is obliged to content himself with Jersey decisions, and to suffer imprisonment.*

ROYAL COURT, Sept. 18, 1824.

Lean v. Robinson.

The defendant, in this case, was a widow lady; and in the year 1818, in company with plaintiff, his wife, and several children, emigrated from Guernsey for the United States of America. Some accounts necessarily accrued between the parties. After a lapse of eight years, the plaintiff (who had returned to Jersey some years previous to the defendant) sued her for a balance of 18*l.* To this she pleaded, that she had years since (in America) discharged the plaintiff's accounts, which she offered to prove. This account of the defendant's, accompanied with regular dates, the court refused to admit; whilst the plaintiff was permitted, on his oath alone, to prove the legality of his claim. The court, therefore, gave the plaintiff a verdict with costs.

This decision was met with astonishment. The defendant was ready to swear to the correctness of her set-off, and further wished to have availed herself of the acknowledged law in Jersey, " That every claim shall be substantiated on the oaths of two disinterested witnesses." This was also refused her, when she was committed to prison, where her adversary may, according to law, detain her for an indefinite period.

ROYAL COURT, July 16, 1825.

Moisin v. Quelin.

This action was brought (by power of attorney from France) to recover a sum from the defendant. The first objection taken by the defendant's counsel was, as to the competency of the court,—on the ground, that the transaction having originated in France, where the defendant had become bankrupt, the courts

---

* According to Jersey law, a debtor, without real property, may be imprisoned fifty years, there being no law which admits him to surrender, as will be hereafter seen.