

XLVIII

IT was true. And now, in the muddy drab-hued days of December, the action is being heard before the Lord Chief Justice and a special jury. *Lamplough v. the Earl of Brentwood and Others*.—This, as newspapers tell us, is an action against the defendants for conspiring together to defraud the plaintiff by inducing him by false and fraudulent statements to purchase shares in a company called the New Darmstadt Hotel Company.

Intrinsically, it is a very trifling matter. It means that fraudulent Lamplough bought a paltry £100 of the second Darmstadt issue, he wants his money back, and he is suing Lord Brentwood and the other directors for its recovery. But he will not succeed. Wise legal advisers declare that he has not the ghost of a chance. He probably knows so himself; but he is vindictive, he wishes to be nasty, and he takes this opportunity of thrashing out his wretched pamphlet once again. Of course the chairman and directors must strenuously defend the action, because, were this shareholder to succeed, all the rest of the shareholders might launch similar actions. Legal advisers may perhaps remark that though Lamplough will fail as against the defendants, he may incidentally land our friend Copland in Queer Street.

To the large unthinking public the matter is of very different import. Newspaper readers see those words, "false and fraudulent statements," "conspiring," etc., and regard it as the case of a nobleman in trouble. Totally unable to discriminate between a civil action and criminal proceedings, they speak of it as "the trial of Lord Brentwood."

Newspaper editors, indulging their readers, say the case is one of "sensational interest," at least twenty counsel are engaged in it, the court is to be packed with members of the aristocracy. Sketches of Lord Brentwood in court, sketches of Lord Brentwood walking and talking with his legal advisers