

does not seem to have been pressed, probably the attorney paid the amount and costs.

Other officers did not escape, for example sheriffs.

An attachment having been granted against Rapalje, the sheriff of the London district, the following proceedings were had—on April 26th, 1826, a rule was procured by James E. Small in *Rex v. Abraham A. Rapalje* (sheriff) to George W. Whitehead, one of the coroners of the London district, to return the writ of attachment to him directed against Abraham A. Rapalje, sheriff of the said London district and returnable the first day of this term. On Nov. 10th, 1827, Abraham A. Rapalje, sheriff of the London district "entered into a recognizance with James Fitzgibbon and Enoch Moore as sureties to appear in the court and answer, etc. Michaelmas Term, 8 George IV., Nov. 16th, 1827 (Præs. Campbell, C.J., Sherwood, and Willis, JJ.), "Interrogatories and answers read by Attorney-General. Sentence of the court, "Mr. Rapalje to remain in custody till money be paid."*

In Trinity Term, 8 George IV., June 30th, 1827 (Præs. Campbell, C.J., and Sherwood, J.), "In the matter of John Spencer, Esquire, sheriff of the district of Newcastle. Motion for a rule to shew cause why an attachment should not issue against John Spencer, Esquire, sheriff of the district of Newcastle, for an abuse of his office in exacting excessive and illegal fees; John B. Robinson, Attorney-General."

*The full story is that Rapalje had in his hand a writ of *fi. fa.* It was ordered by the court to return this writ into court with an account of what he had done under the writ—he omitted to do so. Then followed the next step. Michaelmas Term, 5 George IV., Nov. 18th, 1825 (Præs. Campbell, C.J., and Sherwood, J.), "*John Secord and Elijah Secord v. Thomas Horner*. Motion for an attachment against A. A. Rapalje, sheriff of the London district for not returning the writ of *fi. fa.* to him directed in this cause pursuant to a rule of the court on motion of Jas. E. Small, Esq., of counsel for the plaintiff. Granted and issued." This writ was, of course, directed to one of the coroners of the district, but the coroner, Mr. Whitehead, did not execute it. It therefore became necessary to move against him. Accordingly on June 30th, 1826, an attachment was issued directed to James Mitchell and Esq., *elisors*, against George W. Whitehead, one of the coroners of the London district for neglecting to return the writ of attachment issued to him and returnable in Easter Term last. Then, and only then, the sheriff gave himself up and appeared in court.