

against Marcus F. Whitehead and Thomas Ward, Esq., the former as clerk and the latter as judge of the district court in the said district of Newcastle—*In re Whitehead*. The Attorney-General moves for a rule to shew cause why an attachment should not issue against the said Thomas Ward and Marcus F. Whitehead respecting the former for having taxed to the latter as attorney and the latter for having charged and received illegal costs in certain cases in the said district court in which John Wilder, Christopher Lightle, Festus Burr, Richard Wright, Ephraim Farren, Joseph Cuthbert Townsend, were parties, J. B. Robinson, Esq., Attorney-General, granted."

Hilary Term, 7 George IV., Jan. 13th, 1827, same judges present, "Attachment ordered against both defendants" on motion of the Attorney-General. April 30th, "Defendants' answer put in and filed in this cause." Trinity Term, 8 George IV., June 18th (Pres. Campbell, C.J., and Sherwood, J.), "Judgment of the court that M. F. Whitehead do pay a fine of fifty pounds and remain in custody till paid and that Thomas Ward, Esquire, judge of the district court of the district of Newcastle do pay a fine of five pounds"; See *The King v. Whitehead and Ward*, Taylor 476.

Hilary Term, 7 George IV., Jan. 13th, 1827, "In the matter of complaint of Francis Beattie against M. F. Whitehead, one of etc., motion for a rule to shew cause why an attachment should not issue against M. F. Whitehead, one of the attorneys of this court for exacting unauthorized and exorbitant fees of one Francis Beattie on account of costs alleged to be due him in a cause of the said Francis Beattie against one Kenneth Meriam in the district court of the district of Newcastle in which cause the said M. F. Whitehead was attorney for the said Frs. Beattie. J. B. Robinson, Attorney-General, granted."

On the same day, upon a motion of the Attorney-General, the same rule was granted against the same attorney on the complaint of Francis Parmentier, who had been sued in the same court by Adam Henry Meyers and had been represented by Whitehead as attorney. May 3rd, both rules were argued and "stand till next Term for judgment: J. B. Robinson, Esquire."

The same day a rule was granted against Whitehead at the instance of a suitor in the case of Henry Elliott v. John Badcock,