

wer, and he should not be heard by attorney who asked for delay to answer in writing. No cause was assigned or shown at the time and place appointed why the rule should not be declared absolute, and it was declared absolute.

The power to order coercive imprisonment for contempt is not only inherent in the Court under the common law, but is expressly authorized by art. 834 C. P.

While there is an appeal to this Court from a judgment of the Superior Court ordering coercive imprisonment for contempt of any process or order of that Court, I should say that the subject of such appeal should be limited to an enquiry as to whether or not the forms and rules of law and procedure had been complied with.

As a general rule, Courts of appeal should hesitate to revise or reverse the merits of a judgment of the Superior Court of punishment for contempt, and we should not, except in clear cases of error or excess of authority, interfere with disciplinary acts of the Superior Court, otherwise orders of punishment for contempt would become futile and ineffective.

In the present case, I see no good reason of form or substance why we should interfere with the judgment of the Superior Court appealed from, and the same ought to be confirmed and the appeal dismissed.

---