

cause the said M. F. Whitehead was attorney for the said Fra. 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, in the same district court of the Newcastle district to shew cause why he "should not be fined the sum of three pounds illegally taken by him as an attorney in that cause . . . why an attachment should not issue against him. H. J. Boulton, for complainant."

These seem to have been dropped when Whitehead was punished. No doubt he repaid the costs improperly obtained.

There are several such motions. Sometimes the attorney satisfactorily explains the matter.* Sometimes the whole dispute is referred to arbitration.†

Easter Term, 8 George IV., May 3rd, 1827 (Præs. Campbell, C.J., and Sherwood, J.), "In re F. X. Rocheleau, one of the attornies of this honourable court. Motion for a rule to shew cause why an attachment should not issue against Francois Xavier Rocheleau, one of the attornies of this honourable court, for a contempt on matters disclosed on affidavit; John B. Robinson, Attorney-General, granted." June 28th, "Enlarged rule."

On Nov. 7th, 1826, D. Bethune had obtained a rule against this attorney to shew cause why an attachment should not issue against him for not paying over monies collected by him as attorney for Robert Moore. But this rule, although taken out,

*As in *Radeliffe v. Small, Taylor*, 308, where the client had instructed the attorney to send the money by return of boat, and the attorney had sent it by a passenger of the boat who did not hand it over. The client was left to his common law remedy.

†As in *Carruthers v. John Rolph* (the celebrated Dr. Rolph), *Taylor* 243.