

MILBURN *versus* DELPRATT, December 2. 1782.

A N D

IDEM *versus* EUNDEM.

TWO writs of *extent*; the first was quashed because the *levy* was *more* than the debt. Mr LEWIS offered to shew farther reasons from the record, but deemed superfluous:—It was quashed with *costs*.

The other was quashed, because marked for *more costs* than due, including costs of the writ of extent itself. The whole overcharge was about L. 9.

JACOBS *versus* ALLAN, Replevin.

THE plaintiff, a *mulatto*, made the common affidavit of *possession* three months before in the defendant. BROWNE objected to his affidavit because a *mulatto*, and white person affected. But the Court held him competent in this, and (perhaps) some other cases.

Duke and Duchess of CHANDOIS *adversus* FEARON et Ux.

December 10.

From the COURT of ERROR.

THIS was a *motion* on a rule to produce in *this* Court the entry of the *affirmance* of the judgment, or a copy of the proceedings had in the Court of Error *nisi causa*.

Affidavits from Mr Mure, clerk of the *Court of Error*, and of Mr Jones his head clerk, who generally acts, were read, by which it was set forth, that the Court had made an order against delivering the proceedings to *Fearon*, till security should be given in L. 10,000, to be accountable for *mesne profits* in the event of *reversal* in England.

Mr BROWNE suggested, That the order was made by the Governor and Council, not sitting in their capacity of *Court of Error*. He cited the cases of *Lord Knollis*, whose peerage was questioned, *Salk.*



*Salk.* 509; and denied the legality of an order of the *Court of Error* to the present effect, even if founded on the *King's* instructions. As to the *practice* in former cases, he said it arose from the desire of those acting as *Attorney-General* to support the *King's* instructions.

A great deal was said by him and the other counsel about the practice in *England* of *B. R.* where the record *itself* is remitted; but here a *transcript* of the *proceedings* goes to the *Court of Error*; besides, it seems to make nothing in the present point.

He urged strongly, that the order under the *King's* instructions to demand bail is contrary to law, and cannot bind, 4 *Bac.* 171; 2 *Rolle Ab.* 164; 4 *Co. Inst.* 200. Under this last authority he questioned the right by which the *Court of Error* here is constituted. He reprobated the cases in *Penny's* time, because he was *Attorney-General*. *Doe*, on the demise of *Ross* versus *Beckford* in 1758, was a case of *non pros*; *Palmer* and *Hanlon* was so likewise; he admitted, however, one case in point, though an *Attorney-General* was concerned, that of *Cussans* and *Gregory*.

Mr REDWOOD on the same side controverted the authority of the *Court of Error*, *Lilly's Entries*, 213. 222. 238. 271. 353. 254. 422; 2 *Bac. Ab.* 210. 212. 231. 356; 5 *Mod.* 250; 1 *Black. Com.* 167. 237. 269. 270.

Mr BAKER, on the side of the *Duke et Ux.* asserted, That the order to remove the *proceedings*, should have been to the *principal*, not to the clerks. He said in this case, that the constitution of the colonies should be considered; and that the constitution of the *Court of Error* as established here, is highly beneficial. An appeal lies to the *King* in Council from the *Isle of Man*, 1 *Black. Com.* 95. 105. An act passed in 1776 here relative to the *Court of Error*, has not altered the *King's instructions*, therefore may be said *pro tanto* to recognise them.

Mr SHARPE,—same side.

He observed, that the *execution*, even after a second judgment *here*, is peculiar, and an indulgence, as in *England* it is stayed till the ultimate determination, *Salk.* 97. For another purpose not material, he quoted 2 *Bac.* 203. and *Lord Raym.* 427.

Mr *Attorney-General* cited 1 *Salk.* 261. 321; 2 *Gro.* 535. 341; *Cartb.* 169. 319. and 3 *Mod.* 335.

Mr LEWIS also cited the following cases, and argued from them against the motion, 1 *Black. Com.* 107; *Duchess of Kingston's case*; *Bayly* and *Prioleau*, exactly the same with that of *Cussans* and *Gregory* mentioned by Mr *Browne*; 2 *Rolle* 492; 4 *Bur.* 340; 4 *Mod.* 127; *Hob.* 327; *Show.* 57; *Salk.* 403; *Cartb.* 237. and *Rocke* and *Hall* here.

Mr REDWOOD replied.



The Court considered the doctrine about *mittitur* and *remittitur* out of the question, as the *transcript only* is sent from this Court; and the end is afterwards answered by the certificate from the clerk of the *Court of Error*. The rule of taking security in the *Court of Error* on *affirmance*, seems beneficial and reasonable, and is moreover well established by past practice; therefore the motion was denied, and

*The rule discharged.*

---

*Doe ex dim.* HAMILTON *versus* MORRIS.

IN the deduction of a title, the *probate* of a deed from *John Noy Robinson* was objected to, because the witness's name is not filled up in the *record of the memorandum of the probate* before the Judge. By the majority of the Court the objection was overruled; but a bill of exception thereon was prayed and granted; *query*, It being an old deed? Afterwards a *Thomas Watson* proved the hand-writing of one of the witnesses to this deed.

On this trial the question arose, Whether the *defendant* is bound to show his title? which had been the old practice; but the Court determined that he is not; but may stand on *possession only* if he pleases; *per* GRANT, COPE, LEWIS and ELPHINSTON.

*Browne's* deposition *de bene esse* was tendered and rejected, because it was not shown that he was *dead*, or *unable to attend* to be examined *ore tenus*.

MEMORANDUM.

*French*

January the 16th 1783. Mr ~~FINCH~~, the *Chief Justice*, died, and, on the 17th, I was appointed to that office.

I took out at first a *separate* commission, conceiving that under the law passed in 1780, the *assistant Judges* hold their places of course under the old commission, notwithstanding the demise of one *Chief Justice*, and the appointment of another. I am yet inclined to this opinion, as the most beneficial construction of the act; but having consulted the gentlemen of the bar, they thought the *association clause* in the Grand Court commission required that a new one should be taken out, which was afterwards done, *ex abundante cautela*, but of the same date as my first.

The only Judges I added to the old list, were WILLIAM PEATE, and JOHN HENCKELL, Esquires.

To the *Affize Court* commissions I made no addition.

T

Surry