant's Wise. Rule absolute to stay Proceedings on Payment of 3 l. (the only Instalment due) and Costs. Prime for Defendant; Willes for Plaintiff.

Davy Baronet against Martyn Asfignee, &c. in Covenant broken. Hil. 28 Geo. 2.

Efendant obtained a Rule for Plaintiff to shew Cause, why he should not have Leave to bring into Court, on the common Rule, 40s. in lieu of each Heriot demanded by Plaintiff; but on shewing Cause the Co-

2

42 Mony, Goods, &c.

venant appeared to be, to render to Plaintiff the best live Beast for a Heriot, or pay him 40 s. in lieu thereof, at Plaintiff's Election. Rule discharged. *Prime* for Desendant; *Draper* for Plaintiff.

Wright Executor against Swayne Esquire, in Debt on Bond.

fendant to bring Principal, Interest and Costs into Court, pursuant to the Statute; It was objected by Plaintiff's Council, that Plaintiff being an Executor, this Case is not within the Statute. Bryan Executor against Holloway, Hil. 6 Geo. 2. was quoted to shew that such a Notion was once entertained. But per Cur': The Words of the Statute are general and extend to all Actions on Bond, brought by Executors as well as other Perfons. Rule absolute to bring Principal, Interest and Costs into Court, and thereupon Proceedings to be stayed. Willes for Desendant; Prime for Plaintiff.

Phillips against Barker. Hil. 29
Geo. 2.

R ULE absolute for Leave to withdraw Plea of general Issue, on Payment of Costs, pay 21. 2s. into Court on common Rule,

Rule, and plead the same Plea again; Defendant taking Notice of Trial for the Sitting after Term in *Middlesex*. No Delay has been occasioned to Plaintiff by Defendant's omitting to bring Mony into Court before Plea pleaded. *Poole* for Defendant; *Willes* for Plaintiff.

Ponpros, Ponsuit, &c.

Hamp against Cuming. Easter 27
Geo. 2.

Pule to shew Cause why Judgment as in Case of a Nonsuit discharged. Plaintiff had obtained Rules for Special Jury and View, in Pursuance whereof a View was had by four Jurors only; Plaintiff entred his Cause for Trial at last Warwick Assistes, and was ready to proceed, but Defendant resusing to consent, the Cause could not be tried for want of a View returned by six Jurors at least; Plaintiff has affected no Delay, 'twas not his Fault that the View was incompleat. Prime for Plaintiff; Willes for Desendant.

Potice.

Taylor against Oxley, in Case on Promise. Hil. 29 Geo. 2.

Judgment set aside without Costs for a Defect in the Notice of Declaration as to the Nature of the Action. The Words of the Notice were [in an Action upon the Case] generally, without further Addition; the Intent of the general Rule requiring Notice is, that Desendant should know what he was sued for. Actions on the Case on Contracts and for Torts are extreamly various; the Notice should have expressed at least on Promise, or on several Undertakings and Promises. Poole for Desendant; Willes for Plaintiff.

Dutlawzy.

The King against Manby, on the Prosecution of French (deceased.) East. 27 Geo. 2.

Efendant was outlawed after Judgment, and taken by a Capias utlagat'. Objected by Prime for Defendant, That the Judgment of Outlawry appeared to be entred after Plaintiff's Death; and that the Capias utlagat' iffued without a Revival of the Judgment. He quoted Brownlow's Brevia judicialia, and the Register of Judicial Writs fo. 42 A. B. to shew Writs of Scire facias in such Cases brought by Plaintiff's Executors. Rule absolute to set aside Capias Utlagatum. Wilson for the late Plaintiffs.

Reilley against O Connor Esquire. Mich. 29 Geo. 2.

HE Outlawry commenced and compleated during Defendant's Residence in *Ireland*, was ordered to be reversed at his Expence (without Bail or Appearance). Where the the Court see an unlawful Proceeding they will not put the Party to the Expence of a Writ of Error, but will avoid Circuity and relieve him in a summary Way. *Prime* for Defendant; Willes for Plaintiff.

Pleadings.

[Omitted in Mich. 28 Geo. 2.]

OTION in Action on the Case to plead Non assumption and Infancy denied, because the later Plea is useless; Infancy may be given in Evidence on the general Issue: In Debt on Bond or other Deed Non est factum and Infancy have been allowed to be pleaded, because though the Bond, &c. may be Desendant's Deed; yet if he was under Age at the Time of its Execution he is not bound by it.

Fox Executor against Meen, in Debt on Bond.

OTION by Draper for Defendant for Leave to plead doubly (viz.) Non est factum, and Solvit post diem, denied as never yet granted.

Mathews

Mathews against Statham Executor. Hil. 28 Geo. 2.

Pleas (viz.) Non assumptit by the Testator, a General plene administravit, and a Special plene administravit; it may be dangerous and inconvenient to rely on the third Plea without the Aid of the second; No Assidavit to verify the Plene administravit has been required of late. Poole for Defendant; Wynne for Plaintiff.

Milner against Wilson, in Trespass Assault and Battery. Trin. 28 Geo. 2.

R ULE made absolute to plead Not guilty, and a Licence; a Licence to beat a Man is very extraordinary, but Leave to plead these Pleas has been granted in other Cases. Poole for Desendant; Willes for Plaintiff.

Whitby

Whitby against Chapman, in Replevin. Mich. 29 Geo. 2.

Rule to shew Cause why Defendant should not reply several Matters to a Plea in Bar to an Avowry discharged. No Instance can be shewn of several Matters replied since Satute 4 & 5 Q. Ann. several Matters may with Leave of the Court be pleaded to a Declaration in a common Case; and in Trespass to a new Assignment, that being in the Nature of a New Declaration; and also in Replevin in Bar to an Avowry or Cognizance, setting out the Right to seise or distrain, which is to be controverted; but though the Words of the Statute are to plead as many Matters, &c. and Replications, Rejoinders, &c. are properly Pleadings; yet the Courts of Westminster have never carried their Leave surther than as before-mentioned, Draper for Plaintiss; he quoted Poltro against Self in B. R. Hil. 17 Geo. 2. where the Court resused Leave to reply doubly to a Plea of Tender. Prime for Defendant.

Prisoners.

Keeling against Elliott. Trin. 28
Geo. 2.

Laintiff brought his Action originally in the Court of the Town and County of Kingston upon Hull, and held Defendant to Bail by Affidavit; Plaintiff afterwards removed the Proceedings into this Court by Certiorari; Defendant who remained in Prison for want of Bail applied to be discharged on entring a common Appearance. The Court were of Opinion, That the Certiorari having been brought by Plaintiff to remove his own Action he has loft his Bail; the Practice is the same in civil as in criminal Cases. Where Defendant brings a Certiorari to remove an Indictment into the King's Bench, the Bail is continued; but where the Certiorari is brought by the Profecutor, the Bail is discharged. Cro. James 363. Beston and Buller. 2 Lord Raymond 837. Crifp against Smith; the Certiorari is admitted to be regular, but by it Plaintiff has relinquished the Bail in the inferior Court, he has lost Bail by his own Act. Defendant ought to be protected against Vexation, and from being harraffed. Rule for a common

common Appearance, and Supersedeas made absolute, by the Opinion of three Judges; Lord Chief Justice not concurring. He compared it to a Discontinuance; a Plaintiff may by settled Practice after holding a Defendant to Bail discontinue his Action, begin de novo, and hold Defendant to Bail again; Plaintiff's being liable to Payment of Costs on a Discontinuance, does not materially vary the Case. Poole for Defendant; Draper for Plaintiff.

Atkinson and Wilson against Freeburrow. Mich. 29 Geo. 2.

A FTER Cepi Corpus returned, a peremptory Rule was served on the Sheriff of Nottinghamshire, to bring into Court the Body of Defendant within fix Days; the Sheriff moved to discharge said Rule, upon the Under-Sheriff's Affidavit sworn the 11th Day of June 1755, that Defendant was in the Sheriff's Custody charged with a Capias ad respondend' at Plaintiff's Suit; Plaintiff produced an Affidavit in Answer to the Under-Sheriff's, shewing that Defendant was seen at large at Newark (ten Miles from the County Gaol at Nettingham,) on 16 April 1755. It was urged for the Sheriff, that Defendant has now been superseded for want of a Declaration within two Terms: The Court laid the Escape

Escape and Supersedeas out of the Case. Where a Sheriff takes a Bail Bond, by the Rule to bring in the Body is meant persecting Bail above; but where a Desendant remains in Custody for want of Bail, Plaintiff must declare against him in Custody of the Sheriff; or if he would remove him to the Fleet Prison, he must do it by Habeas Corpus ad respondend. The Court never expect a Sheriff to bring the Desendant's Body into Court by Virtue of the common Rule. Vide Morse against Warren, Mich. 11 Geo. 2. Vol. 1 p. 284. Poole for Plaintiff; Prime for the Sheriff of Nottinghamshire.

Webb against Dorwell. Hil. 29 Geo. 2.

Plaintiff not having declared against Defendant, a Prisoner before the End of Trinity last (which was the second Term,) Defendant 28 October last took out a Judge's Summons for a Supersedeas; Plaintiff's Agent as usual had Time to write to his Client, and not being able to shew Cause against it, on 11 November last in the Evening, a Supersedeas was ordered, which could not be sealed that Night, but on the 13th was sent per Post into the Country. Plaintiff after the Summons served, viz. first November, charged Defendant in Custody with a Declaration, and

and on the 13th figned Judgment, sent down a Testat. Capias ad satisfaciendum, and charged Defendant in Execution. The Court held Plaintiff's Proceedings subsequent to the Time of Defendant's being supersedable, and having applied for a Supersedas, to be irregular. Rule absolute to set aside the Judgment and Testat. Capias ad satisfaciend. and for Defendant's Discharge with Costs, Defendant consenting to bring no Action. Poole for Defendant; Hewit for Plaintiff.

Process.

Hanbury and Wife against Cowper one, &c. by Bill. Mich. 29 Geo. 2.

R ull E absolute to set aside Fieri facias, and the Execution thereof, without Costs; the Writ was irregular in two Particulars; First, in the Return, which was general 15 Martin' instead of a Day certain, and Secondly, it commanded the Sheriss to have the Mony when levied at the Return in Court, to be rendred to Plaintiff the Husband only, and not to the Husband and Wise, though both were Plaintiss. Plaintiss produced

duced a Judgment by Confession to warrant the Fieri facias, but it was faulty, the Recovery being by the Plaintiff the Husband only. The Court ordered the Judgment to be rectified agreeable to Defendant's Confession; and that Defendant should bring no Action. Prime for Defendant; Poole for Plaintiffs.

Ashley the Younger against Mackarley and another. Hil. 29 Geo. 2.

OPY of Process served on the Return Day at 3 o'Clock in the Asternoon, Rule absolute to stay Proceedings. Vide Foot against Hume, Hil. 16 Geo. 2. Vol. 2. p. 330. Davy for Desendants; Prime for Plaintiff.

Trials, Aerdicks, &c.

Lassiter against Harvey. Bull against the same. Trin. 27 & 28 Geo. 2.

A FTER Verdicts obtained by Plaintiffs, the Records of Nish prius and Writs of Hab. Corpora Jurat', were accidentally lost by Mr. Jacomb late Affociate of the Home Circuit; Rule for Defendant and Jacomb to shew Cause, why new Records and Writs should not be made out agreeable to the old, and Verdicts returned according to the finding of the Jury, made absolute on Affidavit of Service, no Cause being shewn to the contrary. Wynne for Plaintiffs.

Armstrong on the Demise of Neve and another against Woolsey and others, in Ejectment. Hil. 28 Geo. 2.

The Point or Question reserved at the Trial, for the Opinion of the Court was, To whose Use a Fine with Proclamations levied without any Declaration of Uses should operate? Held per Cur', That where no Use is declared, there is no Consideration; the Fine must result to the ancient Use; it sufficiently appears in this Case, that the ancient Use was in the Cognizor. The Postea ordered to be delivered to the Plaintiff. Godbolt 180. Vaughan 43. 2 Cooke 58. Beckwith's Case. Shephard's Touchstone of common Assurances, page 501. Wynne for Plaintiffs; Poole for Desendants.

Pendock on the Demise of Mackinder against Mackinder and others, in Ejectment.

Part of the Premisses, subject to the Opinion of the Court.) Point reserved at the Trial and twice argued was, Whether a Perfon convicted of Petit Larceny, and who had D 4 under-

56 Trials, Aerdicks, &c.

undergone the Punishment of Whipping, was, or was not a Competent Witness to a Will, whereby the Premisses in Question were devised? The Court held the Person convicted not to be a competent Witness; Petit Larceny is Felony, 'tis a Crime equal to grand Larceny, if not worse, because the Temptation is less to steal little than much, it springs from an evil Mind. The Postea ordered to be delivered to Plaintiff.

Anonimous.

PULE for a View on the Face of the Declaration (which was for obstructing a Water Course) denied; 'tis never granted without an Affidavit in any Case, except an Action of Waste.

Brookes on Demise of Mence against Baldwyn, in Ejectment. Trin. 28 Geo. 2.

PON Motion for a new Trial, Mr. Baron Adams, before whom the Cause was tried, reported to the Court, That the Verdict (which was a general Verdict for Plaintiff,) was good in Part and bad in Part, agreeable to Evidence as to Lands in Possession of one of Defendant's Tenants, contrary to Evidence as to Lands in Possession of another Tenant, 12 Mod. 271. Salk. 648.

Trials, Aerdicks, &c. 57

3 Salk. 362. were quoted to shew that where a Verdict is good in Part it must stand. Rule that Plaintiff shall take Possession of that Part of the Premisses only, as to which the Judge reported in Favour of the Verdict. Martyn for Defendant; Poole for Plaintiff.

Welch against Richards Clerk. Hil. 29 Geo. 2.

HIS was an Action of Trespass on the Case brought by Plaintiff against Defendant for a malicious Profecution, and Imprisonment of Plaintiff; and Plaintiff thinking it necessary not only to have the Inspection, and a Copy of Defendant's Information, which was taken in Writing by Buckland Nutcombe Blewett Esquire, a Justice of the Peace for Somersetskire, touching Plaintiff's marking a Sheep, with a felonious Intent to steal the same, being the Property of Defendant, but also to have the Original, and also the Warrant granted by faid Justice on such Information, and in Consequence whereof Plaintiff was apprehended and imprisoned, produced at the Affizes on the Trial of this Cause, applied to the Court on an Affidavit of the Fact as to Demand and Refusal; and obtained a Rule for the Justice to shew Cause, why Plaintiff his Council or Attorny should not have Leave to inspect said Information, and

58 Trials, Uerdicks, &c.

and to take a Copy thereof at Plaintiff's Expence; and why the Justice should not produce such Information, in order that the same might be given in Evidence on the Trial of this Cause, at next Assizes for said County; and also for Richard Darch the Constable, who executed the Warrant, to shew Cause, why he should not produce the Warrant, which was granted by said Justice for apprehending Plaintiff, in order that such Warrant might be given in Evidence on said Trial. Note; The Plaintiff having had a Copy of the Warrant delivered him by the Constable, a Copy thereof was not now moved for.

On shewing Cause it was insisted, that it was going too far, to order the Justice and the Constable to produce the Information and Warrant (because that implied a personal Attendance); and that Copies were sufficient. On the other side it was insisted, that in a Case of this Nature, Originals must necessarily be produced on the Trial, and for that Purpose the Case of The King against Smith in Sir John Strange's Reports, Vol. 1. p. 126, was cited.

The Court ordered, That Plaintiff his Council or Attorny have Leave to inspect the Information, and to take a Copy thereof at Plaintiff's Expence; and that the Justice should produce or cause to be produced the

faid

Trials, Aerdias, &c.

faid original Information, in order that the same might be given in Evidence on the Trial of this Cause at next Affizes for said County; and that the Constable should produce or cause to be produced the original Warrant, in order that the same might be given in Evidence on faid Trial. Poole for Plaintiff: Davy for Blewett Esquire.

Menne.

Hunter against Gray; Smith against Gray. Trin. 28 Geo. 2.

PULES to shew Cause, why the Venue should not be changed from London into Essex, discharged; Defendant by a Judge's Order for Time to plead, having confented to rejoin gratis, and take Notice of Trial at the Sitting after this Term in London; though the having obtained an Order for Time to plead, generally speaking, is no Hindrance to the Changing of a Venue; yet if Defendant will confent to take Notice of Trial in the County where the Action is originally laid, that Confent shall bind him; had the Judge been informed of the Defendant's Intention to move to change the Venue, he would have made

made his Order without Prejudice to such Motion. Draper for Defendant; Davy for Plaintiff.

Davies Widow against Parry Esquire, late Sheriff of Monmouthshire, for an Escape. Hil. 29 Geo. 2.

Laintiff shewed for Cause against the common Rule for changing the Venue from Middlesex into Monmouthshire unless Cause, That Mr. Catchmayd who was Under-Sheriff to Desendant, is now Under-Sheriff, and ought not to have any Concern in returning the Jury Process. Rule absolute to change the Venue, but by Consent the Jury Process to be directed to and returned by the Coroners. Hayward for Desendant; Wilson for Plaintiff.

THE

TABLE

OF

PRINCIPAL MATTERS.

Affidavit. See Ejeament 5. Fines and Recoveries 1.

Amendment.

1. RECOVERY amended by transposing the Names of Demandant and Tenant, pursuant to the Deed making the Tenant to the *Pracipe*.

2. Bill against an Attorny and Declaration thereon, amended by striking out Words. 3

3. Plea refused to be amended, though the Application was before Argument; Defendant having likewise pleaded another Plea in which Issue was joined, Trial had, and Verdict for Plaintiff.

4. Fine amended by Deed of Uses, adding a Vill.

Attach-

Attachment.

1. Rule to shew Cause why an Attachment should not issue against one for not attending at Affizes as a Witness, discharged, it appearing he was very old and infirm. 6

Attoznies.

1. Plaintiff an Attorny fued Defendant an Attorny by Capias; Proceedings stayed, and Defendant's obtaining Time by Judge's Order to put in Bail, held no Waiver of his Objection.

Bail and Bail Bonds. See Attoznies 1. Pzisoners 1, 2.

- 1. RULE absolute by Consent, for delivering up the Bail Bond on entring a common Appearance; Defendant a Member of the last Parliament having been arrested before the Expiration of 40 Days after the Dissolution.
- 2. Plaintiff excepted to Bail the Day after Eafter Term, and for want of Justification before a Judge, took Assignment of, and proceeded on Bail Bond; Defendant justified the Bail in Court the first Day of next Term, and moved to stay Proceedings; which was ordered without Costs.

 8, 9.

 2. A Palace

- 3. A Palace Court Officer not admitted to be Bail, and Persons concerned in executing the Process of all other Courts, as well as this, held to be within the Rule of Court.

 9, 10
- 4. Defendant after a Judge's Order for Time put in Bail, and furrendred himfelf in Difcharge of them, held regular, and Plaintiff's Proceedings on the Bail Bond fet afide.

Bankrupts. See Coffs 2.

Bills against Attornies. See Amendment 2.

Certiozati. See Pzisoner 1.

Coffs. See Ejeament 3, 4.

Verdict against four Defendants, Verdict against one only, the rest acquitted; Motion by them, on Affidavit that Plaintiff was poor, &c. to have their Costs deducted out of what Prothonotary should allow Plaintiff against the other Defendant, denied.

to the Affignees of Plaintiff, who was become a Bankrupt, they paying his Attorny's Bill to be taxed by Prothonotary.

11, 12

3. In

- 3. In two Actions between the fame Parties, Proceedings on the final Judgment, in that wherein the least Damages were recovered, stayed, and the Damages and Costs allowed the Defendant towards Payment of the larger Sum recovered by him in the other Action.
- 4. Avowant though not named in the Stat. of 4 Ann. held to be within the Meaning and Intent of that Statute; and allowed Costs on the Pleas found for his, to be deducted out of Costs allowed Plaintiff.
- 5. On Affidavit of Death of Leffor of Plaintiff, Rule that Proceedings should stay till Security given for Defendant's Costs. 14
- 6. The Rule for Costs of Taxation of an Attorny's Bill, should not in the first Instance be absolute, but to shew Cause.
 - 15, 16
- 7. Since the Statute of 2 Geo. 2. c. Costs of Taxation have been reciprocally given to the Party charged, and to the Attorny, as a fixth Part has or has not been taken off.

 Ibid.
- 8. Double Costs not allowed on a Nonsuit in Replevin, where Plaintiff declared for taking and detaining an Ox, and Defendant avowed the Taking as a Seizure for a Heriot Custom, claiming no Right to distrain.

Aliter

Aliter had it been for Heriot Service, for which Cattle, &r. are distrainable. Ibid.

9. Rule for Costs in Prohibition, Defendant having forced Plaintiff to deliver a Declaration, and then pleaded only that he did not proceed in Spiritual Court after the Prohibition, which Court held to be a sham nugatory Plea, not being to the Merits, and such a Plea as would not intitle Plaintiff to Costs under Stat. 8 & 9 Will. 3. c. 10. f. 3.

Declaration. See Motice 1.

Demurrer. See Pighways 1. Replevin.

Ejeament. See Cons 5. Execution 1. Trials, &c. 5.

N Affidavit of Tenant's absconding, and of Service of Declaration on her Son who is her Servant; Rule to shew Cause why such Service should not be good Service, and leaving a Copy of this Rule at her House good Service of it.

2. On Affidavit of Tenant's being Lunatick, and of Service of Declaration on the Person who had the Custody of her, Rule for her and him to shew Cause why this Service should not be good, &c. 23, 24

3. Rule for Lessor of Plaintiff and his Attorny to pay the Tenant Costs of the Application, and restore his Goods, by Affidavit,

E they

they having taken Possession of the whole Premisses, and removed the Goods when he had obtained a Rule to defend for two Thirds.

24, 25

4. Judgment which was figned against the casual Ejector, for a Mistake of interting in the Body of the Plea, the Name of Plaintiff's Lessor instead of that of nominal Plaintiff, set aside with Costs.

5. Rule to make Service of Declaration in Ejectment good, fet aside recause the Assidavit on which it was grounded was sworn before Plaintiff's Attorny as a Commissioner.

6. Declaration having been ferved without Prothonotary's Name on it, Rule for Judgment unless Tenant appeared within usual Time upon Notice. 26, 27

7. Another Rule in the like Case. 27, 28

8. On Motion for Landlord to defend, held per Cur. That 'tis not every Person claiming Title, who is Landlord within the Stat. 11 Geo. 2. c. 19. but one who is in some Degree of Possession as receiving Rent, &c. 28, 29

Execution. See Process 1.

a. In Ejectment after Verdict, though Writ of Error allowed, if no Recognizance be entered into nor Bail put in, Plaintiff is regular in taking out Hab. fac. Poss. and taking Possession.

30, 31

	1	1 . A . O . A	r^{A}	1.0
Exec	utors (and Ad	ministrators.	. See Mo
			Court 2, 5	

Fines and Recoveries. See Amendment

I. INE taken before an Attorny and a Tradefman, the Attorny died without making Affidavit of the due Acknowledgment, the Fine ordered to pass on the Affidavit of the Tradesman.

2. A Caveat comes too late after the Return of the Writ of Covenant and Entry of Post-fine at the King's Silver Office. 32,33

The King's Silver is the Post-fine or Fine for Licence to accord.

Ibid.

3. Rule to shew Cause why a Fine should not be vacated on Suggestion, that one of the Cognizors was disordered in her Senses, discharged, on her being produced and examined in Court, and appearing of good Capacity.

33, 34, 35

4. Fine taken in *Italy* allowed to pass though not signed by the Cognizors, one of the Commissioners attending, and making Oath that it was duly acknowledged before him and another, &c. 35, 36

Heriots. See Cons 8. Honyinta Court 4.

Highways. See Demurrer.

Person occupying only one Ploughland in a Parish not compellable to E 2 fend

fend into the Highways more than one Wain or Cart, though he keeps more. 18, 19, 20, 21, 22.

Inspection of Court Rolls and Books.

1. RULE for a Freehold Tenant of a Manor to have Leave to inspect the Court Rolls.

2. The fame Rule with Restriction to particular Entries. 38

3. Leave to inspect Corporation Books denied to one who was no Member of the Corporation.

38

Judgments.

1. Judgment figned for Want of a Plea, set aside, Defendant having pleaded (though after the Rule for pleading was out) and entered Appearance on the last Day for appearing.

Mony into Court. See Costs 2.

1. R ULE to withdraw Plea of general iffue, and pay Money into Court, pleading the same Plea again, &c. 42, 43

2. Rule by Consent for Payment of Mony brought into Court, to Executrix of Plaintiff, together with such Costs, as Plaintiff would have been intitled to if he had accepted it.

40

3. Mony

3. Mony paid into Court in Action on a Bond to fecure an Annuity.

4. Rule for paying Money denied in Covenant, it appearing Defendant was to render to Plaintiff the best live Beast for a Heriot or 40 s. at Plaintiff's Election. 41, 42

5. Rule to bring in Principal, Interest and Costs in Action on Bond, though Plaintiff was an Executor.

42, 43

Monpros and Monsuit.

1. R ULE to shew Cause why Judgment as in Case of a Nonsuit discharged, Plaintiff having entered his Cause, and being ready to proceed, but the View which was directed was returned by four Jurors only, &c.

Potice.

1. Judgment set aside for a Defect in the Notice of Declaration as to the Nature of the Action.

Dutlawzy.

1. CAPIAS utlagat' iffued after Plaintiff's Death without Revival by Sci. fac. fet afide.

2. Outlawry commenced and profecuted during Defendant's Residence in *Ireland*, reversed without Bail or Appearance. 45, 46

JPleading**s**

7	y	•	- -	••	-		
-1-	1 17	2.7	671	m	m	_	
P	7 F	97		8 8	98	• 1	
-	••				**	•	•

r. R ULE to reply feveral Matters denied, Courts have never construed Statute of 4 & 5 Ann. to extend to other Pleadings than Pleas.

Double Bleas allowed.

1. Non assumptit by the Testator, a general Plene administravit and a Special Plene administravit.

2. In Trespass, Assault and Battery, Not guilty and Licence.

Double Pleas not allowed.

1. Non assumpsit and Infancy. 46

2. Non est factum and Solvit post Diem. Ibid.

Pisconers.

Defendant Prisoner for want of Bail to Action brought in inferior Court discharged on a common Appearance, Plaintiff having removed his Action here by Certiorari.

49, 50

2. What is meant by the common Rule against the Sheriff where he takes a Bail Bond.

50, 51

What where Defendant remains in Custody for want of Bail. Ibid.

3. Declaration, Judgment and Execution against a Prisoner set aside as irregular, being all subsequent to the Time of Desendant's being supersedable and his having applied for a Supersedeas.

51, 52

Pzívilege.

Privilege. See Bail 1.

Procels.

1. Fieri facias and Execution against an Attorny set aside without Costs, for Irregularity in the Writ.

352,353

2. Proceeding staid Process being served on the Return Day.

53

Prohíbition. See Costs 9.
Record. See Crials, &c. 1.

Replevin. See Costs 4, 8. Highways 1. Sheriff, Sheriffs Officers. See Bail 3. Supersedeas. See Pzisoner 3.

Trials, Aerdias, &c.

1. AFTER Verdicts, Records of Nifi prius and Writs of Hab. Corpora Jurat', being lost by Associate, Rule for new ones to be made out and returned.

2. Held that a Fine levied without any Declaration of Uses, must result to the ancient Use.

3. Held that a Person convicted of Petit Larceny and whipped, was not a competent Witness to a Will.

55, 56

4. Rule for a View never granted without Affidavit, except in Action of Waste. 56

5. On Motion for a new Trial in Ejectment, the Judge reporting Verdict to be agreeable to Evidence in Part and contrary in Part, Rule

Rule for Plaintiff to take Possession of that Part only, as to which the Judge reported in Favour of the Verdict. 56, 57

in Favour of the Verdict. 56, 57

6. Rule for Plaintiff to have Leave to inspect Information, and for Justice of Peace to produce it, and Constable produce Warrant on Trial. 57, 58, 59

Menue and Menire facias.

I. VENUE refused to be changed from London into Essex, Defendant by a Judge's Order for Time to plead having consented to rejoin gratis, and take Notice of Trial in London.

59, 60

2. Venue changed from Middlesex to Monmouthshire, in Action against the late Sheriff, the Jury Process to be returned by the Coroners, the Under-Sheriff having been Under-Sheriff to Desendant.

Miew. See Trials, &c. 4.

Witness. See Attachment 1. Trials, &c. 3.

FINIS,