

The Legal News.

VOL. V.

JULY 29, 1882.

No. 30.

CONTEMPT OF UCORT.

The London *Law Times* refers to a case of *Smith v. Bennett*, which came before Kay, J., on the 24th June, as showing the strictness of the Court in dealing with applications to commit persons to prison for contempt in disobeying the orders of the court. The plaintiff and defendant were co-owners of a public-house, and the defendant had worked coals under the house in breach of the rights of the plaintiff. The plaintiff brought his action for an injunction, and on the 4th May last, Hall, V. C., granted an injunction to restrain the defendant from "working" the mines. The plaintiff alleged that the defendant was nevertheless continuing to work the mines, and on the 15th of June last moved before Kay, J., to commit him for contempt accordingly. On that occasion the evidence appeared to his lordship to be unsatisfactory, and he directed that the parties should attend before him to be examined orally. This was now done, and, as the result of the evidence, and in particular that of the defendant, it appeared that the same number of men were kept at work in the pit as before the injunction, and that a man at the top of the pit was employed as theretofore in sharpening the tools of the men below, and in winding up the coal, so that to all outward appearance matters were going on as before. It was sworn, however, that the coal so being raised was coal lying in the pit which had been severed and gotten previously to the injunction. Kay, J., in giving judgment, said that no doubt the case was one which justified a strong suspicion that the defendant was acting in breach of the injunction. But the evidence now before him did not show that there had, in fact, been an actual breach, as the "winding" of the coal was not "working" it within the meaning of the injunction. Anybody who sought to put a man in prison on the ground of disobedience to an order of the court, must prove his case in the strictest way. This had not been done, and he, therefore, should refuse the motion with costs.

SERJ. BALLANTINE'S EXPERIENCES.

Serjeant Ballantine who, we suppose, may be correctly described as a popular lawyer, has made a very popular book, and the author is rewarded by seeing the third edition of his literary venture exhausted, while the public, like *Oliver Twist*, is asking for more. Whatever the learned serjeant's actual experiences of life may have been, he has been careful in this book to hold up the bright and pleasant side to the public eye, and no client or rival has reason to tremble, for the "Reminiscences" contain no betrayal of professional confidence or professional secrets. The veteran author was not particularly fortunate in his school experiences:—

"Marched two and two to the parish church clad in our best clothes, and encased in a sort of moral strait waistcoat, cramped up in a narrow pew, prayer-book in hand, listening to what we could not understand, we strove, often ineffectually, to keep awake, knowing that if we yielded to drowsiness we forfeited our share of the pudding—sole pleasure of the day."

The serjeant has a good deal to say about actors and actresses, but we pass on to one or two of the professional experiences. In 1856 the trial of William Palmer took place at the Central Criminal Court, for the murder of John P. Cook. Lord Campbell presided, and, says Serjeant Ballantine, "the reputation of his lordship for politeness was amusingly illustrated by a remark made by the crier of the court. His lordship had said, with great suavity of manner, 'Let the prisoner be accommodated with a chair.' 'He means to hang him,' said the crier." Sir Alexander Cockburn conducted the prosecution. There was considerable doubt as to the poison employed, for none was found in the body of the victim. But, writes the serjeant, "the strong good sense of Lord Campbell brushed away the merely scientific question; showed that it was not material to discover by what poison the deed was effected; dwelt with overwhelming force upon the facts, to which, as he explained, the medical evidence was merely subsidiary, and only used for the purpose of demonstrating that the appearances presented were consistent with the means suggested." Palmer was convicted, and justly.

Of Lord Chelmsford at the bar Mr. Ballantine says: "He was very painstaking and industri-