

Unless plaintiffs themselves are thoroughly acquainted with the practice it will be advisable to have the confession executed before the clerk, who will always have the necessary forms before him, rather than the bailiff. Moreover in such cases the papers are at once to be placed in the possession of the clerk ready to be presented to the judge at the next sittings of the court.

FRENCH SMALL DEBTS COURTS.

A correspondent of one of the English law periodicals, writing from France, enclosed an "invitation" to attend the "Juge de Paix," which appears to be an equivalent there for the much less courteous County Court summons in England, or the Division Court summons here; he also remarks upon the politeness of the language, so characteristic of the French nation, and wherein, by the way, we might "take a leaf out of their book." The following is the translation which is given of the document:

County Court of the Canton of, &c.,

21st January, 1865.

To Mr. A., resident at ———, at the house of Mr. B.

In the name of His Honor the Judge of the County Court of, &c.

You are invited to attend at the sitting of the Court in the Town Hall, on the 23rd January, 1865, at 10 o'clock, a.m., to be heard upon a question which concerns you, in the matter of a plaintiff of Mr. C., resident at, &c., for money due on account stated.

It concludes with the signature of the officer, &c., and an *N.B.* to bring the "invitation" with him to Court.

SELECTIONS.

POLICE BLUNDER.

Another police blunder, which almost throws the Shrewsbury escapade into the shade, has just been perpetrated. We learn from the *Manchester Examiner* that on Sunday night a gentleman named Crum, an officer in the army, who had been staying at Scarborough, and who arrived in York on Monday morning, was apprehended at one of the principal hotels in that city, charged with having forged a cheque for £1,500, on a bank in Buxton. One of the inspectors, named Hodson, had a warrant for the apprehension of a man named Temple Morris, and he arrived at a late hour on Saturday, after which he received

information that a gentleman, who, it was supposed, was the offender, had arrived in the town. Inspector Hodson immediately waited upon Captain Crum, and told him that he held a warrant for his apprehension on a charge of forgery. Mr. Crum told the policeman that he was mistaken, and after informing him that he was a nephew to Messrs. Crum, merchants, Moseley-street, Manchester, told him and a policeman who accompanied him that they might search his portmanteau (in which were his regimentals), his card-case, and, as he said, "the whole of his letters," if they liked. However, the local "Dogberrys" declined to do this, and the constable, exhibiting the handcuffs, told him that if he did not go with them by the next train, he would have them applied in a manner that he would not approve. Mr. Crum, acting upon the advice of some gentlemen who were present, but who were unknown to him, consented to go quietly, whereupon he was removed from York to Buxton, and, on being confronted with the bankers in the morning, they immediately stated that the police were mistaken. The gallant officer was released from custody.

It is said that legal proceedings are contemplated. We sincerely trust so.—*Solicitors' Journal*.

A QUAKER JURYMAN.

We have all heard the story of the Quaker who refused to take off his hat in the presence of Charles the Second, but we hardly expected to find in the present day anyone so foolish as to make himself a martyr to the principle involved in that objection. At Hereford Assizes, last week, one of the jurymen on entering the box omitted to take off his hat, and insisted on retaining it after Baron Pigott had requested its removal. The gentleman said that uncovering the head was an honour which he considered due to God only, and stated that members of the Society of Friends were allowed to wear their hats in most of the courts of justice in England. A fine of forty shillings was inflicted on this ill-advised individual, and he was ordered to leave the jury-box, as the judge did not consider him a proper person to sit there.—*Solicitors' Journal*.

The *Pull-mall Gazette* states, but we doubt the accuracy of its information, that "the following little scene is authentic, and might, if necessary, be described with all due particulars of name and place." A prisoner at one of our criminal courts was convicted of an outrageous crime. The judge began to sentence him with the usual sermon, in manner and form following:—Judge: "Prisoner at the bar, you stand convicted of a most abominable crime, one equally brutal and cowardly; you—" Prisoner: "Ow 'much?" Judge: "Eight." Whereupon without more ado the prisoner was removed, and the officer of the court recorded sentence of eight years' penal servitude.—*Solicitors' Journal and Reporter*.