

INDEX TO ENGLISH LAW REPORTS, FROM 1813 TO 1856.

JUST PUBLISHED, BY T. & J. W. JOHNSON & CO., No. 197, Chestnut Street, Philadelphia.

A GENERAL INDEX to all the points direct or incidental decided by the Courts of King's and Queen's Bench Common Pleas, and Nisi Prius, of England, from 1813 to 1856, as reprinted, without condensation in the English Common Law Reports, in 83 vols. Edited by George W. Biddle and Richard C. Murtrie, Esq., of Philadelphia. 2 vols. 8 vo. \$9

References in this Index are made to the page and volume of the English Reports, as well as to Philadelphia Reprint making it equally valuable to those having either series. From its peculiar arrangement and admirable construction, it is decidedly the best and most accessible guide to the decisions of the English Law Courts.

We annex a specimen showing the plan and execution of the work :

PLEADING.

- I. General rules.
II. Parties to the action.
III. Material allegations.
(a) Immaterial issue.
(b) Traverse must not be too broad.
(c) Traverse must not be too narrow.
IV. Duplicity in pleading.
V. Certainty in pleading.
(a) Certainty of place.
(b) Certainty as to time.
(c) Certainty as to quantity and to value.
(d) Certainty of names and persons.
(e) Averment of title.
(f) Certainty in other respects; and herein of variance.
(g) Variance in actions for torts.
VI. Ambiguity in Pleadings.
VII. Things should be pleaded according to their legal effect.
VIII. Commencement and conclusion of Pleadings.
IX. Departure.
X. Special pleas amounting to general issue.
XI. Surplusage.
XII. Argumentativeness.
XIII. Other miscellaneous rules.
XIV. Of the declaration.
(a) Generally.
(b) Joinder of counts.
(c) Several counts under new rules.
(d) Where there is one bad count.
(e) Statement of cause of action.
(f) Under common law procedure act.
(g) New assignment.
(h) Of profert and oyer.
XV. Of pleas.
(a) Generally.
(b) Pleas in abatement.
(c) Pleas in abatement for nonjoinder.

- (d) Plea in abatement for misnomer.
(e) Pleas to jurisdiction.
(f) Plea p[er] d[omi]n[u]m contumace.
(g) Plea to further maintenance of action.
(h) Several pleas, under stat. of Anne.
(i) Several pleas since the new rules of pleading.
(j) Under common law procedure act.
(k) Evidence under non assumpsit.
(l) Evidence under non assumpsit, since rules of H. T. 4 W. 4.
(m) Plea of payment.
(n) Plea of non est factum.
(o) Plea of performance.
(p) Plea of "nil debit" and "never intended."
(q) Of certain special pleas.
(r) Of certain miscellaneous rules relating to pleas.
(s) Of null and sham pleas.
(t) Of issuable pleas.
XVI. The replication.
(a) Replication de injuria.
XVII. Demurrer.
XVIII. Repleader.
XIX. Issue.
XX. Defects cured by pleading over, or by verdict.
XXI. Amendment.
(a) Amendment of form of action.
(b) Amendment of mesne process.
(c) Amendment of declaration and other Pleadings.
(d) Amendment of verdict.
(e) Amendment of judgment.
(f) Amendment after nonsuit or verdict.
(g) Amendment after error.
(h) Amendment of final process.
(i) Amendments in certain other cases.

I. GENERAL RULES.

II. PARTIES TO THE ACTION.

It is sufficient on all occasions after parties have been first named, to describe them by the terms "said plaintiff" and "said defendant." Davison v. Savage, 1 637; 6 Taun. 575. Stearnson v. Hunter, 1 675; 6 Taun. 406.

And see under this head Titles, Action; Assumpsit; Bankruptcy; Bills of Exchange; Case; Cause in Action; Covenant; Executors; Husband and Wife; Landlord and Tenant; Partnership; Replevin; Trespass; Trover.

III. MATERIAL ALLEGATIONS.

Whole of material allegations must be proved. Reece v. Taylor, xxx, 590. 5 N & M. 469.

Where more is stated as a cause of action than is necessary for the gist of the action plaintiff is not bound to prove the immaterial part. Bromfield v. Jones, x, 624; 4 B & C. 380. Eresham v. Postels, xii 721; 2 C & P. 540. Dukess v. Gostling, xxvii, 786; 1 B N C. 698. Pitt v. Williams, xxix, 203; 2 A & P. 841.

And it is improper to take issue on such immaterial allegation. Arundel v. Bowman, lv, 183; 8 Taun. 102.

Matter alleged by way of inducement to the substance of the matter, need not be alleged with such certainty as that which is substance. Stoddart v. Palmer, xvi 212; 4 D & R. 624. Churchill v. Hunt, xviii 243; 1 Chit. 480. Williams v. Wilcox, xxxv, 909. 8 A & E 314. Brunskill v. Robertson xxxvii, 9 E & L. 840. And such matter of inducement need not be proved. Crossings Bridge v. Rawlings, xxvii, 41; 3 B N C. 71.

Matter of description need not be proved as alleged. Wells v. Gilling, v. 853. 10w 21. Stoddart v. Palmer, xvi, 212; 4 D & R. 624. Bicketts v. Salwey, xviii, 68; 1 Chit. 104. Treedale v. Clement, xvii, 329; 1 Chit. 603.

An action for tort is maintainable though only part of the allegation is proved. Bicketts v. Salwey, xviii, 68; 1 Chit. 104. Williamson v. Aenley, xix, 140; 6 Bing. 266. Clarkson v. Lawson, xix, 229; 6 Bing. 687.

Plaintiff is not bound to allege a request, except where the object of the request is to oblige another to do something. Amory v. Broderick, xviii, 690; 2 Chit. 329.

In trespass for driving against plaintiff's cart. It is an immaterial allegation who was riding in it. Howard v. Peete, xviii, 633; 2 Chit. 315.

In assumpsit, the day alleged for an oral promise is immaterial, even since the new rules. Arnold v. Arnold, xviii 47; 3 B N C. 81.

Where the terms of a contract pleaded by way of defence are not material to the purpose for which contract is given in evidence, they need not be proved. Tolson v. Fallows, xxvii, 186; 3 B N C. 492.

Distinction between unnecessary and immaterial allegation. Draper v. Garratt, lx, 11; 2 B & C. 2.

Preliminary matters need not be averred. Sharpe v. Abbey, xv, 537; 5 Bing. 133.

When allegations in pleadings are divisible. Tapley v. Wainwright, xxvii, 710; 5 B & Ad. 396. Hare v. Horton, xxvii, 302; 5 B & Ad. 715. Hartley v. Burkitt, xxviii, 925; 5 B N C. 687. Cole v. Crosswell, xxxix, 355; 11 A & E, 661. Green v. Steer, xii, 740; 1 Q B. 707.

If one plea be compound of several distinct allegations, one of which is not by itself a defence to the action, the establishing that one in proof will not support the plea. Balfie v. Bell, xxviii, 900; 4 B N C. 485.

But when it is composed of several distinct allegations, either of which amounts to a justification, the proof of one is sufficient. Ibid.

When is tender a material allegation. Marks v. Lalee, xxxii, 193; 3 B N C. 408. Jackson v. Allaway, xlv, 842; 5 M & G. 942.

Matter which appears in the pleadings by necessary implication, need not be expressly averred. Galloway v. Jackson, xlii, 498; 3 M & G. 960. Jones v. Clarke, xviii, 694; 3 B & P. 194.

But such implication must be a necessary one. Galloway v. Jackson, xlii, 498; 3 M & G. 960. Prentice v. Harrison, xlv, 852; 4 Q B. 852.

The declaration against the drawer of a bill must allege a promise to pay. Henry v. Burbridge, xxvii, 234; 3 B N C. 601.

In an action by landlord against sheriff under 8 Anne, cap. 14, for removing goods taken in execution without paying the rent, the allegation of removal is material. Smallman v. Pollard, xlv, 1001.

In covenant by assignee of lessee for rent arrear, allegation that lessee was possessed for remainder of a term of 22 years, commencing, &c., is material and traversible. Carvick v. Balgrave, v. 783; 1 B & B. 631.

Multitudo allegation is the maximum of proof required. Francis v. Steward, xvii, 6; 4 Q B. 984, 986.

In error to reverse an outlawry, the material allegation is that defendant was abroad at the issuing of the exigent, and the averment that he so continued until outlawry pronounced need not be proved. Robertson v. Robertson, 1, 165; 5 Taun. 309.

Tender not essential in action for not accepting goods. Boyd v. Lett, 1, 221; 1 C B. 222.

Averment of trespasses in other parts of the same close is immaterial. Wood v. Wedgwood, 1, 271; 1 C B. 273.

Request is a condition precedent in bond to account on request. Davis v. Cary, lxix, 416; 15 Q B. 418.

Corruptly not essential in plea of almsgift contract, if circumstances alleged show it. Goldham v. Edwards, lxxxi, 436; 1 C & P. 437.

Made by which nuisance causes injury is surplusage. Fav v. Prentice, 1, 827; 1 C B. 828.

Allegation under per quod of mode of injury are materia averments of fact, and not inference of law in case for illegally granting a scrutiny, and thus depriving plaintiff of his vote. Price v. Belcher, liv, 68; 3 C B. 58.

Where notice is material, averment of facts "which defendant well knew," is not equivalent to averment of notice. Colchester v. Brooke, liii, 339; 7 Q B. 338.

Specimen Sheets sent by mail to all applicants.

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL,

Toronto, 4th September, 1857.

EXTRACT from the Standing Orders of the Legislative Council.

Fifty-ninth Order.—"That each and every applicant for a Bill of Divorce shall be required to give notice of his or her intention in that respect specifying from whom and for what cause, by advertisement in the official Gazette, during six months, and also, for a like period in two newspapers published in the District where such applicant usually resided at the time of separation; and if there be no second newspaper published in such District, then in one newspaper published in an adjoining District; or if no newspaper be published in such District, in two newspapers published in the adjoining District or Districts."

J. F. TAYLOR,

10-tf.

Clerk Legislative Council.