

petition, but not to file it in the records of the Court, until further orders.

This recusation took place at the beginning of the term and consisted of four separate petitions, that is, one for each judge.

After four or five days consultation, Mr. Justice Badgley, the only judge unchallenged, suggested to Mr. Doutré that he should withdraw the petitions and present them *de novo* on account of the absence from the bench of one of the judges, at the time they were first presented, but to this Mr. Doutré did not accede.

However, the last day of the term arrived, and then the five judges concurred in a judgment, declaring the petitions inadmissible inasmuch as the charges contained in them amounted to accusations against the judges of treason and perjury.

Mr. Doutré thereupon moved for an Appeal to Her Majesty's Privy Council. No decision was given on this motion, but the Court suggested that a rule be taken returnable on the first day of March, a course which evidently did not meet with the learned counsel's approbation, as he has not adopted it, preferring, as we understand, to allow the motion to remain as a protest against the judgment and to proceed to the argument, so as to bring the whole matter in Appeal before Her Majesty's Privy Council, should the pretensions of the widow Guibord be unsustained.

The case is, while we write, being argued before the court on its merits, and the judgment will probably be rendered in the month of June next—a judgment to which our readers will look with no little interest.



*Mount Library*