YALE LAW LIBRARY

PURCHASED WITH
YALE LAW LIBRARY
PATRONS FUND
1939
Lectures
on
Municipal Law
by
Tapping Reeve L.L.D.

Viginti annorum lucubrationes.

Taken by C. Baldwin 1810 & 1811.

Volume 3rd.
Executors and Administrators

Para. 1 acts as a reimbursement of deceased heirs

for certain lumpsum fe to their real estate and
the duties which affect such real estate. Law 199, 2, 393.

An exec is a reimbursement ut infra appointed by
the last will of the decedent. He duties an exec to
execute the will 2, 393.

To make an exec tis unnecessary that the record
should be used. To enough if the decedent's intention
can be clearly learnt. D 4 69, 199 all my goods to
the discharge of A. Laws 119, 2, 392, 393, 392.

The appointment of an exec is effective to the existence
of a will 2, 393. Code 392, 393, 393, 393, 393.

A disposition of part only in contemplation of death
not containing an appointment of an exec is called a
testament. Law 2.

It has been called a testament in the circuit 2. 392 to
show in the disposition of the body of the decedent.
C. 466, 391, 391, 391, 392, 2, 392.

There may be a will without a testament 392, 392.

Having an exec is by implication a gift to him of
the goods of the deceased, exec being bound to pay the
debts. Hence naming an exec makes a will 2, 392, 393, 393.

At 6. 6, a testamentary disposition of goods without naming
an exec was called a will as in case of chattel was
called a testament ut infra. 2, 392, 392, 392.

A testamentary disposition of gifts is not named as called.
An executor or administrator is a representative of the deceased person, appointed by the testor to execute the terms of the will or to collect and distribute the assets. 1 Sh. 299, 2 B. 182, 496.

They are appointed only in those cases where no executor is appointed, and where the court or court of equity acts as executor and no person is appointed as such.

They are entitled to the property of the deceased, 1 Sh. 299, 2 B. 182, 496.

Hence, the jurisdiction of the court in cases of will and the appointment of the executor to the real estate of the deceased, 2 B. 201.

The heir is the person appointed by the testor to succeed to the real estate on the death of the testor, 2 B. 201.

The devisee is the person entitled to the real estate in intestacy appointment, 2 B. 201, 2 Sh. 463, 2 B. 184.

The power of entry over real estate is merely that of tunnels, as supra, except so far as they themselves are entitled to it. Thus real estate cannot be sold as such, and where no person is the real estate was not originally the owner of the real estate. 2 B. 493, 2 B. 494, 2 B. 201.

Entry may have the disposition of real estate like other persons, i.e., by appointee appointment of the testator. So if the court is devised to be sold for the payment of debts, the court will so empower the court to sell, in the event of the transfer, the transferor to the transferor, no other being appointed, 1 B. 493.

But a court, in no such power — the heir is the person entitled to manage the real estate, 2 Sh. 493, 1 B. 204.
It has been said that in such cases as such, vesting the deceased, as to both real and personal property, is inconsistent. The idea seems to have arisen from the heirs being liable as such to pay the ancestor's debts, and from the real property being subject to debts of all kinds. Executors have within a few years in many cases met even hundreds of real estate to be sold; they may have a power granted by a judge of probate to sell—but as may transfer, 

Prob. 105.

Intermingling with real estate don't make an estate de jure tant. In the ancestor's death, the title to land was derived, not immediately in the heirs—it must vest in the heir or in the estate—but an estate must have it—the court maintain ejectment. During the settlement of even an insolvent estate, an estate must maintain ejectment, the heir must do it—the heir must account with the estate in this case for damages. In favor the heir may recover the land immediately by probate, may order a sale afterwards.

A deed of land sold by an estate under a power from probate, signed by her wont as executors, in which she is not scanned as much, as if she had been counted upon, don't pay the interest. Such a deed of power in estate would be rejected. Such an omission would be relieved as in Aug. 1. (Prob. 1065)

The legacy becomes the legacy when the estate. (Necro 518)

The devisee takes subject to the intervention of the estate the negro B affairs as heir, but only so if the estate has the same power one real, or a real part.

The real party in interest is charged by B. with all the debt of it.
deceased, but in every case, the real estate is liable for debt by
agreement, & debt of record only. Law 23. 3 Bl. 113. 140. 2 Do.
190. 2. 86. 478. 254. 5.

at & t. or rather since, the real estate is liable for debt
or equity, or debt of record, or debt of record, or debt of the
estate from the first day of the term or which they
were recovered, & goods & chattels from the date of
the execution. Now by stat 29. 2 Ch. 1. they limit the
lands, as in bona fide purchasers, only from the day
on which the judgment was signed. & the goods & chattels
from the delivery of the execution to the offices.

According to the old & judge bound lands in the
hands of the heir from the time of the original
suit. 3. Bl. 96.

Specificity of suit may resort to either the real or
foot estate, & if they come upon the real & the insufficient
to discharge all the debts, the estate by specific suit
are liable to lose all their demands, as the can may
be without any remedy at all, since they cannot take
real estate & are postponed to specific suit. Law 93. 3 Bl. 126.
2. 20. 977.

But here they will relieve the specific suit by
letting them in upon the real estate, for as much as
the specific suit have taken from the foot. Law 1337.
3 Blk. 84. 3. Bl. 74. 1. 69. Bl. 1. 86.

The relief is afforded by them, ordering a sale of the
real estate in the hands of the heirs, some indulgence in
chattels in known to the legatees. 3 Blk. 116.

If the proceeds of the sale are insufficient, an average is mad.
...
do too it is in any mortgage whether in fee or not — But in case of a mortgage in fee, the mortgagee has no other than an equitable interest; for there is no recovery — but if lands in fee be mortgaged for years, the reversion is legal after. If the estate may have a judgment in the heir of the mortgagee for after, quod modo accipere — i.e. there is a stay of execution till the reversion happens. comes into estate. Cowen. 122. 1 N.S. 410. 6th. 93. 2, 4, 5, 16, 384.

In how an estate of redemption is legal after. A reversion express and determinate of an estate fee tail is no estate. 7 & 3, W. 384. 1 N.S. 444.

There is a contrariety of opinion as to the quality of after arising from the sale of lands devised to be sold or directed to be sold, the part exclusively devised for the payment of debt whether they are legal or equitable? According to most of the older authors, money arising from the sale of lands devised to the estate, or subject to his power to pay debts are legal after, on the principle that what comes to the estate as such, is legal after. 1. P.R. 125. Thodey's 460. 1 S.R. 69. 2 D. 366. 254. 478. P. 68. 125. 2, 166. 420. 2, 4. P.R. 384, 416, 450.

But the latest lawyers in this case & some of the oldest refer to the case in the double character of estate and tenancy, have arrived themselves to the latter character, in which case the estate is equitable. Finch. 146. 6, 197. 1, 4, 184. 2. 1 R. 80. 1. 66. 3. 150, 140.

In 1st. P.R. 197. 3, 2. Thus low denies the case in. 1, 2. 420, 198. 4th. 139.

This case seems to have overruled the old authors.

For money reserved at suit, by trustees is equitable after by reason of being exclusive jurisdiction over broken trusts. 2. P.R. 216, note. 1, 2. 140. 2, 184. 2.

But it has been held that when lands the changed
with the present debts so descend to the heir & are not devised, i.e. when the intestate does not leave any legal issue. 9 D. M. 416 note. 2 Moore 191. 2 Atk. 293. 1 Ch. 440.

The estate in fraudulent devises gives the opportunity with such cases an action of debt at law in the name of the devisee. 9 Ga. 22.

In conformity with the last but it has been held that money coming from the sale of lands, under a law now or to sell for the payment of debts or estates, is in order legal issue because the lands descend & the devisee is not broken. 1 Atk. 444. 9 S. 860. 690.

This distinction is evaded by Dr. Shaw, who held that the devisee was broken by a power to sell, as much as by a devise to sell carrying the interest by express words. 3 B. 130. 7. 150. note. 2 Lib. 1129. 3 Chel. 456.

Lands descending to an heir are to be applied to the present debts, before lands specially devised can be taken. This is reversed when the lands are specially devised for the payment of debts. 1 Atk. 196.

There is no surety founded in any difference between securities or acts of debtors - this there is in certain cases a priority arising from the consideration out of which the debt grew, & from the possession & privilege of the estate. As in case of equitable estates, personal charges, last resort, debts due to the state are first paid - the remainder is divided pro parte et deo. 6 Stat. 790.

If the tenant changes debts under the heir, & the estate next of kin, in the first fund, the estate may come upon him for the amount - i.e. when the tenant is intent is that the first fund shall not be diminished.
8.

In long, the heir is liable at once for specially debts to the amount of his effects. The still the obligor may sue the estate of the deceased, Ecc. 44:8. 9-605. 9 Bo. 25. Rov. 441, 9 Bo. 12. long 458.

So he may sue the heir for front in, the estate for front. 3 Bo. 25. 9 Bo. 13

But if the receiver judge in both and receive a full satisfaction from one, the other may be released by an audita quous.

Note and acts, an round by the costs of the deceased as far as they have effects, not named. 3 Bo. 443. 9 Bo. 113, 9 Bo. 1599. 9 Bo. 13.

The heir is never bound by the special costs of the ancestor unless expressly named, because according to the old feudal, as other petty than goods (not the land itself) were liable to execution on the first costs of the ancestor, these are not liable but by express words. 3 Bo. 25. 1 Bo. 180. 9 Bo. 440. 6, 902. 62, 9 Bo. 13. 9 Bo. 2. Aot. 572.

The debtor's body cannot originally liable to execution. 9 Bo. 12. 8 Bo.

And even when the heir is bound, or whether the obligation descends with the land, his body cannot in execution. to in the land only, 9 Bo. 25. 9 Bo. 22. 8 Bo. 454. 9 Bo. 454.

Moore 203. 9 Bo. 207. 8 Bo. 215.

The land is determined to enter not in fact, but till the issue of profits shall discharge the debt (altered at s. l. m. in the heir would be unlikely). 9 Bo. 330. 3 Bo. 172. 9 Bo. 458. 9 Bo. 451. 9 Bo. 441.

This is the only instance in which land could be taken in execution, founded on foot actions, at s. l. 9 Bo. 330. 9 Bo. 172. 9 Bo. 160. 9 Bo. 441.
The preceding A is meant when in behalf of subjects - the king might always take lands in execution in the fault of final effects. 3. Ed. II. R. Ba. 322. 1604. 441.

Land of the debtor first made liable while in his own bonds, half of them to execution for debts by stat. 13. Ed. III. 1st Ed. I., by right. In some years the statute of morter idec, was framed so that the debts to pledge all his lands by a recognizance, in the nature of a ruin morta: nun. 2. Ed. III. 286. 3. Ed. 411. 2. Ba. 429. 2. Roll. 489.

The loss of the debtor was first subjected to execution for debts i.e. by the Stat. 15. Ed. III. This gave the captain ad rumpendum. 2. Ba. 329.

Ex parte actions are used on the court of the declared only, in the detinut, not in the debt, because they are liable on the respect of debt, which they hold for others not in their own right. 2. Ba. 358. 3. Roll. 184. 1st Ed. 359.

Changing in the debt & detinut is now ceased by the verdict under the stat. 16. Ed. II. Ba. 11. 2. Ba. 523.

There is an exception where the extra dexter are personally liable as they may be in some cases. E.g. for rent incurred on a lease for years after the lessor's death - for these he is charged in his own right. 2. Ba. 459. 1st Ed. 291. Rev. 5. 1st Ed. 623. Ba. 4711. 1st Ed. 366. 1st Ed. 450. 2nd Ed. 546. 3rd Ed. 22. 6th Ed. 143. The case the lessee was more indicted.

He is chargeable in the debt in case of a tenant. 2. Ba. 66. 1st Ed. 494. 1st Ed. 603. i.e. after judgment as finite or extra de sui testamenti, for he shall not be charged with a tenant's rent on more revenue. 6. Ba. 84. 1st Ed. 321.

The lessor must be sued in the debt & detinut.
because he has affinity in his own right, if the debt descends with the land. 9 Bo. 29. 6 Bo. 36. Clov. 440 &. 1 Lw. 140.

Charging him by detinue only is aided under the act 16. K, 17. Bar. 11. 3 Bo. 99.

& to & the heir could defeat the specially one by declining the land, before the action brought 9 Bo. 36. 321. 170.

But if he claims it after the suit is purchased, as the bill is filed in bona regis, the said was laid in the hands of the purchasers. 9 Bo. 16. South. 335. 1 Nw. 239.

So that judgment on the heir binds the land by retroactive effect in case of pius & the ancestor. Now by stat 9 Bo. 16. 35, the heir in case of such an abatement before action is liable to the value of the estate sold, but the land in the hands of a bona fide purchaser is not liable.

9 Bo. 26. 1 Eq. 30. 179. 1 PA. 177.

If the heir abides after the action is brought to think it, even so at 6. B. 3 Bo. 26.

An estate can't bind his estate when he is not himself bound. E.g. A covenant to take B an heir of the estate & that his estate shall pay 1/2. No action lies in the estate for the 10. B. 3 Bo. 144. 1 W. 283. 2 C. T. 183. 6. Eq. 139. Bar. 140.

Formerly land devised were not liable in the hands of the devisee for the bond debt of the estate had no remedy in l. 2. in 207. 9 Bo. 27. 2 Bl. 178. 1 Eq. 60. 1 Bl. 189. 3 Bl. 299.

By stat 9 Bo. 114. 4. & 5. 2 of lands are void as land entailed if the land enacted was void debt in the demise & the heir jointly & summarily. 9 Bo. 33. 29. 1 Eq. 16. 329.
Note & Add.

The heir of an heir is liable for the bond debts of the last
true ancestor, but the second heir is liable in escoc"e
I suppose no further than the first had asked, as far as
for, unless in the second heir has, affects of equal amount
from the joint. 5. Ba. 53. 2. Ch. 49, 1. 148. 470. 3. 33.

But in that if the heir alone, the land to defeat the extra
only will follow the money into the hands of the extra
as heir. 3. Ba. 53. 2. Ch. 49. 2. 49. 3. 53. 148. 470. 3. 33.

The heir as such is not liable to son to pay his ancestor's
debt. but if as security can be had in the extra. the heir
may be liable in equity. On the principle that they will
secure the assets wherever they are. 2. Med. 363. 1. 50. 62.
3. Ba. 53. 2. 496. 2. 50. 33. 1. 50. 363.

Heir as such are liable in how at k. or the ancestor's
remainder of warranty.

All persons who can make wills & every other may
be executors. 2. 50. 180. 2. 192. 1. 62. 3 Ba. 62. 2. 50. 363.
In this case, if more than one child is born, they are all entitled at infancy.

An infant cannot act as an agent until 7, i.e., 1821. 2. 7. 291. 1. Font. 124.

Until this age, an administrator de ventre rei nocte is appointed. 1. 1821. 7. 11. 124.

Regularly, the acts of an infant under 17 are not binding, e.g., he cannot sell the testator's goods, he cannot accept a legacy. 1. 1821. 7. 292. 1. 124.

And even after 17, he is not bound by an agent to a legacy unless he has agents to pay debt. 1. 124.

And bail for. He is not bound by receiving debt. 2. 1821.

Under 17, he cannot sell the testator's goods for sure. He may sell goods to pay debts, no other person, however, by his order according to the 2. 124.

An act of the age of 17 is bound by his acts or acts done according to the office or duty of exent. He may also change a debt or pay. 1. 1821. 124.

But an infant act of 17 or more is not bound by acts against him, to his prejudice, e.g., if he has given an account or release without receiving of pay, no, if he accepts a legacy when he has not paid in his hands to pay debt, for in such cases he should be subject to a deviation. 2. 1821. 7. 11. 124.
Ex parte Action

So if he gives a reason for more than he requires to not binding on to the exec. These arts can not done according to his office & duty as exec. 1 boro. 139, Mod. 146, p. 69, 70, 2 B. 474.

An exec. can no do can consent a deficit not till 21. hence if a word is forfeited the infant into action on recovering the principal, to us day of d. to an action for the penalty. 1 Boro. 927, Boro. 149, Fout. 713, 2 Boro. 375, 1 Roll. 290.

Infant exec. the 17. must when need be, act by guardian like other infants on its reason they can't take an altem 9 Boro. 190, 1 Roll. 287, Boro. 190, Sec. 670, 441.

The reason is they have no remedy in an altem for mis- peelling, or terror for neglect, but in a guard, they have. 9 Boro. 190, Sec. 670, 441, 1 Mod. 59.

If be nan by an altem to set to be shown the judge is for own. 9 Boro. 190, 9 Boro. 190.

contra. 1 Roll. 287, Sec. 670.

This distinction is probably founded on the a. that after can't act till 21. But if an infant, an adult can act, they may both one by altem. For the adult may make an altem for the infant. this if they can, and the infant exec. must appear by guard. 9 Boro. 184, 1 Roll. 287, Sec. 670, 1 Boro. 190, 1 Mod. 71, 286, Sec. 225, Sec. 725, Boro. 315, 1 Mod. 286.

Infant altem may be made liable by mispeelling for costs be de busis prejudiciis for which he has no remedy in the altem that he has in the guard, But an infant still is made liable for costs. 9 Boro. 190, 1 Roll. 287, 1 Roll. 287.

By statute an infant may make wills at 17. A. d.
Soble Addis

The may be an ize at 17, by another at 12 a bor, every ize must give bonds. St. Bon. 186.

Home council.

They may be ize according to the i. of ize that, i.e. the council. The is considered as a person & is a part of owning & being sued alone, & taking upon himself the office of council without the consent of his 17. 2. Bo. 373.

But by 6. L he can without his DD. council. 2. Bo. 375.

And 17. 6. 209.

So long the 6. council is necessary the DD. council cannot be against him without. 2. Bo. 375. God. 189. 110.

But if he actually administer she is bound by his act during over time so that if during more an action is brought to them, she can plead no unity either if the administrator without the consent she is satisfied from unity. 2. Bo. 375. God. 110.

If a person sole is named over & woman before an inter meddles with the price of the DD. administrator, that is such an acceptance as well bind her, so that she can't refuse.

Sure. She is probably supposed not to have defined. A person council can only be without the DD. council.
make a will or sateth a testament of such goods as
the heir or exec. 2. Ba. 278. 79. If. 3. 198. 9. 4. 3rd 110. 1. Roll. 608.

Contra. 1. Mod. 21. 92.

So as not disinterested but that the exec. may make an
execr. of the goods she holds as exec. 2. Ba. 53. Mod. 436. 3rd. 92.
4. Roll. 608. 92

This seems much the same as making a testament -
for the exec. shall as much have the disposition of the
goods.

King. In Eng., the king may be an execr. but he may
nominate others to execute the will. He may be
used as representatives of the deceased. 1. Com. 436. 2. Ba. 574.

Corporations, aggregate cant. be execr. because, 1st:
are bodies for special purposes. 2nd. it cant take an oath
to make the probate of will. 1. Roll. 71. 2nd. 1. Com. 436.

An other reason ws the substantial objection, for as
a corporation can be an execr. because it can take the oath.
Godel. 95. 2. Ba. 574.

Dissentente. According to the civil 1. 6. 8. apostate & trait-
or, felon outlaw, he could not be execr. Godel 95. 2. Ba.
327. Of. 3. Ex. 12.

But the English 6. no foreigner disabled from being an
executor by any offence in the civil 6. including 8. persons, except
of treason can be execr. because they don't act in their
cant make will for their goods are forfeited. 2. Ba. 579.
Row. 96.
Datum x Actus.

Omnis excommunicata cant de eis in eis | being excluded
from the church, they cant of the goods in from
mus. Joseph. 2. 2. 375. 2. Eil. 134.

This is the only instance of disqualification it namely
the English L. annexing co debito—here we have nothing
to do with excommunication, & I suppose there is no
disqualification annexing co debito

Aliens, by the English L. may enter as actors—seemly
the act in except in case of military testament that
are governed by the samegentes. (Rom. 2. 2. 8. 3.)
(Acts. 28. 13. 1. 1. 413.)

Can an alien enemy vito maintain an action as actor?
It seems that he can hold the office—the act in are va-
rious in this subject, but the better opinion seems to be that
he can. 2. Rom. 976. 2. Ero. 2. 149. 639.

Idiot, nor lunatics are able by the English L. to be enter
or actors—for they cant execute the trust or determine
whether to undertake it. 2. Rom. 376. 1. 1. 486.

As if an actor becomes more capable administration may
be committed to another. Sec vs. Sale 96.

A testament it cant subdue probate to any one because
he is poor or insolvent—for he discharges his duty from the
South 457. 1. 1. 484. Act. 961.

Nor can the testament in the spiritual & demand of
unity of the testor or pursing the will, since the testament
required more. 2. Rom. 296. South 451. 1. 1. 489.

In bon. actor & actor must always, give bonds, faithfully
to discharge their duty. It ben. 167 3.
they considering an estate as a trustee will compel him as all other trustees to give security if insolvent. 2. Dec. 259. 3. Rev. 327. South. 468. 1. North 24.

So where the estate the real insolvent is wanting the gift they will compel him to give security - to or a suggestion of insolvency, they will order the devisor of the second not to buy the estate. District tea. 2. Dec. 246. 1. North 281. 75.

Who may be an Administrator?


The right of admiralty may devolve upon an infant, a son of law - but he can administer till 21. So one item can properly be called actio null that age.

Some counts may stand for an action, without consent of the heirs - for they cannot be entitled as next of kin.

As such no disqualification as in the case of infants. An inevitable that persons may stand for a common grantee to others from other. Recover null. 3. Dec. 493. 1. North 219. 259.

If a person sole executor, here the libel, during counten for his act, committed before counten over to a defendant. 1. Dec. 223. 1. Rev. 609. 203. 27. 1. North 250.


At the 1st in the last case in bound during counten only, but he only the other may follow the objects into the 1st hands, after he the death. 1. Dec. 223. 1. Rev. 609. 1. North 250. 2. Dec. 119. 1. Dec. 119.

To too into his extra hands. 1. North 329.
May not legislinr uinct of linu do this 

Corporations agnugilcat canr I suffre be act in thyr 
canr bachi oath - thr I suffre no corporations may as 
in case of enter. Est. 163.

In full or excommunicant canr be an act in - hre this 
A. canr ally - but an outline may be our. So of 
Rule may follow admiatured, Judges 2. Ba. 37. 15.

Sine an to an office cunning as in enter. Eso. 2. 55. 62. Eser 

Idiot & lunaticks canr be act in. 2. Ba. 376. Codex 96.

Origin of Administrations.
It has been so that actio belonged in leg. to the suit 

Others say the king might see the old l. suit when the 
acts of all intelline - as fresners busses & tvitries - 

Soror says this right belongs to the act of the crown 
Eser. 2. 55. 2. Ba. 97.

The jurisdiction of ecclesiastics in nature of testament & 
administration is ot to have commenced in the reign of Rich. II. 
Oftetowards the crown gave them their branch of law 
except what was before granted to as a free 
Until the intestate disposed of the goods to his use and he violated his trust—This form of the ordinary does after it the possess of well and not being accountable to any one, he did as he pleased with what remained after deducting the 2 rupees to four to the widow and 2 children. 1. R. 2. 94. 5.

During the early part of the life of the ordinary a mere wife and children, could bequeath only on third of its chattels, 1 action extended only to this. If he had no wife or no children, half was at his disposal, if he had no wife and no children, he might bequeath the whole, 2 action was continuous with his power of disposal. 1. R. 2. 95. 1. 5.

The ordinary was not bound to pay over the debt of the intestate; but when a will was made the intestate was obliged to do this as far as he was able. While this was the 1— the ordinary disposed of the goods in favor, he could not appoint others. 1. R. 2. 95. 6.

The first claim given to the power of the ordinary was by stat 3d 2. 1. 9. 1. that obliged him to pay debts to the amount of debts, & also gave the entire an action therein. 1. R. 2. 95. 2. 1. 99. 53. 5. 99. 6. 1. 99. 13. 3.

This stat is not to be in appearance of the 1st but when is this 1st to be found. 1. R. 2. 95. 3. 1. 99. 53. 2. 1. 99.

But the surplus after the pay of debts still remained with the ordinary, to remedy this, by the stat 31. 3d. I was enacted, that in case of intestacy the ordinary should bequeath the next 2 most lawful friends of the intestate to administer. 2. 1. 93. 2. 1. 14. 4. 59. 1. 93. 21.

This stat this is the origin of action, & before this time...
Before that state the ordinary had begun to appoint others to act in his stead, but they could neither nor so be sued. 2. Ba. 514. supra. 20. Litt. 133.

The reason why they could not sue, and because they were more to the ordinary, but this state enabled acts appointed under it to sue, to be sued by order as was might, 3 as the ordinary was subject by. West.

but still they were not obliged to distribute after paying debts. 1. R. W. 12, Ba. 515, 2. D. 28. 596. 597. 1. Lev. 299.

---

Action by them granted.

The right of granting action, as well as brevets of mill, now clearly belongs except in certain cases to the spirituals, so in Aug. 2. Ba. 933. 2. R. P. 408. 6. 1. Litt. 319. 2. Bl. 393. 1. Pax. 286.

And a mill can be given in and in a cl of b. d. to please the like to first try. 4 but proved in a spiritual it. see of a accessory. Doug. 621. Dow. 1. 200. 105.

It has been set that the king is a reference ordinary of the kingdom, and such may grant action. 2. Ba. 999. Allen 59.

But the right of the king has, since been denied. If a person dies intestate leaving no kindred, the practice is for the king to grant action by letter patent. The ordinary admits the patient to action. But the action must be not to judge but from counting or sequestration. The ordinary may in such case dispose of the goods in prior neciss. 2. Ba. 999. Litt. 5. 88. Salt. 97.

This the ordinary 5 purpose is not to afford an action. 2. D. 13916.
Ex parte Acton
C. 1st baron of a bastard intestate - by usage the king is entitled to all his goods. 1 Bl. 205. 1st 37. 4th 41. 23.

In certain cases the baron have by monumental custom, the right to grant action & prove wills but in no other way. 2nd 37. 3rd 41.

In some probate grants, action - an act of appointment in a neighbouring slate may have here to recover his effects. Actus in Erg. 7th 90. 8th 37. Why is not our Act essential?
2nd 41. 5th 40. 4th 41. 7th 40. 6th 41. 7th 40. 8th 41.

Who are entitled to action?

By Stat 31, Ed. 3, the ordinary is entitled to grant action to the next & most lawful friend of the intestate. The words have been construed to mean next of blood, who was under no disability. 1st 261. 2nd 496. 3rd 39.

Yet it seems to have been always held that Stat 29, Bar. 2, 2d, 261 that the 3rd was entitled to administer on the estate under this Stat. 3rd 41. 4th 40. 5th 41. 6th 40. 7th 41. 8th 41.

Is the 3rd entitled to administer on the estate? In no case it appeared that the 3rd was entitled to the exclusion of the 2nd' or third. 4th 41. 5th 41. 6th 41. 7th 41. 8th 41.

If there were several friends of equal degree the ordinary might perhaps select the most proper. 7th 41第一条。

The power of the ordinary was enlarged by the Stat 21, 3d, which allowed him to grant action to the widow or next of kin or to both, & what 2 or more were in the same degree, & with how to choose. Next friend & next of kin seem to have been synonymous, except the widow may have been included in the first words. 2nd 41. 3rd 496. 4th 41. 5th 40. 6th 41.
The stat seem to have been considered in some measure explanatory of the stat. 21. Ed. 3, 2d. 2d. it grew the power of juvenile the rest of the time to the third of joining them. Both stat. now constitute the 2. Lev. 2. 2. Ab. 456.

The stat dont seem to gain the action to the int. or the
W. death, but he has always been helden entitled to it. Lev. 2. 2. Ab. 850. 1. P. W. 92.3.

After were still not liable to distrilute to the kindred of the deceased, the them has been some controversy on this subject. 2. Ab. 899. 1. 68. 139. 1. P. W. 44.

Now by the stat of distribution 21. 3. 29. bar. 2nd. action are obliged to distrilute. But tho. who are added by the 29. bar. 2nd. declared to be not within the 22. 29. bar. 2d. 2. Ab. 410.

Hence if the W. die before action is taken, his representative, i.e. his exec. or action will be entitled to action on his W. estate, to the exclusion of rest of kin in any one of the ordinary is not by L. 1. P. W. 9822.

If the W. was exto to another person, if she die, action of the good which she had an exto goes not to her W. but to the next of kin to her taker. Lev. 3. 68. 21.

By stats. 21. Ed. 3, 2d. 21. then. 8th. the ordinary is compelled to grant action of the W. estate, to the widow, or to the next of kin; but he may grant it to either or to both. Lev. 3. 2. Ab. 456. 505. Lot. 86. 88. 55. 1. Born. 261.

When the W. is dead action goes to the next of kin of deceased in the same degree the ordinary may take in 2d. Ab. 505. 496. 7. Born. 261.
This is a s. B. the exceptions are below.

Art. 3. when granted to 2 or more may by some in-
stances be joined, but it may always be joint. Sev-
eral advts may always be granted of several parts of the
goods. e.g. Art. 5 of one part to the W. & of another to the

But of an entire thing as a bequest of 200 £. several advts
must be appointed. If 2. are appointed they must be
joint. Lev. 5. 1. Pet. 36. 1. Ed. 140.

The degree of kindred are appointed according to
the civil law, & not by the canon or b. Hence children
are preferred to parents; the combustion from the de-
cesed as direct agnates a great part of kindred claims
are, but in defect of children, yet both are to extend
degree. The order is 1. Children. 2. Parents. 3. Brothers.
6. 3. Ath. 36. 1. Ath. 52.

Females are entitled equally with males of the same
of the same degree. 2. 3. Ath. 36. 1. Ath. 52.

In conducting the degree, proximity, not quantity of
blood is regarded, therefore half blood is as much en-
titled as full blood. 2. 3. Ath. 36. 1. Pet. 84. 7. 3. Ath. 36. 32. 52.

In case of next of kin or next friend, does the right of
representation exist? The state do not mention repre-
sentation I believe, nor do the books generally at all, but it seems that according to one case under
the stat. 91. Ed. 94. the representation does obtain or in

The order under 91. Ed. 9. is not to have been 1. Heirs & W.
Extrm v. Addie.

Laws of their Representation. 2 Rev. to representation. N. Bay 428.

If none of their character will accept, a court may be by custom an act act in bung - he is next claimant.

Salk. 33. 1. Ed. 428. 1. Rev. 5.

If there is no one or if on move of one, the king acceding to wage appoints or within recommends one of the ordinary appoints him of course. Salk. 33. 1. Rev. 5. 24.

If an act refuses to administer, or dies intestate having goods undistributed upon, action must be granted - but in this case, the state. 31. Ed. 1. 1. Rev. 1. 91. does govern the ordinary - he may grant action to the residuary legatee in exclusion of the move of one. 2. B. 336. 3. B. 327. 1. Rev. 219. 1. Rev. 231.

The state 1. then gives it to the move of one or the determination that the deceased intended it for him - but the determination is not for him - for the move new is given to another. But may the ordinary appoint any other than the residuary legatee, unless he is disqualified? it seems not for the reasons just given. 2. B. 916.

Suppose the relative dies intestate as to a fact, i.e., no residuary legatee was appointed - the move of one would be entitled to presume, for as this fact the case does differ from common cases of intestacy. 2. B. 386. 1. Rev. 372. 1. Rev. 20. 1. Rev. 229.

If the residuary legatee who entitled to action at a move, she dies, his move of one, not the testator's must have the action it seems. 1. Rev. 230.
Godol. speaks only of an extra who is a minister to the ordinary, but in default of all these cases the ordinary may appoint any one he pleases, to administer the estate. 2, Br. 90. 91. Br. 247. 8o.d. 90.

Before the state such an one was usually an attorney or officer to the ordinary; now he is a keeper of the estate. 2, Br. 413. 8.

In this case the ordinary may grant letters such as one of collector, but then do not make him act but a kind of bailee or custode to gather & keep the goods safely. Cons. 2, Br. 387. 8. 91c. 8, 8o.d. 375.

When an estate devante minoritate of an infant is to be appointed, the ordinary chooses whom he pleases or he in lieu a curator for the infant. 2, Br. 387. 8. 91c. 8, 8o.d. 375.

By the state the action belongs to the widow or next of kin or both, by their refusal or incapacity, to some other person as the st shall think fit. Stat. Cons. 18. 8. 90.

In case of decease the st. has no title to action on his said estate.

Granting action to the st. in Eng. is not within the state of kin 8th yet under this state, the st. was appointed. 1, 91c. 8, 8o.d. 90.

In Eng. if a person named as an extra don't appear he from the ordinary or being summoned, to accept or refuse he is excommunicated. 2, Br. 403. 8. Godol. 60. 8. 15.
Of transmitting Trusts

If an act's done, his acts are not acts to the未成财
action must be granted ann. locus. If B. ed be
resem. de 2. Ro. 639. 6.

An act's in act's, transmit the trust thereof in him to
another, if results to the ordinary, unless he received
it. 1 Roll. 106. feb. 230. 1 comm. 250.

So if an act's done, his acts is not acts to the first
estate--for there is no priority between the first in
trust & second acts. 2 Ro. 306.

A can have no acts unity one in apponed to his
estate. The 2nd act's is to administer on the goods of the
first only if not on his estate. acts's must be granted
ann. 1 comm. 251.

But the acts of his acts. As acts having formed the
will, is the acts of A. for the power of an act is found
ed on the appointment of the deceased, if the appointment is founded on a special confidence in the deceased.
1 Ath. 506. Co. 179.

the way therefore transmit it to any one in whom
he has equal confidence after he has formed the will.
1 Roll. 256. 2 Ro. 306. 1 comm. 255.

If C. dies leaving 2 acts. A & B. C. die leaving B. his
acts. Now during C's life B. has nothing to do with the
estate of C. the acts devolve on A. 1 comm. 251.

But if after B's death A dies leaving 2 his acts, D
acts to J. 3 Ro. 505. 1 Ath. 911. 1 Ath. 193. 2 Ro. 506.

Still the acts of A acts is not the subsequent acts.
The acte is commissary to adimister the goods of an eaten, not those of a the original tenant. 1. 60. 2

Therefore actus de boar man can testamentary answer must be granted. 2. Ba. 925. 6. Baig. 122. 1. Roll 927.

If before prolate of an eaten die leaving an eaten, the latter is not A. eaten. 1. Roll 926. 2. Ba. 926. Salb. 926. Dyre 922.

Whenever therefore the course of representation is in interrupted from eaten to eaten by any one eaten, not all the goods can not administered, admission must be granted of the goods not administered by the first eaten or actus. 2. Ba. 926. Salb. 925. 1. Roll 926.

Actus de boar may way like an original actus in special. i.e. of certain specified parts of the effects not administered, the rest being committed to others. 2. Ba. 926. 1. Roll 925. Salb. 926.

If J die leaving A the eaten of A die leaving B an in part his eaten. A actus declarate minoritate of B is granted to B, B is not the representation of J. 2. Ba. 926. 620. 922. Hol. 283.

If the Manner of proving Will

The ordinary way in offices or at the instance of any party resituated, it is the eaten to prove the will. Where
may the eaten may be cited by person, whether be has a
legacy left him or not. 2. Ba. 927. Godol 928
In form the exte must appear voluntarily in 30 days. The ordinary may request the testator's goods, till the will is proved. 2. Bac. 502. Godet. 613.

If it be uncertain whether the testator is alive or dead the fact is to be judged of by the ordinary. If there is good presumptive evi of his death, the will is to be proved, &c. If he is in distant part, &c. common jur is that he is dead. 2. Bac. 509. Godet. 612.

But if the testator is living, the probate is void as invalid, 2. Bac. 129. 130.

The time in which a will ought to be proved is not settled by any passage, &c. in Bac. As left to the ordinary's discretion. But regularly it ought to be insinuated, &c. the existence of the will should of course be made known, to the proper heirs within 4 months of the testator's death. 2. Bac. 503. Godet. 61.

Form in Bac. 2. means of proving wills. It is common form, as when the exto presents the will, with out citing the party interested. &c. He procures himself that to the time &c. last will of the testator, &c. the judge on that proves it. This is sometimes done when there is no contest. 2. Bac. 503. Godet. 62.

2nd in form of 2. i.e. when the next of kin &c. are cited to be present, &c. witnesses are examined. We infer when an exto proves a will in common form, he may be compelled to prove it again. &c. in form of 2. &c. when the first probate is in form of 2.

Probate of a will in common form may be questioned.
The office of executor being privy to the testator's intent, if he be named by the testator or not appointed by the testator, he may refuse to accept the will. If the executor is disinherited, he may refuse to accept the will. In either case, the testator may appoint another executor. 1. Ba. 46, 2. Show. 252, 6. 262.

But it is not the ordinary may compel the executor to prove the will as he may refuse to accept it. 1. Ba. 363.

In corso he may be compelled to prove it. 2. Ba. 163.

An executor resign his office it being fiduciary. 1. Ba. 46, 2. Show. 252.

No one can be refuse by any act or fact - or by a deed - that the court accept - i.e. this alone would bind him. It must be by some act recorded in the spiritual ct. 1. Ba. 46, 2. Ba. 87, Moor 252, 6. 262.

If these is but one or two named & he refuses, action can told. He must be granted - if the executor never offered afterwards, prove the will, or act in any way as executor. 1. Ba. 86, Vaugh. 144, 1. Roll. 307, Crowe 2. 3.

May he refuse the refusal & prove the will informing - is granted?

If one of 2 or more executors renounces before the ordinary of the testator from the will, the first may according to the English law administer at any time afterward; even after the death of his coexecutor for the execution of the
According to the civil law, the renunciation is irreversible. 

By & continue. Sal. Y. A. W. supra.

The extenuating may release debt due to the debtor. 960.24 960.99 60 962. 60 962.99 24 b

So the extenuating must be named in every action brought by the other. 960.99 962.99 962.99 4 962.99 2 962.99 4 961.99

Since the action is brought in the extenuating. 962.99 2

After an extenuating has administrated he cannot renounce 
for by this he accepts & determines his election & subject 

General Rules. 962.99 Whatever the extenuating does respecting the 
effects of the debtor, which harms an intention in him 
to accept that office, amounts to an acceptance & cannot 
thereafter renounce.

2. Any act which would make one an extenuating 
is an act & is deemed an acceptance. 962.99 Taking part 
of the debtor's goods & converting them to the extenuating use.

1 Ba. 406. 1 Roll. 917. Dyer. 100. 45 Ba. 49.

So taking the goods of a stranger & administering upon 
them, under the administration, they are the debtor's 
goods. 1 Roll. 917. 2 Ba. 406.
Secur, if he takes the testator's goods claiming them as his own.

As likewise if he receive debts due to the testator, own


As if there be 2. exts 8. without the other consent

taken tapes of a specific chattel, bequested to him by

the testator, this is an action, for a legatee can't take

without the consent of the exts. 2. Ba. 406. 1. Roll. 9.17.

But if the judge in this case, knowing that the exts

has administrated, will notwithstanding accept his

refusal & grant action to another, the grant is good &

the exts can't reverse the office. 2. Ba. 405. 1. Roll. 902.

Ux. Ba. 40. 41.

Yet if after action is granted only because the exts don't

appear when summoned to prove the will, the exts

chooses to accept, he may do it if action must be re-


And if after the exts has refused & action is granted

to another, it should then appear to the judge that the

exts had administrated before refusal, I surmise the

judge may refuse action & compel the exts to reap.

2. Ba. 409.

If an exts appears & takes the usual oath, that he will

execute the office, he can't afterward renounce, for he

has by the oath accepted, nor can the ordinary refuse

to admit him, even tho' after taking the oath he had re-

fused. If he die, a mandamus hir. 2. Ba. 405. 1. Roll. 94.1.
Of the manner of granting action & in what case it is granted.

This head includes the different kinds of action. It must be granted in writing. 1 Benn. 269. 1 Bell. 283. 3 Pown. 405.

It is to be granted first when one dies intestate 1 Benn. 269. 1 Bell. 283. 3 Pown. 405. 9 El. 3.

Here the person entitled to [due] has a gr. aut. in his own name & for himself as aut. i.e. not for another who has a sub-

mission right. The ordinary may take a bond for due action in all cases, even when the cause testam. non

visum. 1 Benn. 263. 2 9 Pown. 405.

It may be granted to 2 or more if due it remains.

In this it differs from the common case of a delegated

aut. as a letter of atty. to a person. For on the death of

1, the aut. ceases. 2 1 Benn. 263. 1 Bell. 283. 3 Pown. 405. 4 9 Pown. 405.

Several actions may be granted of several things, but not if

1 entwined thing. 1 Benn. 263. 1 Bell. 283. 1 9 Pown. 405. 3 Pown. 405. 1 Heat. 4 9 Pown. 405.

If a person is made an aut. without any limitation

or restriction, he cannot assume, as to a point, if he

cannot seize a sum of less value than the sum-

he must renounce it in toto or not at all. 2 1 Benn. 263.

1 Bell. 283. 3 Pown. 405. 9 El. 3.

2. Even formerly doubted whether action could be

granted to one during the absence of the exec. out of

the realm. It is now settled that it may be so too when

the time for actio is out of the realm. 1 Benn. 269 4 9 Pown.

1 Heat. 1 Bell. 283. 9 El. 3 Pown. 415. 2 1 Bell. 283. 3 Pown. 405. 4 9 Pown. 405. 8 9 Pown. 405.

3. A transfer any action may be granted when the


nightful actio is an actio os in personam. 2. Co. 418. 42d.

Why in case of outlawry? for an outlaw may sued be sued as ext. & actio. 2. Co. 997. 42d. 12b. Co. 128. 42d. till death & outlawry.

These actions are when the absence unius personae 42d of the ext. or nightful actio are unused.

4. It may be granted in the actio lite of a will, to claim when the devise is decided. formerly these doubts occur now. 1. Co. 266. 42d. 917. 1. Nau. 69. 54. 42d. 917. 42b. 2. Co. 515. 1. Nau. 193. 42d. 917. 406. 42d. 100. 159. 42d.

5. If there is a dispute concerning the action it may be granted in the actio lite. 1. Co. 263.

The temporary actio may sue & be sued while the cause continues. even actio is granted in the actio lite. 1. Co. 263. 1. Nau. 69. 42d. 917. 2d May 1871. 2. Co. 515.

6. If the ext. named assigns, actio curn titube is to be granted. not actio de bonis non. Where none of the goods are administered upon. 1. Co. 287. 2d 42d. 42b. 2d 42d. 917. 931. 1. Rul. 920. 193. 2d 42b. 3d 42d. 917. 931. 42b. 3d 42d. 917. 931.

7. If the ext. die in foro probate an immediate actio is granted curn titube. unless it is an actio de bonis non administratis. 2. Co. 940. 42d. 904.

8. If the ext. die having actually administered, but be none probate, an immediate actio i.e. not one de bonis non is granted, but one curn titube unless he cause to die before he undertook the execution of his will. 2. Co. 940. 42d. 304. 1. Rul. 987
§ 38

As if one makes a will & names no one as an actio de bonis nox in granted. 1 Bros. 158.

If an actio dies leaving goods not administrated upon an actio de bonis nox in granted. 2 Ba. 980, 2 Ple. 906, 1 Bent. 907.

If the teste de intestate after he has proved the will, administration de bonis nox esse testa & is granted. 1 Ba. 986, Salk. 905, 6. Here the teste has administrated in part.

By the old 6. no one. If the original actio on actio had brought an action & removed judge & died without taking execution, an actio de bonis nox could not sue out an execution, nor in any way take advantage of the judge rest being frozen to it. 2 Ba. 986, 4 Selw. 38.

Now by notes 12. Barb. 12. Barb., the actio de bonis nox may have a new foison on the judge when he neweran an a verdict. 2 Ba. 986, 1 Mod. 290, Salk. 322, 2 Ed. May. 1072.

When the teste in this case dies intestate, the testator is ed to die intestate. 1 Bent. 907.

An actio de bonis nox is entitled to all the real estate of the decedent, which remains not administrated & in specie. 1 G. Term., household goods. 1 Salk. 906, 1 Selw. 159.

So to money remain'd by the original testeator's & kept by himself as such, for it can be identified. Salk. 906.

But if the original testeator takes a note for a debt due to the testeator, the acceptance of the note is such an alteration of the real estate, that the note rest in the infrumentation of the original testeator & not in the actio de bonis nox.
10th If an act is under a donee duarante minoritale is granted, i.e. till he is 15. 1. hors. 296. 3. orb. 92. 8. 295. 6. 99. 29. 2. Mod. 28.

So if the person entitled to actio is an infant, actio duarante minoritale, i.e. till he attain full age is granted. 2. Ba. 981. Sin. 150. 1. hors. 126. 298. 299. 8. Mod. 29.

Actio duarante minoritale being not to curate for the infant, the ordinary may grant it to whom he pleases. 2. Ba. 981. Sin. 150. 8. Mod. 29.

And in 8. 98. 298. that actio granted during the minority of an infant actus determinis or in meaning a person of full age, as he becomes interested with him in his mind as vater 8 is of age to act. This is denied in 9. 98. 98. 1. hors. 288.

If an infant is a person of full age an executor, actio duarante it is not granted to a third person, for the one of full age may execute the will—actio to a third person would be void. 2. 98. 299.

And that the act of full age may take such actio & declare as estate or actio 2. 981. 8. 299. 299. 240.

If 2 infants are later or 15 of the other 15 the former may execute the will & actio duarante is not to be granted. 2. 98. 199.

In this case I conclude the elder actio can't take actio duarante & for now but an adult can do an actio.
If I die leaving to his issue, & of die leaving to an infant his issue, & is appointed after death, & of B. B is not the representative of J. is the heir for B who is J. B, ent. 2. Pa. 391. Bvo. 6. 211.

There must be an actus of J. appointed dure ant 82 of B. God 220.

Of the Actus of an Actus Durance X. of an infant children or heirs.

In such that an actus durance X. of one entitled to administer, was for the time all the forum of an absolute actus. 1. Bvo. 250. 2. Bvo. 910.

But it seems to be established that an actus durance X. has not such a sort of force in the effects of the decease, such a sort of actus X. as an absolute actus. For the

actus is generally given by virtue of commendum at profiticio on executors, &c. yet not long after at commendo X. so that he is in the nature of a reversion to the infant without actus. 2. Pa. 391. 5. 60. 290. Bvo. 8. 718. 1. Bvo. 250. 3. Bvo. 118.

Thus actus relate to the actus of an actus durance X. of an infant, entitled to administer. The actus of such an actus is generally granted at onis. commendum X. pro

bono X. but not always.

Yet the his actus is special he may generally do all actus which are incumbent on an actus, & which are in legal presumptive for the benefit of the infant or the estate of the deceased. B. E. he may appoint to a legay if there are other heirs sufficient to pay the debt but not otherwise. 2. Pa. 391. 5. 60. 290.
An estate may be sold in any circumstance that is

So the may sell as injul. 9. Ba. 351. 6. Ba. 87. [1]

But on he can do nothing to the prejudice of the in-
vent. He can sell the goods of the deceased, except for
the firste of debt, which is a case of necessity, as un-
less they are fiuished. 5. 60. 3. 6v. 9. 119. 7. 1092,
2. Ba. 381

A bailiff may also sell for the firste of debt. 9. leon.
102. 1. 6m. 780. 2. Ba. 381.

He can't leave a term united in the estate or adde.
102. 5. 6m. 780. 5. 68. 19. 6. 60. 67.

There is an exception to this. When the action durin
lebe is granted generally it is not ad commodandum. He
he lige a term united in the case V is good till the
exte in 7. 2. Ba. 381. 6. 60. 67.

But he not lated down even in this case that the adde
may sell the goods of the deceased, except for the pay
of debt. as supra.

When Action may be repealed.
Dene formerly holden in some cases, that the ordinary
could not refuse letter of action once granted. He
having executed its forum. 2. Ba. 811. 1. Hom. 108. 1. Xod. 143,
But to now settle that it may be rejected for various causes - the rest on briefly. 2. Ba. 410. Lev. 13. 19.
Salk. 67. 1. Born. 2. 68.

II. When unduly obtained. 1st. If action is granted on the ground of suffused intreaty, when there is a valid will, or residvate of it, action will be rejected or revoked. Salk. 14. 49. 1. Salk. 98.

2nd. When in case of actual intreaty, it is granted to one not legally entitled to it - or to the wind of him to a former cause excluding the it - it must be rejected in favour of the 1. Lev. 18. 1. Sid. 489. 2. 1. Born. 2. 263.


So if granted to one of his own testaments ancieno when there is a residvate legitime. 1. Ba. 538. 1. Sid. 423. 340.

3. When obtained by false suggestion or any kind of fraud it may be rejected. 2. Ba. 410. 1. Sid. 299. 1. 2. 2. 63. 72.

So when obtained by imposition or the ordinary or when in grant, action on a wrong suggestion, the possibily not fraudulent. 1. 1. 1. Salk. 19.

4. So if obtained in an irregular manner or without citing the parties required by it, to be ad. 1. Born. 2. 68.

So if obtained without giving security to account on within the 14. days. 2. Ba. 410. 3. 2. 64.

So if after action is granted, a new action is obtained
by fraud, without a refusal of the first, 
the act is void. If the act is refused, his refusal

II. Action duly obtained may be refused by a
consequence of matters in fact facts, or if the original
acts should become a blemish or otherwise incapable.

So, contra, if the person legally entitled, is incapable
at the latee's death. If the act is not the reason grant
et to another, then last act may be refused
so the former becoming capable. 1. Barn. 15. 3. Barn. 236.

Action to, so may be refused without a notice
of revocation, or by granting a new action. 1. Barn.

If the consequence of refusal of Action.
the, that when the objection to an act is grant
ed or, that to a wrong person, the grant is voidable
not void. 2. 683. 3. 30. 30. 30. 30. 30. 30. 30.

If the act is regularly granted this to a wrong
person, it is afterwards, refused by a citation to the
ordinary, all the intermediate acts of the first act
are good. So, if he give the goods of the intetate to
another for this lawful - to such a rightful act
may do 1. Barn. 264. 3. Com. 10. 147. 147. 147. 147.

In this case if the first act are a, a to the intetate
he may retain like any act to satisfy his debt.
But if an order whose letters are repeated by citation, makes a gift of the intestate's goods by bonus, before the refusal, the gift is void as in the-debtors' last good in the subsequent acts. C. 66. 44. 59. 3. 6. 18. 6. 59. 6. 15. 6. 6.

Yet in the last case of the first order is not due on an appeal to a higher ecclesiastical it, the intermediate acts of the first order i.e. between the appeal taken from the refusal, can I suppose void. 3. 66. 44. 3. 6. 15. 6.

A refusal on citation is only a revocation of the former letter of action, but does not affect the original sentence but a counter sentence on an appeal act directly on the sentence appealed from, which is suspended by the appeal itself. 6. 6. 15. 6. 59. 6. 6. 160. 9. 6. 206. 7. 9. 6. 129. 129. 1. 190. 1. 5. 66.

Now this it is in the Act. 6. 6. 15. 6. 59. 6. 160. 9. 6. 206. 7. 9. 6. 129. 129. 1. 190. 1. 5. 66.

As the cases in 6. 6. 15. 6. 59. 6. 160. 9. 6. 206. 7. 9. 6. 129. 129. 1. 190. 1. 5. 66.

If the first act in the last case had obtained judgment in a ch. of the diocese before the refusal, the Attorney is required on it by an auditio quæsta. I. 6. 1. 2. 66. 1. 6. 6. 193. 2. Sound. 149. 1. 6. 1. 6. 1. 6. 160. 9. 6. 206. 7. 9. 6. 129. 129. 1. 190. 1. 5. 66.

If the debtor is taken in execution on the judgment, he may be discharged on motion. I. 6. 1. 6. 1. 6. 160. 9. 6. 206. 7. 9. 6. 129. 129. 1. 190. 1. 5. 66.

Appeal granted by wrong act is void. 56. 59. 59. 59. 59.

Agreed to the Act. that an appeal by citation does not make void intermediate acts; it has been decided that if one dies intestate, a will is forged & proved as his.
Ester Adkin

this probate is afterwards revoked or rejected, acts done in
granted, all acts that a rightful act might have
'due our good. 

But the 1. that, to rehear an citation, all lawful acts at npiro remain good, applies only to cases of
actual intestacy, not where the deceased left a valid

If the decedent has appointed an act, but the ordi-

cency ignorant of this grant of action, if the act after-

ward be proved the will, be shall avoid all such acts

For the act has an intent of which the ordinary
could not define time, the ordinary had no duty to

grant action; for he cannot grant but in cases of intes-

tacy, the act is void, Justice Butler seems strongly to

So if the decedent left a will, the former of which was
held the latter, if the act of the former prove it, yet on
the probate of the latter by the proper act, all the men-

Justice Butler & Gropp deny this. 2. 1. Ser. 190. They cite

Sum men are not the last case of intesacy. 2. Ba. 511. 412.

When the first act is reheard or rejected, the acts
of the first act are over on the record, & he is liable for all
the acts in his hands to the rightful act & also for unlaw-
But his lawful acts finding the solution as well as before are good. Salk. 38. 6. 60. 13.

The effect of an action being ab initio void, as of it being so by a reversal or an appeal, is that all the acts of the first action are considered as may be treated as the acts of a stranger. E.G. He may be sued as a trespasser. 2. Bo. 8. 11. Raw. 279. 1. 1. 26. 23. 2. Ex. 182.

Yet in the last case if the estate has paid legacies, debts or funeral charges, which the rightful estate ought to have paid, he shall recover the amounts paid in damages, i.e. relief or be allowed so much in mitigation of damages. 2. Bo. 8. 11. Raw. 279. 1. Ex. 28. 33. 3. 1. 26. 4. 1.1 394.

So in that case when the action is void, or made so, a voluntary payment of debts to the original estate, don't discharge the debt, even tho a release is given, he must pay it over again. 2. Bo. 8. 11. Roll. 919. 1. 1. 463. 1. 1. 394.

Justice Buller contends in this as in case of a refusal of action, or the probate of a will, the relief in case of a refusal of any kind, when an appeal. 9. Bo. 130.

But it has been held that if a debtor pay money on a judgment of execution, to one who is in fact the facts, having a probate under seal, he shall never be compelled to pay it again. So doubly if paid to an act & in a judge. 2. Bo. 8. 11.

Where then in the necessity of an audit. 1. Bo. 392.

If an action is granted, a new action is gained by bond, without a refusal of the first & the second acts, release. If this action is refused, the release is void.
What acts an heir may do before probate.  

An heir derives all his interest from the will, the party of the testator's effects is vested in him before probate on the death of the testator. Oterwise the will is called a nec.aspxsor. 2. Ba. 494.


Hence a plea that the fttb who receive an estate has not armed the will is bad— it should be that he is not estate, thus he must produce the probate. 2. Ba. 496. 1. Noll. 316.

This act of the estate right, vic. probate, in revery is to do, for on the probate, there is an inventory of the deceased, no other acts to be done which are for the benefit of others. 2. Ba. 479. 1. Noll. 903. 1. Noll. 390.

As therefore the estate draws his right from the will, he may do many acts before probate that will be valid. 1. Com. 298. 2. Ba. 412. 6. Ex. 99. 1. Noll. 156.

But an acte can do no act that will be valid, till it ten of action are granted. for he derives all his acts from the appointment of the ordinary. 2. Ba. 412. 502. 2. Ba. 123. 1. Noll. 57. 1. Noll. 403.

By valid acts an heir can act on a former act of a claimant. There are indifferent acts which any person may do by the heir may before probate, take jeofs of the
testator goods. & may enter the heir's house if he can without breaking, & take securities belonging to the testator. 2 Br. 413. Rew. 173. God. 145. 2 And. 257. Brown v. ward 127. 4 Br. Ex. 43.

But he must not even break an inner door: he cannot break a chest. Excl. 152.

So before probate he may assign to a legacy & the assign is binding, & worth the interest in the legacy. Rev. 4 Br. 413. 2 Br. 412. 4 Br. Ex. 34. 39. 1600 229. God. 155. 60. Litt. 292.


But if one entitled to action should receive debts & legacies, & give release: before action granted, he might after obtaining action receive again: for the right of action was not in him. Excl. 119. 126. 160. 229.

So an act may before probate sell, give away, or otherwise dispose of the goods of the deceased, even in the case of action. Br. 419. Excl. 154. 4 Br. Ex. 34. 35. 49. 1600 238. Brown 130.

So if a bond of the testator is conditioned for pay at a certain day, which happens after the testator's death, but before probate, it must be paid at the day to the estate: or the penalty is forfeited at 62. 2 Br. 418. 4 Br. 34. Lov. 15.

So on the other hand if the bond was made by the testator, the estate must pay it at the day the before probate, or the penalty is forfeited. 2 Br. 413. 206. 913. Excl. 154.
A person named in the will to be cew to all estates & survises, except that of bringing actions - this he can't do till after probate. Sal. 301, 1. Do. 288. Lev. 174. 2. Prov. 271. 2. Ex. 98. 23. 10. 60. 32. 60. Litt. 202. 1. Ex. 31. 1. Mod. 24. 2. Do. 116. Godel. 158.

But even this restriction is to be taken with some important qualifications - it indeed seems to be unnecessarily extended, for it doesn't apply at all except to 2. cases viz. the action of debt & to other actions on the intestate's contract to such actions for debts as occurred during the intestate's lifetime. Lev. 174.

Therefore he may before probate maintain such actions as owe their origin to the debts of the intestate, since in this case he must be the one who owes the debt. 2. Ex. 98. 2. Ex. 98. 2. Ex. 98. 2. Lev. 174. 1. Do. 288. 2. Bull. 265. 2. Lamb. 23. 2. Lamb. 23. 2. Lamb. 23. 2. Lamb. 23.

He may indeed in this case maintain an action in his own name, without declaring himself as executor. Lev. 174. 2. Do. 419. Bull. 158.

Here a present of letter testamentary is unnecessary. 2. Do. 419. 6. Mod. 271. 1. Mod. 62. 9. 2. Mod. 623.

So before probate he may determine on cause for next when a recover of a sum from years comes to him from the intestate. A suit occurs to him after the intestate's death, because the suit occurs after the cause of action is cause in him. Secur if the suit occurs during the intestate's life. Sal. 302. Lev. 174. 2. Ex. 158. 1. Do. 233. 1. Mod. 970. 1. Roll. 912.

So before probate he may maintain debt & an
a sale of the testator's goods by himself, or where the
cont is his, not the testator. 1 Com. 253, Lord 125, v. 41, 32.

With respect to the actions of debt. No, the actions on the
testator's cont is supra, is not true as said in 6 to 24, 126.
99 &c. that no cont court before probate being an action
ever in these cases. It is clearly agreed that he may in
these cases commence an action before probate, but he can
maintain the action or declare before probate. His suit
may bear date before probate - is sufficient if he pro-
duces his letters testamentary at the time of declaring
when he must make protest. There remain the impor-
tant cases of executors. 2. B. 919, 1. Roll. 911, 1. Com. 288, St. 13, 39, Le.
281. Kent. 376, the Ray 521, Combe 371, Lat. 302, 3. 7.

Of executors

If there are several executors they are deemed in law but as
one person representing the decedent. Their interest is
joint entire if indivisible. 2. B. 919, 1. Com. 288, Godd. 139.

Hence in a n.y. B. that the act of one is the act of all - or sale
on gift of the effects by one is valid being considered as the
acts of all. A sale by one of debts actions &c is binding.
2. B. 395, Lord 21, 1 Com. 240, v. Ex. 31, God. 139, 1. Roll. 220, Dice. 22,
v. 8. 347.

So if one grants all his interest in the testator's time for
years to a stranger the whole passes. B. Dice. Godd. 201. 1. v. supra.

So if one surrenders part of debts due the testator. God. 139.

It is different from the case of joint tenants for each cest
is referred of the whole, there are no heirs or moieties in their possess, so one cant grant his interest in the testament object to his coheiress possessing it by the grantee for each possessed the whole before 2 Ks 498, God 195.

So one may not have an action of account for the profit of the estate in the other, 1 Ks 8, 12, 2 Ks 12, 19, God 195. 1 Pet 13.

But each have a right to plead different pleas. God 195.

Therefore a warrant of attorney to confess in judgment to all in ill, & the judge will in most cases not abide 1 Ks 20, 1 Pet 429, 2 Pa 397, 1 Kt 4, Am. 93.

One of 2. actors cant make a valid release nor convey an interest so as to bind the other, both must join for the duty of actors in entire & joint - this R. was formerly doubted 1 Ks 230, 1 At 96, 160, London 312, God 195.

There is an exception to this R. - where the actors may sue in their own right, the trustee declining on their own behalf. Here they are considered as principals not as subrogations. Hence one may release the right of action 1 At 93.

If 1 of 2. or more actors or actors dies, the future remainers.
1 Ks 406, 1 Ks 250, 1 Kt 9, At 509, 1 Ks 249, Nick 36, 2 Men 54, London 312.

So 1st that one estate may compel the other to account with him in thing, for a moiety of the estate. 2 Bac 416, At 93, Burn.

So if the actors can make mineralogy legacies, I may sue the other in the threshhold it, for a moiety, for he is in the character of legatee. God 119, 189, 1 Ks 99, 2 Ks 396.
of Actes.

If an Act be not chargeable for the saving of his companion, he is no further liable for another, than that which came to his hands. 2. Ba. 395. Gaz. 133. Of Ba. 100. 4. B. 817.

Yet if all the acts join in giving a receipt for money received by one of all are liable at 1. to enter as much as if it had in reality received, each is liable for the whole. 2. Ba. 396. Salt. 311.

Seam in order—how the actual receiver only is liable, for receiving in the substance—joining is mere matter of form.

So all the acts make but 1 person in the regularity they use all to sue & be sued. 2. Ba. 396. Of Ba. 135. Salt. 307. 1. Bo. 32.

If an act be brought in one act, a plea that another is not in suit, without averning that he has administered his suit, for if the act be not administered, the plea is not bound to prove that he is in suit. 2. Ba. 396. 1. Bo. 164. 3. 38.

If 1 act be not alone sufficient for the debt to be paid that there is another act, without averning that he has administration for the suit, as not supposed to be within his cognizance. 2. Ba. 396. 931.

In an action by actes all must join that 1 has not paid the will, or is within age, or has refused before the ordinary. Sand. 291. 9. Bo. 37. Gel. 130. Salt. 3. Hunt. 37.

If an act be not chargeable for the saving of his companion, he can't plead the mistake in abatit, he loses the advantage of it. 2. Ba. 376. 4. Bo. 61. ars. 700.

So if 1 of 2. acts sue alone the plaintiffs at abatit only
If in case of 2. enter our refusal to accept or prosecute will he must be named (stalk 905. 960. 32. yed 195) then must be a new more regular. The object of new more regular to prevent the other not acting from making them take away the property to the said they make their own partly 2. Ro. 296. 2. Roll. 26. Plate. 12. 4th. 16. 114. 31. Bill. 129. 12. 2a. 63. 2.

But if a trust in committed over the goods of the decedent, while in favor of 1 of several letters of power may use for it. For them he need not see a note but on his own. god. 134. 12. Ex. 124. 2. Ro. 32.

Drum holden content 2. Brev. 129. 2. Ro. 397. for the favor of 1. in the favor of all. 1. Att. 226.

*Of an executor de son fort.*

This is one without any duty from the decedent or the ordinary, done such acts as belong to the office of estate on acts. 2. Ro. 295. 26. 20. 30. 1. Brev. 26. 12. Ex. 171. god. 30. 26. 12. 2. 03. 29.

In general any unreasonable meddling with the estate of the decedent, will make a stranger estate de son lost 2. Ro. 26. 5. 60. 23. 14. 12. Ex. 131.

12. Taking power of the affair & converting them to be own the paying debts out of the affair receiving & owing for debts due to the decedent. In general all acts of acquiring possessing & transferring the affair. 2. Ro. 293. 1. Roll. 11. 2. 03. 12. 192. 36. 52. 8. 60. 23. 39. 32.
The value of effects taken is immaterial - nothing more is sufficient. 1 Bo. 390. Dyer 166. 2 T.R. 162.

So playing legato with the after-taking a specific legacy without the testor's consent, or by other means he is made as far as 'tis, any other plea than the quantum valeo for by any other he abounds himself etc. 1 Bo. 483. Godet 91. 92. 1 Bonn 263. 5. 6. 7. 8. 9. 10. Roll. 915.

So the widow of the deceased becomes one de son tort by taking more apparel than is convenient for her de gree. 1 Bo. 387. 1 Roll. 915. 1 Bonn 263. 5. Dyer 166.

If a stranger takes poker of the effects I deliver them to another, the latter is one de son tort. 2 T.R. 29.

By stat. 53 Eliz. if the goods of the intestate are given by fraud to a third person, or a release given by fraud of a debt, the donee or releaser is one de son tort. 1 Bo. 387. 1 Bonn 269. bro. 250. 840.

If one intermeddles with effects even in pursuance of the directions of the deceased, he is an one de son tort. 2 T.R. 29.

So a fraudulent gift of the deceased himself, makes the donee de son tort, as to color some the necessity of the case, but not as to want of two legates, extra le- le, good us them. 1 Rest. 104. 2 Bo 628. bro. 221. 1 Roll. 542. Godet 477 2 A.D. 592.

But one way to many acts relating to the effects of the deceased, I must be an one de son tort, by overseeing or taking care of the deceased's cattle, paying debts of the deceased, with our own money, repairing the buildings, under suffering for the want of repair, providing necessaries,


Taking effects under the law of forty weeks when the
same was mortally examined. Since artifice for him
he does undertake to act in exto. 1. B. 166. Yoven 166. Root 166.

Intermeddling with real estate about make in exto de nov.
lost even in horen 1. Root 166.

What acts are sufficient to make an exto de nov. lost?
in a question of K. 2. A. 92.

The true principle of discrimination in this, if the act
of the stranger is such as fairly occurs unto the influence
he claims, the management & disposal of the act.
he in exto de nov. lost otherwise, not. In the first case
the act is such as belongs to the office of exto. K. 2. A.
38. Horev 166. Yeve 166.

The above Ao, as to what makes an exto de nov. lost, op-
dly in their full extent, only to cases where there is no
rightful act on other. & to those where there was even
at the time of intermeddling. For after probate of the
will, or after the estate has otherwise administered, or of-
ter action is granted; common acts of intermeddling,
are taking proper accounting, embarking he won't make an
exto de nov. lost. If there is a rightful act on other, or the
good taken after probate an act in the hands of
the rightful act on other, they having come to his hands.

The wrong done in this case is liable to the exto on the one, as a true
paper. Shall 38. 90. 2. B. 48. 484.

But we often probate if one not only intermeddle.
eto X A.

but drawn to be into or into, be in chargeable or acte, de non tenu, 7th says from. Salk. 319. That the claim may be taught from certain acts 1st to remedite, such as receiving & paying debts the act from common, acts of intermixing one, such as are in the nature of common necessities. I. Ba. 358. S. 60. 35.

Salk. 319. 2 Ch. 8. 44.

If the intermixing is before justice, as other graud, in, in into de non tenu, the the act is nothing seen then taking place. If he is liable as such as enter, unless he deliveres over the goods to the rightfull act or acte before the action is brought. 2. Ba. 358. 560. 39. Salk. 358. 99.

7. Roll. 99. G. 358. S. 669. 5. 44.

The ground on which enter de non tenu can liable to enter, is that from the act enters have a right to presume they are legal representatives, if they have no right to discharge this presumption since their own wrongful acts have raised it. 3. Pk. 37. 7. S. 367. 12. Mod. 97. 04.

An enter de non tenu is liable to all the trouble of an enter ture, without is profit. He is liable to be sued as such. 2. 56. 50.

He can retake for a debt due to himself as other enter, as other may sue in center of an importer. 2. 56. 50.

7. 56. 5. 370. 9. 5. 569. 3. Moor. 379. Roll. 122. G. 689. 63.

12. Mod. 451. 721. 1. 56. 526. G. 697. 9. 5. Mod. 34.

But if he pays debt with his own means, he may retake to the amount on hand. 7. 56. 1. Salk 76.

As after intermixing he obtains letter of actue, he mayretake for the same debt as center of an equal or inferior degree, for the letter of actue youths the
There is a case apparently contrary to the last, viz., that in one case the one both after taking action of ejectment, may be charged as ejector, for that he shall make claim himself by any thing out of ejectment 1. B. 294. 3. I. 114. Ex. 8. 4. 4. H. 113. 2. 5. 366. 310.

But this seems nothing more than that after action obtained, he may be described as ejector for being so described, he cannot abate the suits, but as to all other suits, the suit now is fungible it is not.

The ejectee does not in liable as former as he has rights to the rightful one or other to all costs & to litigation. 1. B. 266. 35. Ex. 254. B. 103. 6. 210. 11. B. 252. 1. B. 117. 2. B. 321. Local. 34.

When he is sued by the rightful one or other he is considered not an ejector, but a stranger would sue a common trespasser 2. B. 294. 11. Ex. 254. 11. B. 252. 1. B. 266. 2. 341. 4. B. 379.

But if the ejectee or other in a suit to the demand, he may bring suit in the ejectee's name, with the averment that none of the offsets came to his hands. Salt. 904. 2. B. 379. 1. B. 379. Salt. 904.

In an action by ejector he is named as ejector generally. 2. B. 252. 35. 6. 210. 11. B. 252. 1. B. 310. 2. B. 252. 1. B. 266. 2. B. 252. 2. 310. 1. 201.

Generally he is liable only to the extent of offsets in
his hands, & as to costs, he is allowed all costs made to other ents in equal or superior degree. he may plead pliche administravit, & gain such costs in aid to support the issue. 2 Bac. 567. 6. Mers. 327. 6. 60. 36.

But as in the nextfult exct on acct. he can't by pledg such pays, then the action & such pays therefore in bad. but on the J. issue he shall recover, i.e. he allows in mitigation of damages. the amount of such pays. unless perhaps the nextfult exct is by such pays prevented from retaining his own debt. 2 Bac. 589. 592. 12. Nod. 341. 571. Off. Ex. 15. 179. 187. Shin. 275. 5. 60. 36. & 8th. 194.

There lawful acts however bind the party thus disposed of in the

In the act de son tort, is generally liable only to the amount of afts. received at Suo, yet if the pledg act, to an action by a acte de son tort, he is liable for the whole amount. he is liable for the whole de

And however that in these cases, wherein the value of the afts. received is very large, the act de son tort may be relieved in equy. 2 Bac. 390. 1. 151. 8.

If he plead, in this case pliche administravit, he shall not be charged beyond the afts. received. 1. born. 266. 266. 186.

If there be a nextfult acte to an acte de son torts, they may be sued jointly or severally. 1. born. 266. 6. 350.

Secur in the case of a nextfult acte for an acte de son tort. 1. born.
can't be joined in an action.

At 6. b. the estate of an extra de non int. were not liable to enter the they were in Ch. 1. Gen. 216. 2. Mod. 293.

Now by the stat. 90. bar. 2d. the extra de non int. are liable at 6. to enter 2. Bo. 296. laws 11. 4. Burn's L. L. 191.

In one instance there may originally be an extra de non int. in non vic. case of a gift by the decree himself to deprive enter this neglectful acts or actions cannot recover it. They being bound by the gift 1. Will. 549. Gelb. 191. 2. Doug. 537. laws 12. 211. 2. Bo. 605.

By Making Debtor: Executor.

By the old English b. if a debtor was made extra his debt was discharged - the reason given in this case was (why he should not retain his debt) that he could not sue himself. Will. 6. 539. 3. Doug. 34. 3. P. Law. 859.

But it has since been held that his debt is a part in his hand, for the part of debt is wages. 1. 3d.

So that if there be other assets sufficient to pay the debt & legacies of the deceased, he may still retain his debt - for the debt is considered in this case as a residue. 1. 211. 135. 3. Doug. 10. 2. Doug. 573. Salk. 369.

But A. thinks he is discharged only when he takes the residue. There has to date been no decision recognizing this principle - but a clear proof that this view is.
that the debt of an aliis who is never entitled to a residu- 
num is not discharged by his appointment. [Bibl. 926. 
Geba 160. be 6. 393.]

In long the estate is residiuity legatice unless there is 
something in the will, clearly manifesting an intension 
that he shoult be 9. 86 399.

As his right to usufruct is part of debt, so those who 
claim under the slat of distributions, is founded on the 
idea that he is entitled to the residuum, it may be a 
question when he has such a legacy as would bar his 
right to the residuum, whether he can retain his 
debt as such claimants.

Of Making Suit to Estate.

A debtor may make his estate an estate, if indeed can 
the estate will retain so much of the estate as will sati- 
fy himself- but this must be understood when the 
debt is in equal degree, with such estate- otherwise he 
cant suitor. 9. 86 978. 86 158. 86 128. Gedol 183. Salk 84. 
10. Med 596.

So if action be granted to an estate, he may retain enough 
estate to satisfy himself - but this must also be confined 
to estate in an equal degree. Ged. 183.

There As from the nature of the case are reasonable & 
just - for as the estate who first commences an action 
gains a priority to all others in one equal degree & 
as an estate can sue himself, he must retain this 
method is furnished, as furthered to all estates they in 
equal degree.
But an *exte de son tenant*, who is a *cote cant retaire* for this would be allowing to take advantage of his own wrong. Bo. 96. 2. Mt. 3. 299.

An exte is not obliged to take in hand, when they are not often enough to pay the whole debt. 2. Ath. 411.

**Of an Executary right to the Surplus.**

In bug, if an exte be appointed, it has been a question, to return the surplus of final party after the pay of debt. Mag. 66. Belong. 2. Bo. 320. Mt. 3. 299. Tols. 240. Bo. 299.

Formerly the exte himself was always considered void many ligates but now if any considerable ligary, not approv'd to any particular purpose be left to the exte, or if there can be collected in his will an inten-
tion in the testator, that the exte should not take a
residuary ligate, the it of it will order a distribu-
tion as in case of action. But whereas if no such inten-
tion can be inferred from the will, the exte will be
considered residuary ligate. 3. Ath. 413. 2. Mt. 291. 293.

An exte in bug has no wages for his trouble.

A ligary bar the exte right to a residuum in their cases; only, when it affords proof of an intention in the testator, that the exte should not take the resid-
uum. And proof is admissible to show that notwith-
standing the ligary, the testator intended the exte should be residuary ligate, but this 2. don't hold vice versa.

Ref. 290. 2. Mt. 265. 270.

So it by ligal writers that in cases of this kind, panel
proof is admissible to rebut an entry or convict an implication that is found; proof may be admitted to establish the old legal support of the will, or rather instrument, when such support emanates from the equitable construction. Yet such proof cannot in this case be admitted to establish the equitable in contradistinction to the old legal construction, but the former must be collected from the instrument itself. 2 Wh 63. 224. 7. P. 50. 2. 6. 91. Will. 319. 11. 11. 453. 1. 8. 6. 9. 201. 228. Taub. 240.

of Wills.

A will is a declaration of the mind either by word or writing in disposing of an estate, to take place after the death of the testator. 1 B. B. 32. 597.

To every will there must be an exist. 2 B.

A testamentary instrument not appointing an executor called a testament. 1 B. 32. 146. 2. B.

Generally any person labouring under no particular disability may dispose of part of his estate by will. 1 B. 32. 146. 1.

In all cases the presumption is that he was of sufficient discretion & ability, so that the burden of proof lies on him who contests the will. 2 B. 32. 146. 2. B. 92. By 1 B. 20. 51. 2. B.

Persons of the following description cannot make a will: 1. idiot. 2. Person of unsound memory, as Lu-
natives. 3 An aged person can't make a will if it appears from his conversation at the time of making it, that he was not of sufficient discretion. 4 If the testator was unable through ignorance or blindness, or any other cause to read the will, it must have been read to him if such reading must be proved. 5 Deaf and dumb persons can't generally make a will, but proof may be admitted to show that such person knew the contents, & had understanding sufficient to make a just & wise disposition. 6 A drunken man can't make a will. 7 If a man an alien make a testament of goods or lands, a will made under any restraint or fear is not valid. I would seem that in this case the cause of fear whether real or imaginary ought not to be regarded. 8 The age of discretion in making wills in this case is according to some authorities 14 in males, 12 in females—others say 16. 9 F. R. thinks it to be at 17. Because according to Belland the civil & govern in this respect, which say 17. 4. Roper. 31.

A co tenants can't dispose of his life interest in action, chattel real or personal by will. The he may dispose of all by deed, except the first kind of personal. 4. Roper. 31.

A joint tenant can't dispose of his life holder in joint tenancy, because the jus accrescendi intervenes between the right of the testator & that of the devisee or legatee.

A remainder of a chattel interest may by way of exec- cution or, be limited ever after an estate for life, provided that the remainder men be all in use, at the death of the devisee, that the contingency on which the re- mainder is to vest happen, whether a life or lives of 21 years, or the fraction of a year, 2St. 6K. 12403. 6 Kett. 20 2 & 38.
The life man must lodge an inventory of the jewels, linens, and other goods, if in failing circumstances, must give security which will be forthcoming.

2.388. 10. 4.

An estate tail cannot be created in favor of a man, if the heir of his body, the absolute owner, be not in the first take. The reason given for this is, that English lawyers believe that an estate tail in favor of a man cannot be barred by fine or recovery; therefore if suffered to exist must be a forfeiture, which the law abhors.

A will of favor must be regularly to be in writing signed & published by the testator.

It is not necessary that there be subscribing witnesses as in case of 1. of land. If the testator's name written by himself in any part of the will is sufficient signing. There is indeed an instance given by Littell, where the testator, name the written by another person, yet being approved of by the testator, was held sufficient. If the testator could write his name with his own written by another person is sufficient.

2.58.

As set too, that if the will is in the hand writing of the testator, no good without signing. No, but in some cases, if the hand writing of another.

It is laid down as a rule, that if the testator of both, seal & point, be well executed as to the first, only, to void only as to the seal. In support of this it is said that the intention of the testator ought not to be unnecessarily defeated, as the will is good in part the intention as to this part ought not to be disregarded.
This reasoning is unsatisfactory for it is not improbable that one joint of the will was made with a view to the other. If that the intention of the testator would be violated by permitting thelegatees to take all the real Forty, they come in for a sham of the real.

At best, executory wills might be made off theifty, but the restrictions imposed on these wills by the Statut 29, b. 2, have almost abolished them.

**Duty of Executor & Administrator.**

His first duty is to make out an inventory of all the estate that can be ascertained in his hands. It to prove an appraisal of it by judicious persons under oath.

After this he must account with the will of probate for the forty so enumerated, but is not liable at all events to pay the amount of the appraisal unless sold for less than what is liable unless to his fault, but if to his fault he is liable to make or his bond. But if the estate is in common from they must ground their action, not on the inventory.

If sold for more than the appraised value, the estate must account for the whole amount.

A judge of probate ought not to reject an inventory of forty, the title to which is disputed for his decision cannot affect the right of trying the title at b. 2.

The estate is never liable to execution till the receiver of it unless he has made unreasonable delay. Sect. 512. Lord 22. 46. 57.
If an executor or the submit to arbitration if the arbitrators award to him, he can't afterward such the want of afidavit as to that claim. If part of afidavit to his hands, his liability increases. 3 T.R. 383, 5 D. 61. 671.

An insinual commitment by an executor or admiral as much of money due from the testator don't make the executors personally liable. 1 H. Bl. 103, 12, 2 H. 619.

The former obligations of executors are nearly the same, tho' there is some difference. They are bound only to the extent of afidavit. 2 Ba. 915, Butt. 110, 2 Sc. 918.

The Payment of Debt.

Here the following order must be preserved. 1. Funeral charges & the expense of proving the will. 2. Debt to the king by record or specialty. 3. Debt to particular. 4. Debt of defect. 5. Debt of record. 6. Debt on writ costs. 3 P. Writs, 2 T. 277, 2. 2. 121, 2 Ba. 499.

This don't appear just. Of debts in equal degree he may pay which he pleases first, but he can prefer a debt which in favor of one to debts which are already payable, unless the latter one is of an inferior degree. 2 Sc. 318, 2 Ba. 594, 9 Roe. 80.

If he pay a debt of inferior degree while a higher one remains, he is personally liable, even if he did not know of the latter. 1 T.R. 630, 2 Ba. 433, 2 Roe. 277, 1. 2 Ba. 298, 2. Roe. 592.

A debt may gain priority to debts in equal degree by what is called legal diligence. 2 H. Bl. 413.
A voluntary bond is preferred to all debts, but for

favored to all legacies. 2. B. 202. 20d. 26.

If a executior insists on the pay of a bond given by the
decreed on the ground that it was voluntary, he
may by bill, bring the party into chancery to litigate
the claim at their own expense & he may make his
according to the decision there given.

Enquiry may always be made into the consideration
of bonds when third persons are concerned.

In the duty of the estate to retain debts in his hands for
the pay of debts in favor of the legatees in future. But if
after the 8 before pay'd he becomes a bankrupt, to some
what doubtful whether the estate can pursue them with
in the hands of the legatees & devisees. I think it ought
to be done, as well as in other cases.

In any no time is limited for the exculpation of
cliers on the deceased estate.

If the estate has paid out the whole estate & obviated
the iniquity of claims &c. is sued, he may file a
plea administravit.

Legacies.

After debts, legacies must be paid. A legacy is not to be
a bequest of particular goods & chattels by testament.

An estate to return a legacy is given & to profit him
self as in the case of debts. &c. 933.
At the intestate's death, the indeterminate right of the legatee commences, the legal duty of the legacy still resides in the estate. If he may dispose even of a specific legacy to pay debts. The effect of the estate with the legal duty in the hands of the legatee, I very slight matter may amount to an agent, to fill M. 2. 4. 595, Ref. 28.

**Specific and Specific Legacies.**

Specific legacies are legacies of things specified - the legatee, one of sum of money made in his lifetime that don't identify any particular parcel. 3. St. H. Roper. 28, 1. 461. A. 5. 635. 1. P. 422.

Specific legacies are liable to enter before specific, but there are liable if the agent are insufficient. Ref. 28. Br. 66.

But if a part only of the specific be taken to pay debts, the legatee whose parts are not taken are enforceable in chancery to make a reasonable allowance to those whose parts have been taken. Ref. 113.

This is claims however only where it necessary to take a part of the specific legacies, for if the estate take such legacy he is bound to its amount.

If a specific legacy is lost or destroyed by any inevitable accident, the legatee must bear the loss. Br. 160. Ref. 24.

After the part of specific legacies, if there be not assets enough to pay the pecuniary one, these must be an average. Ref. 114. 12. W. 422. 595.
Out of these do not sufficient to pay the specific legacies, then first hand one always performed & they shall be no awargo between them.

In such cases where the pecuniary legacies are preferred to specific - but the preference definitely wholly on the testator's wants. Br. 953 Channel. 115.

Thus if all the real property at a particular place or places be bequeathed in specific legacies, when there is no real estate elsewhere, if afterwards a pecuniary legacy is given, to be paid out of the real estate the specific legacies are chargeable with the pecuniary legacy.

[Inscription:.....]

Listed & Passed Legacies.

A vested in 1, which of course vests in the legatee or his representatives - passed, can't be taken by the legatee but must back into the residuum.

If a legatee die before the testator his legacy is passed. 2 By 8th 1st 1st. 18617 7 7

The legatee who has the residuum if there be one is entitled to passed legacies if not built go according to the will of distribution. 2 R. 201. House 200. 2 No. 373. 351. 216. Co. 6th. 200. 510.

To this we there are 10 or 2 exceptions - to decide that if the legacy passed by the death of the legatee during the life of the testator, it goes to the next of kin if not to the residuary legatee - but if it passed by the failure of the condition on which it gives it goes to the residuary legatee. 2 No. 373. 5
A legacy given is a payable at a future day is a
vested legacy, but a legacy given to a man at a cer-
tain age don't vest till he arrives at that age, if he
die before he arrives at it, its lapsed. 16. 6. 2. 12. 6.
53. v. 6. 2. 55. 58. 52. 3. 54. 51. 6. 2. 52. 5. 64.
3. 52. 2. 51. 51. 4. 3. 52. 1. 6. 2. 56. 2. 50. 645.

This distinction seems to be over once it probably tends
to defeat the intention of the testator. The 5. 6. 1.
proof of distinc-
ction are not however without exceptions. 1. 5. 6. 10.

If such legacies are charged on real property the lega-
ties die before the time at which they are payable,
in one case, I give it to the other they shall take. This
exception is for the benefit of the true who is a favour-
te of the English to.

Another exception is that when a legacy given at a
future time, is paid when at least it is not lapsed till
the legatee die before the time. 16. 6. 2. 63. 12. 362.
5. 6. 2. 12. 6. 2. 51. 4. 3. 52. 1. 6. 2. 56. 2. 50. 643.

So also when the legacy is to be paid out of a con-
tinuance, which yields an annual increase to until
they will compel him to pay a legacy charged on his land, yet if such legacy lapsed as of it is not
paid. If the legatee die before the day of pay, the heir
will hold it to the exclusion of those who claim under
the estate of distributions. 1. 6. 26. 3. 5. 2. 42. 3. 6. 32.

The same favour is shown to a devisee as in which lega-
cy are charged. This favour who is entitled to
a lapsed legacy, may demand pay immediately af-
ter the death of the first legatee, provided (Simpson's)
years 12 a day be paid, no term is fixed by the testator.
2. 6. 2. 12. 6. 2.
A legacy may be made with a proviso, that if the legatee die before the testator, or before he arrive at a certain age, it shall go to another, & such a limitation will be good. Bo. 51, 2, 200, 521, 611.

Conditional Legacies.

If a man order a legacy to be paid on condition not to dispute the will, & the legatee commence a suit whereby he does dispute it, is he punishable, if there was probably causa impedendi. Dyer 42, 2, 124, 91.

It is by R. that all conditions in restraint of marriage are to be construed strictly, being prejudicial to society. Sumn. 266.

Legacies to which are annexed general conditions in restraint of marriage, are vested immediately & absolutely, if the condition is void, or where the condition is that the person shall marry a person of a particular profession or calling. 3, 527, 1, 306, 76, 1, 1 5, 4, 6, 14, 1, 202, 288.

But a legacy left by a testator leaving a family of children to his W, on condition of her not marrying is an exception to the above R. 1, 13, 26, 1, 206, 20, 20, 20, 20.

Yet if there had been no children & the legacy had been given by a stranger, & should vest if the condition be nugatory, there being no real neglect, no good reason why a widow should not marry, as well as a maid. Godd. 46.

So conditions restrictive of marriage before a certain age, or not to marry at a particular place, have been considered good — as also not to marry a pauper. 1, 282, 1, 20, 257, Sumn. 267, 8, 1, 20, 20.
Date & Page

Legacies given on condition, that they be professed of the legalow manner, without the consent of a particular person, are not subject to forfeiture on breach of the condition, unless limited to another. 170a. 502. 1. Nait. 199. 1. Ark. 504. 1. R. & R. 868. 1. Cont. 259, 258.

When a legacy is well given.

I. A last will being made, when the testator is supposed to be in his sound mind, the legatee's intention rather than the technical import of the words used to signify that intention. It hence any words manifesting an intention to create a legacy do it. Yatob. 240, 1. Nov. 565.

2. In all descriptions of persons who may claim to be legatees, the testator's intention must be sought. It has been adjudged that grandchildren may take under the description of children, if the testator used no children in all other cases. 1. Lev. 126, 1. Nov. 286.

If a man desires legacy to all his children and grandchildren, it is settled that this extends to those only, who were alive when the will was made, Deo. 125, 6. 1512. 1. 1. 470.

Any given to be equally distributed among the testator's relations, or among his poor relations, or among his relations of a good moral character, is to be divided according to the state of distribution, the description being too general to have any efficacy. This is now fully settled. Pr. 66. 471, 2. 251, 2. 327, 1. 381.

This duty is given to a number of children, to be distributed according to the direction of a particular person, who is named in the will, the division made by
that person will stand unless it manifestly injure

sufficiently. 2 Pet. 3:17.

I say it in Godolphin, that in order to discover the
testator, meaning us to the things he intended to
give away, it is necessary chiefly to regard the time when
the will was made for in presumed the testator's mind
is not altered unless it otherwise appear by good &
sufficient end. In another place however he observes
that this thence must be understood as the testator saw
the words in the present or future sense, & if it be
doubtful whether they refer to the time past or to
come, they shall be understood to relate to the time
to come. Godol. 272. 274.

But it is now settled that a gift in a will of all the te-
tator's personal property, all that he had at the time of his
death, & no more will pass whether the sum of his
personal property be increased or diminished after the time of

The 2 respecting real property is directly the reverse for
of this no such a point only will pass as was the testator's
at the time of making the will.

A bequest of a certain personal thing in a particular place ex-
tends to all he may afterwards have in that place.
2 Pet. 696.

By a bequest of a particular thing at a certain place, it
thing specified passes whether it was at the place or not
at the testator's death.

When a Legacy shall be a satisfaction of a debt or duty,
The doctrine that obtained for more than a century wiki
was that if a man gave a legacy to a citie, it should be a satisfaction of the debt in ture, equal or superior in value to the debt, this was otherwise. (Refer. 163. 3. P W 338, 2. 67. 122. 6. 62. 348. 93.) 1. 51. 123. 6. 14. 117.

This A. twas supposed with the intention of its account, long existed, but chancellor, finally to go to excess, particulars were, by repeated adjudication, to abolished. The following are exceptions to the A. 1st. That the legacy in order to operate as an exaction of the debt must be given generiously. 2. P W 326. 956. 2. 67. 68. 10. 58. 12. 40. 46.

1. That it should be payable at the time or at least as soon as the debt. 2. At 96. 2. 3. 96. 1. 62. 93. 1. 52. 1. 67. 12. 60. 58.

3. That there be no clause directing the payment of it debt. 1. P W 110. Refer. 168.

4. That the A. debt apply in an illict chancel.

5. That the intention of the to taxpayer to continue the debt by the legacy be apparent. 2. P W 335.

6. That it be expressly given in that.

If several legacies to the same person be exactly the same in quantity, or equal to the same instrument, they are not accumulative, but if otherwise as the same bequest is given in a will, or in a codicil, to accumulate, unless some words show a contrary intention. 1. P W 334. 338. 1. 3. 87. 2. 60. 21. 51. 98. 1. 1. 32. 126. Friend 52. 2. 1. 62. 96.

A legacy to a W. or other person entitled to money from the to taxpayer, by articles of many settlement, is generally
considered as intended to be a satisfaction of all or part of what is due, if the legatee may have
this election as to which he shall take he can't have both.

A gift to a legatee by a testator during his life, is to be
considered as part of the legacy bequeathed previous
to the gift. B. & B. 1. & B. 2. to 111.

The Ademption of a Legacy

This is taking away a legacy which was before bequeathed
- it is now to be preserved, but must always be pres-
erved. Lev. 22. 3. Psa. 470.

The accidental destruction or alienation of a legacy may
be an ademption or not according to the circumstances;
but it is not necessarily so, for this the legacy be specified.
it may be replaced by a similar article. 3. Psa. 34. 1. Psa.

To determine whether to an ademption or not, the in-
tention must be consulted - if there intended to ademt to

But if it be lost or destroyed or disposed of that any oth-
er intention can be inferred to no ademption. If a
debt be bequeathed if the testator calls it in for no other
purpose than to take it away from the legatee, it is an

If the thing bequeathed be pledged or sold then necessarily
by the testator, it is no ademption. Lev. 534. Awas. 39. 41.
But if the estate of a debt bequeathed was unsoldicated by the testator, or if the debtor was in failing circumstances, or if the testator wanted money, his endorsement. The estate or actio is consummated for the value of it. Mod. 319. Formul. 221. Act. 436. 8. Am. 461. 2. Ko. 36. 329. Agebr. 58. 624.

So in many cases where a legacy is destroyed, as in can a house is consumed by fire, so new one is built in its stead by the testator if we accommodate. Am. 329. Formul. 425. 2. Ko. 628. Agebr. 96.

If a man by will gives his daughter 500, & afterwards on her own, give the same or a greater sum the legacy is extinguished. 2. Ko. 110. 8th. 168.

If the testator bequeaths a certain sum to one child & give in the same will the same sum to the same child again both don’t go. Am. 348.

So laid down however as a is to be rebutted by showing a different intention, that if the bequest be of goods & specified to be in a particular place, they must be there at his decease to give effect to the legacy. Agebr. 37. 7. Br. 28. 123. 4. 36. 537.

But the removal of goods out of a ship before the testator’s death is an admittance. Agebr. 29.

Adverting & Dismissing Legacies.

The estate or actio is not obliged to pay any legacy, till the legatee gives security to refund if debts should afterwards appear for no time is joined within which debts must

be brought forward. 2. Ko. 358. 2. 205.
A legatee on receiving the legacy has not given assent to refund in favour of debts afterwards appearing, he is not compellable to do it. 1 Mart. 60, 2 Do. 59; 1st Dr. 148.

This A. however does not operate if the estate when he paid the legacy did not know of the existence of debts afterwards appearing or if he be compelled in chy to pay them. 2 Kent. 365, 2 Do. 198. 1st Dr. 148, 3 Do. 593.

J. B. thinks that in such case an action for money had and received would lie, since the money is paid by mistake and of course the consideration fails.

Act of  may come upon the estate of debtor in the hands of the legatee by a bill in chy if the estate is sufficient but not otherwise. 2 Kent. 354, 2 Do. 198, 1st Dr. 93, 2 Do. 201.

Occurrancy legatee abates in proportionation to the deficiency of debts. 1st Dr. 91, 2 Do. 562.

If a legacy begins to an estate for his care & pains, it has no preference but must abate in the same proportion as others. 2 Do. 934.

So one legatee may compel a succurrancy legatee to refund when the assets become deficient, the time was no provision for refunding, & tho' he has a remedy in the estate by which he is compellable to pay it out of the main pocket, if he voluntarily paid away the assets to the other legatees. 2 Dr. 198, 2 Do. 248, 2 Kent. 366. 3rd Dr. 112.

Payment of legacies.

1. An estate which he pays legacies ought to take a receipt or proper kind sufficient voucher, because it is held to be
such an equitable demand, as is not barred by the statute
deference, the same shall also, if a legacy may be
presumed to have been paid, 1. Ch. 225. & 230. 1. & 2. Wm.
So brought to be caseworthy to pay all legacies in primo
hands, for without a devise or order, if a legacy be paid
then owe to pay their own to pay their relations of the infant.
S. 26 & 27. 1. & 2. Wm. 125.
If without this he should pay a legacy to the father of an
infant he does it at its own expense, the rent if he pays
it to any other guardian, or any other guardian does it
comply to discharge his trust faithfully, 1. & 2. Wm. 255. 1. & 2. Wm.
9, 10 & 21. 285. 1. & 2. Wm. 6, 128. 1. & 2. Wm. 128.
4. If a legacy be given to a person certain it must be paid
to the 2. When a legacy was paid to a person certain by
separately from her 2. was decided in a bill brought
by the 2. that it should be paid again with interest.
2. Will. 261. 1. & 2. Wm. 96.
So where the 2. were discovered a neutrals & there, the 2. alone
can declare a legacy. to the 2. 2. 9, 10 & 21. 285. 1. & 2. Wm.
9, 10 & 21. 285. 1. & 2. Wm. 6, 128.
But this 2. is not at all one where duty is given to the other
attire owe to the 2.

But if no time be appointed by the testators for the payment of
successor in the estate of the legatee, they are payable at the end of a year from his

This 2. is to be paid from the estate of
A legacy is payable to the representative of the deceased legatee
at the time originally fixed for pay. 2. & 31. 199. 285.
The person entitled to a legacy may demand payment immediately after the death of the intestate. A year has passed, and no time is fixed by the testator. 1. V. 91. 2. 283.

3. If a legacy be given generally, it carries interest regularly from the expiration of one year after the intestate’s death. 2. Eliz. 515. 2. V. 281. 263.

But if the legatee being of full age neglects to demand it at that time, he cannot have interest but from the time of the demand. Barker 65. 2. Att. 109. 3. P.R. 136. 2. V. 597.

And here may be remarked a difference between a legacy and a debt—a debt if no time be limited for payment has interest whether demanded or not. The reason of this difference is, that the estate who is a debtor, is not like a debtor, bound to send the person he owes through of the advances the duty when demanded. Rith. 185.

But the legacy be given generally & no time ascertained for the pay, yet if the legatee be an infant, he shall be entitled to the interest from the expiration of 1 year after the intestate’s death even if no demand be made—for no balance shall be inquired to him. 2. Salk. 413. 4. V. 254. 2. Bk. 261. 2. Gilm. 299.

If the legacy be appointed by the intestate himself to be paid at a time certain, it is not fully settled whether it shall bear interest from the time so fixed, or from the demand. Modern courts favour the latter principle or hypothecation. Salk. 415. 2. Bk. 11. 161.

If a legacy be made payable to hold of the intestate even at a future time, if no other provision be made for its maintenance, it will bear interest from the end of the
year immediately following the testator's death, because
the father was obliged to have provided for it while liv-
ing, it is presumed he intended it should be maintained
after his death. By 2. e. 301. Z. Ath. 329. Z. De 101.

By 6. s. money made payable at a certain day, bear
interest from the time fixed for payment.

Legacies now recoverable.

They are recoverable by a bill in the ecclesiastical
suit, or in a suit in chancery. If the legacy is charged
on lands to recoverable only by a bill in chancery 22. Bills 321. 6. Mod.

They compel the heir of a legacy the ninety on the ground
of trust. Cath. 130. 2. Deo. 2. 332. 364. 2. Show. 59.

Residuary Legacies.

When the debts and other legacies are discharged, the residu-
ary legacies will take the surplus, to the exclusion of all
other, except where legacies charged on real estate are left
for the benefit of the benefit of the next of kin. 2. Matt. 276.
Alt. 593.

If a residuary legatee die before the debts are satisfied,
so that it does appear what the surplus will be, yet the exec-
or administrator of such a person will have the whole residue of
the first estate, which remains over if it is not the vote of the

So if there be a residuary legatee and the extrini,
p rate of
the testator's effect out of the inventory, or undervalue then
Exempts Alien
he fits in, the residuary legatee may file a bill of dis
covering to him, before he has paid the testament debt.

When the estate has the residuary has bee already consid
ered, but if no residuary legatee be appointed under the
will, the intention of the testator is manifest, that the estate
shall not be residuary legatee, the residuary is distribu-
ted as she the testator died intestate. 2. Instt. 33. 1. Rohn 519. 2. Do
674. 737. 1. P.M. 9858. 9. 20. 90.

Donatio causa effectis.

This is a specific form used by a donor in continu-
ation of death, i.e., a bequest. In the event of the donor's
death, the donee does not receive the property. 8. Ob.

If the donor die, the legatee rests immediately on the do-
nee, without the intervention of estate or any other person.

To give effect to this, there must be a manual tradi-
tion or some act amounting to it by the donor.

This gift is not good in extenso but no action lies in the estate
he not being instituted with it.

J. R. thinks that the donee, who claims as the donee must
bring his action as donee in his own name for
the representative of the deceased being bound by the gift;
the estate or donee cannot as in other cases inventory the debt.

If it were, that by this gift a chose in action of a negati-
ble nature will help, but if it not negotiable, the better.
**Distributions**

After the settlement of debts and legacies, the estate must be distributed to the next of kin. The mode of distribution is settled by the statute 22 & 23 Geo. III, which directs that after the settlement of debts and legacies, the residue shall go to the children and their representatives. If there be no children, to the next of kin and their representatives. No representation is admitted beyond brothers and sisters children.

As the ecclesiastical did the management of the estate of deceased persons, the civil law also adopted to determine rules upon the descent of heir. The distribution shows that in the hands of the intestate at his death, and consequently are incapable that the claimants die before the distribution 2 Bala. 58.

An intestate who be an infant at his death was under the rule of distribution. No distribution is made till after the expiration of 1 year from the death of the intestate. Bowel 66.

The first estate first goes to the next of kin the deceased line to their legal representatives, i.e. to the children and issue of issue 2 Bala. 23. 3 Will. 58 Pro. Bala 28.

So long as any of the old stock remains in any degree, the estate goes first to the heirs of the deceased and their legal representatives, i.e. to the children. Some however contend that the distribution is in the
The right of representation among collaterals extends no further than to the children of brother & sister beyond that degree kindred can claim in their own right only. If than the brother & sister of the proprietor be dead, & a part of their children also, those remaining who survive shall take the wholly estate in exclusion of the grand nephew & grand niece of the proprietor. 1. P. 20. 984. 9. 80. 58. Bath 190. 1. No. 203. 8. 1. Ab. 554. 5. Bath 38.

A son of first places the mother in the same rank with brother & sister in the distribution of personal property.

But the degradation of the mother takes place only when there are brothers & sisters of these children living. 1. Ab. 558.

No distinction is made in distributing between the whole of the half-breed, for the civil & regard, proximity, not quantity of blood. 1. Vent. 316. 313. 528. Bath 38. 1. Ab. 558.

If the father of the deceased be living the mother takes nothing for whatever she might take would belong to her
Extra Ashe

II. If after a divorce a vinculo matrimonii by parlia-
ment, for insufficient cause, the son, or his father
or mother still living, then divorced, the same would
be entitled to any thing or not. But as the the right to
his real property, according to principle, would remain,
he would have a good claim. If the divorce were only a
moral, then she could not claim any thing her her living
for the right to
his real property continues
the after his death she might.
And in all cases where the
man was not at the
void, she has a claim after his
the death.

In deciding in this that the intestate take in entirely
of

the grand-father or mother, but is in accordance with
the governing No. 2, Aeb. 722, Libd. 4, Godet 239.

children in ventris the were one by the civil as well
as of the consideration in the V take property by the 13 of
of distribution & in favour of such an infant an injunc-
tion may be granted to stay wards. Aeb. 752. Aeb. 115.

1. Ver. 274, 7101.

Distribution is completely in a act of duty. Aeb. 135 2.

As a f. R. that juveniles estate is to be distributed according
to the day the country reduce the intestine lived at the time
of his death. 2. 475. 486. 2. 43. Amb. 35.

Advance.

By statute every child except the heir at 6, if he
has received an advancement from his father during
his life time, shall in order to be entitled to a distri-
bution share under the rest of distributions being what
he has thus received into hotchpot. 60 Co. Litt. 176.

This is however operative in those cases only, where the
father dies intestate as to the whole of his estate. Co. Litt.
170. 3 Wils. 346.

A man's settlement is an advancement. 2 Wils. 538 2 Bla.

It seems that the doctrine of advancement does not prevail in
cases where a man has partly of which he is ignorant,
or which he does not notice in his will. Co. Litt. 170.

When a man gives a greater legacy to one child than to
another, V dies intestate as to part of his estate, to no
advancement— for it must be made during the testator's life.
2 D.W. 34.

De partitione.

Any act of negligence by the cestui que accidit by which the
benefits are lost or injured subjects him to a deponent,
and which execution goes de bonis juxta, as ve-
leaving debts at a discount—submitting to allotment—
receiving less than was due—exceeding an unreasona-
ble sum for funeral charges. 2 1 Bla. 431.

Where in this case there is a breach given the may be car-
ged on it— If there be 2 coextors, is not liable for a deponent
out of the other, unless he has directly or indirectly
contributed to it. 1st May 1820.

If there be 2 coextors, having effects by the other not, if the
former commits a deponent, both may be sued in
the first instance in the usual form. A judge may go
In both - but if no other be found, now not & will be returned - a mere facsimile will go in both, I judge will go, on the receiver only.

If both enter have signed receipts, & taken himself received, both are liable to enter but the receiver only to legatee, Salk. 313, 2. B. A. 113.

Actions by & to enter &c.

In some cases the decedent ought not when the testator or other said - so too as to being sued.

The R of discrimination between these cases when the testator or other may be sued, on account of the decedent & those where court has been left down thus, that the testator or other is liable for the court, but not for the loss of the testator or intestate. But within branch of this is strictly true - for there are cases in which they are not liable for the costs of the decedent, if others in which they are liable for his costs.

The present R as to lost person seems to be this - if the testator has benefited the decedent's estate, they are liable - otherwise they are not. Even then the estate of the family united has been injured by the lost.

J. R. however think that the inquiry ought not to be whether the objects have been benefited, but whether another or has been injured by the loss of the decedent.

At J. S. the testator or other was not liable for any testator of the decedent - then present liability is derived from the unity of the estate 1704. 1704. de bonis in vita & post mortem. In the old oath the words actus bini are not inserted
but in the printed stat. to begin. In fact does this statute impose a liability onRepresentation, or merely give them a right of action? 2 8a. 737. 441. 1 8orn. 251. 1 8eed 30.

When a right of recovery for the tort of the deceased survives to the executors, etc., still, the action must not sound in tort but in case. If the usual mode of recovery is by ass which cannot be traversed, consp. 372. 9 8a. 349.

Cons. 40. 4. 8ibd. 148. 8alk. 311. 8ed. May 97. 1592.

If an action which would survive in an exec at which the totalor, if the latter die pending the suit it does not abate the suit to recur if it would not survive. If therefore an action be brought in the totalor, or a right of recovery that would survive in the exec. If the action sound in tort, the suit must according to principle of principles come to the suit. If the latter must revert to an action sounding in case in the suit. I where the action as well as the right of recovery will survive in the exec, a new process must be issued to summon the exec to answer to the suit. consp. 372. 8ero. 2 877. 8atch. 163. 1 8. 37.

In a vice process in an exec, he cannot plead any matter that might have been pleaded in the original action 8alk. 1.

8ero. 6 883. 1 8ed. 182.

I have said there are cases of the totalor that would survive the exec. The is of disannulment in this: where as is usually the case the cost is such, that the totalor has received or is to receive any consideration from the other party, or performance of the cost the cost is liable.

1 8ero. 439.

But where according to the cost, the totalor was not to receive any consideration, growing from the other party, but a compensation amounting solely from the perfor-
nance of the suit, it in which the other party was
not interested, if he fail of performance, this running
interest, his estate is not liable. An officer who is to
receive legal fees for the execution of a process, fails to
execute it, his estate is not liable.

Formerly no action survived a estate in the case
where the testator was not his own the law, 3 P. 60.

In some instances too the estate can't maintain an ac-
tion which the testator could. The A is the "of test
committed to the testator, has injured his estate, the
estate may maintain a suit for the recovery of damage:
otherwise he could not. 2 Cl. 536.

When the suit is commenced by the testator it is offered
a nature, that it would survive in favour of the estate
& the testator die before judgment, the estate may make
himself a party to the action by suggesting the death
of theflt & using his own name in the testator's place. 3 P. 897. 3 Knt. 16. 9 Co. 87.

By the stat. of M. if a deft die, his estate must be ex-
tended, in which event he becomes a party to the suit,
& judgment goes in favor an estate, but on the other hand if
the deft was dead the estate neglected to enter his name
the estate would be remitted.

The estate may sue in his own name when the cause
of action is a suit of his own, or his accrued since the
testator's death. 3 P. 90. 28.

The estate a suit by a suit of the testator, is not com-
plained to take advantage of the stat of limitations. 6th
26, in Hartle.
But if he thinks the demand just he may insist and to go as him, I must be guilty of a duvetani.

Whether an exte is obliged to take any advantage of the state of usury is a question about which English courts disagree. It settled that in general he is obliged to avoid himself of any illegality in the case. But he doubts whether the R. reaches deals that in honour conscience ought to be paid. Aug. B. 129, Hob. 167.

The exte is not perhaps warranted in renouncing all his legal advantages, that the tenant might have recovered.

A count for money had or received to the use of the exte or such, may be joined with a count for money had or received to the use of the tenant. 3 T.R. 882.

A suit can join in one duty, a cause of action which accrued to him as exte with one that accrued to him own right. 1 T. R. 352, Sta. 1271.

If that for which the exte sued, and when received be agents in his hands, he must sue in his representative capacity. 5 T.R. 233, 7 T.R. 939.

Sure is, the exte in all cases of this kind, if you assert on does the R. mean that unless he suit, in this way he is liable to costs? it can mean that he is obliged to sue an exte, nor in he exempt from paying cost in all such cases. 2 T.R. 128, 1 Do. 235, 7 Do. 383, 1 Do. 55, 2 Do. 8, 926.

When a promise is made to an exte, as much he may sue as much. 1 T.R. 487.

If an act to bind himself as exte he is personally bound to sue before them administrat. 1 T.R. 631.
In a y. P. that when an extre one V is defeated be is liable to no costs, V by st. 3rd S 2d w. which governs on this subject there only names liable to costs who sued in their own right extre therefore don't come within the st. 
2.6 Ba. 436.

The last rule applies only to jts. who are extre. Mut. 64. 
6ov. 6. 318, hand. 168. Above 142.

When an extre brings an action in his own right he is liable for costs - as in comm. on this prep. he. 152. 6. Med. 
12. 131. 2. 192. 

What things are first party & affects inter 
In a y. P. that all first party goes to the extre & all not to the heir - yet there are some things which seem to be first party that go to the heir - V things that seem real go to the extre. Thus past in a field & deer in a park go to the heir - but was the cattle been killed they would have gone to the extre. Annual rent on land, the first party goes to the heir - while wheat growing at the death of the tenant, paper into the hands of the extre, so 2.01. 53.

The disposal of the residue of an estate per annui where the tenant dies during its continuance goes to the extre. 

Tenant rents are sometimes considered as real & sometimes as first party - they part of course lie a deed of the land - & if an injury be done to them, it is a trespass - but as between the heir & extre, entitles are always to be regarded as first party - & also as between the lord & tenant, when the estate determines at an uncertain time. 

I knew as to rents, the digging of which requires the freehold - they go I presume to the extre as well as to the tenants for they are entitles. By the old I anything
affixed to the freehold, however slightly, was considered a part of the reality. Ex. 19:5. Prov. 3:14. 3 Kgs. 11:2.

But in some the revenue. For whatsoever is neverly appertained to the freehold is considered as part only, which its separation would materially injure, that to which he fixed. The P is now established holds equally between land lord & tenant, heir & cohe. 2 Kgs. 11:8, 12:2. 3 Kgs. 19.

There are certain debts transmitted by the custom of king called heir looms.

If a tenant or intestate deceased of a term for years it belongs to the cohe or acte. If a lease for years comes to the hands of the heir, he must annually add to the inventory, the surplus of the profits, if any after allowing for part of rent & the P is the same as to all accruing profits. Ex. 6:17.

If the intestate died in fee makes a lease, the rent on his death goes to his heir.

The revenues however distant in time are next after in the hands of the heir, if extant may be leased immediately to be leased, where they shall happen. 2 Kgs. 12:3.

Rights of redemption on the mortgage of the intestate are in estate, real effects in the hands of the exe but real estate.

If the intestate grants an estate in vivum vacuus, the future estate of the heir is after he real when they shall happen. If the intestate be mortgagee, all revenue of an estate in vacuo, the estate on his death is after in the hands of the exe & he may cause a foreclosure. 1 Kgs. 14:9. 1 Kgs. 21:28. 2 Kgs. 22:2.
The subject debt is said to be due before 1st December, 1894, and to be secured by the personal security of the defendant.

If the defendant were able to prove that the debt was due before 1st December, 1894, he would be entitled to set aside the judgment for want of jurisdiction.

The defendant is, however, not entitled to set aside the judgment for want of jurisdiction, as the personal security of the defendant is not sufficient to against the personal debt.

The personal security of the defendant is not sufficient to discharge the personal debt, as the personal security of the defendant is not sufficient to discharge the personal debt.
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The personal security of the defendant is not sufficient to discharge the personal debt, as the personal security of the defendant is not sufficient to discharge the personal debt.

The personal security of the defendant is not sufficient to discharge the personal debt, as the personal security of the defendant is not sufficient to discharge the personal debt.

The personal security of the defendant is not sufficient to discharge the personal debt, as the personal security of the defendant is not sufficient to discharge the personal debt.

The personal security of the defendant is not sufficient to discharge the personal debt, as the personal security of the defendant is not sufficient to discharge the personal debt.

The personal security of the defendant is not sufficient to discharge the personal debt, as the personal security of the defendant is not sufficient to discharge the personal debt.

The personal security of the defendant is not sufficient to discharge the personal debt, as the personal security of the defendant is not sufficient to discharge the personal debt.

The personal security of the defendant is not sufficient to discharge the personal debt, as the personal security of the defendant is not sufficient to discharge the personal debt.

The personal security of the defendant is not sufficient to discharge the personal debt, as the personal security of the defendant is not sufficient to discharge the personal debt.

The personal security of the defendant is not sufficient to discharge the personal debt, as the personal security of the defendant is not sufficient to discharge the personal debt.

The personal security of the defendant is not sufficient to discharge the personal debt, as the personal security of the defendant is not sufficient to discharge the personal debt.

The personal security of the defendant is not sufficient to discharge the personal debt, as the personal security of the defendant is not sufficient to discharge the personal debt.

The personal security of the defendant is not sufficient to discharge the personal debt, as the personal security of the defendant is not sufficient to discharge the personal debt.

The personal security of the defendant is not sufficient to discharge the personal debt, as the personal security of the defendant is not sufficient to discharge the personal debt.

The personal security of the defendant is not sufficient to discharge the personal debt, as the personal security of the defendant is not sufficient to discharge the personal debt.

The personal security of the defendant is not sufficient to discharge the personal debt, as the personal security of the defendant is not sufficient to discharge the personal debt.

The personal security of the defendant is not sufficient to discharge the personal debt, as the personal security of the defendant is not sufficient to discharge the personal debt.

The personal security of the defendant is not sufficient to discharge the personal debt, as the personal security of the defendant is not sufficient to discharge the personal debt.

The personal security of the defendant is not sufficient to discharge the personal debt, as the personal security of the defendant is not sufficient to discharge the personal debt.

The personal security of the defendant is not sufficient to discharge the personal debt, as the personal security of the defendant is not sufficient to discharge the personal debt.

The personal security of the defendant is not sufficient to discharge the personal debt, as the personal security of the defendant is not sufficient to discharge the personal debt.

The personal security of the defendant is not sufficient to discharge the personal debt, as the personal security of the defendant is not sufficient to discharge the personal debt.
Private Wrongs.

Stander.

Stander consists in maliciously imputing a fact by words written, spoken, or spoken which tend to injure him in any social or public estimation, or interest. 1 Sa. 193, 6. 174. 9. 113. 93. 496.

2: Without words, as by picture, signifies the same tendency. 5. 60. 123, 6.

This is the most usual division, to wit, Words, painting, and signs or pictures.

Stander by words is of two kinds: 1st of words in themselves actionable. 2nd of words not actionable, but becoming so, 4. 53. 4. 41. 2.

The y. b. rebuking one standing off 1st is actionable.

1st. What slander.

 truth of words must concern the definition of malice.

4. 2 y. b. that for words themselves actionable, the suit may recover in many cases. the word some exceptions for damages are inflicted and such words prima face import malice. But the free sensation of malice may be rebutted by proving that they were made under circumstances that exclude the notion of malice. 4. 53. 1. 6. 33.

1st. Some that bring the honor of nations they are
Private Wrongs

1st. Bringing into danger of immediate punishment.

2nd. Tending to exclude him from any or all society.

3rd. Injury in his trade or profession.

4th. Injury in his office or sphere of duty.

1st. Bringing into danger of punishment. If the words charge a fact that would incur corporal punishment, the words are clearly actionable. 5. Co. 424. 4. R. 88. 6. B. 638. 662. 7. Tit. 177. 136. 8. 811. 4. Co. 20.

According to this classification words may be actionable for 4. 5. 6. 7. 8. 26.

Words charging what would subject to transportation or banishment. 4. 26.

Words charging what would amount to imprisonment, or subject to imprisonment. 4. 26.

Words charging what would amount to imprisonment, or subject to imprisonment. 4. 26.

The 6th 8th 14th subjects to imprisonment any woman who has had a bastard. Consequently, to charge a woman with this in actionable of itself.

Words charging a fact that would subject to a fine or actionable on not as the fact charged is or not so decided by our Supreme Ct. 4. 26.

Sect. 497 says, that to charge one with having committed any crime evinced makes the person spoken of liable to a prosecution is actionable. 19. 26.
Words changing an intention of evil are not actionable: but must be changed. Sed. 543, 1 How. 121, Exp. 516.

A woman gone from council to live is not actionable. 2 Stilw. 106.

I expect to see him indicted for stealing not actionable. Matt. 11.

He is in court for stealing a horse, not actionable. Mat. 11. 114.

Words of a similar import are held insufficient of an indict. 2 Stilw. 106.

Adjective words, are actionable, or not, as they presuppose an act committed or not. — Reclusion is not actionable. — Arjumand, &c. Exp. 534, 460. 183.

Here, jonesmore, is not actionable, unless you added in such a cl, or in a judicial proceeding. 4 Bac. 422.

You C. 609 3 Cev. 106.

So if the particular theft had been pardoned, charging one with having committed a crime of which he has been acquitted. 3 Black. 781.

If the words charge a crime, which it appears could not have been committed, they are not actionable. Thus that one killed J. 5. yet alive. Exp. 476 4. 60. 12.

This matter may be summed up in two words under the y issue. Rule 8.

If to the words charging the crime, a description
But changing a crime tho' the prosecution is barred by the statute of limitations at the time the words were spoken, is actionable.

If the punishment of a crime changes as in the alternative, the words are actionable if the punishment may be corporal; thus changing one with being the father or mother of a child that may be chargeable, the father is not liable to imprisonment, unless he disobeys the order of the justice. 1 Sc. 311. 1 Ew. 831. 4 Sc. 576. 1 Brow. 145.

1st. Injury to exclude from notice as to change with having a contagious disorder. 3 S. 582. 3 Sc. 124. 6 Brow. 474. 1 Pe. 634. Holt. 212. 1 Lew. 209. 3 Sc. 488.

So is actionable, the words must charge a present dinor. 1 Sc. 113. 2 Sc. 673. 6 Brow. 624. 2 Brow. 149.

Under this head adjective words in the present tense are actionable. 1 Holt. 213. 2 Sc. 585. 6 Brow. 474.

3rd. Injury to injure one in his trade or profession. 4 Sc. 630. 1 Com. 182. 1 Brow. 524.

Calling a lawyer a bram, or saying he was prevented his client's suits, is actionable. 3 Sc. 123. 1 Com. 152. 1 Vent. 24. 1 Holt. 113.

So that he is no bram, no man is bramer than

So in general, changing a lawyer with ignorance of his profession is admissible. 1. Esa. 38:13, 13, 14; 1. Esa. 29:1, 29:2, 39:4, 2. Esa. 41:2, 41:2, 9.

In these cases the lawyer must state in his declara
tion that at the time of the words spoken, he was a

Proof of the facts, acting as a lawyer insufficient.
1. Th. pag. 45.

So falsely calling a lawyer a bankrupt in action
able—recalling him a bankrupt known to him will

So to charge him with cheating his customers and
to advise them not to trade with him. 4. Ba. 39:4.

In actions by traders even in these cases, it must
appear, by laying a colloquium or otherwise, that
the words were spoken with reference to his trade.
4. Ba. 39:4. 8:1, 8:1, 8:1, 8:1, 8:1, 8:1, 8:1, 8:1. 4. Ba. 39:4.

Thus, “He is a cheat!” here a colloquium concerning his
trade is necessary to be laid—but if the words are
“He is a bankrupt!” should be sufficient to aver
whether that to mean a trader. 1. Lev. 6:2, 6:6, 6:6, 6:6.

To not deal with him, he is a cheat! thus is good and
true colloquium.
Private Wrongs.

To call a person a liar is actionable.

In order to change a man with speaking is actionable. 21. Sir N. 1. 60. 341. 4. 84. 1. Deut. 1. 84. 1. 86.

To call him a drunkard or a videogame to call a person a liar is actionable. 2. Sir N. 1. 60. 341. 4. 84. 1. Deut. 1. 84. 1. 86.

To say he was blind or his patient is not actionable in up to him knowingly or something ignorant. 2. Sir N. 1. 60. 341. 4. 84. 1. Deut. 1. 84. 1. 86.

Pure and inoffensive libelous in his profession. 2. Sir N. 1. 60. 341. 4. 84. 1. Deut. 1. 84. 1. 86. When the same words and more apathetic were deemed actionable.

Words tending to injure a mechanic in his trade are deemed actionable. 2. Sir N. 1. 60. 341. 4. 84. 1. Deut. 1. 84. 1. 86.

4. Tendency to injure in the office. Words tending to injure a person in an office of trust or profit with a want of duty or integrity are actionable. 2. Sir N. 1. 60. 341. 4. 84. 1. Deut. 1. 84. 1. 86.

Words tending to injure a person in an office of trust or profit with a want of duty or integrity are not actionable. 2. Sir N. 1. 60. 341. 4. 84. 1. Deut. 1. 84. 1. 86.

Tend if they impair our integrity. 2. Sir N. 1. 60. 341. 4. 84. 1. Deut. 1. 84. 1. 86.

To call a person a wicked, knavish fellow is not actionable. 2. Sir N. 1. 60. 341. 4. 84. 1. Deut. 1. 84. 1. 86.

Changing a person’s opinion in order to suit with such motives or principles that no person without changing our will. 2. Sir N. 1. 60. 341. 4. 84. 1. Deut. 1. 84. 1. 86.

When the words spoken show of themselves sufficient to
Private Wrongs

have been spoken of him in his affairs, as by a colloquium or exegyary 21. Nov. 1769. 4. Bar. 480.

1. § 280

Verum de faciendo de - or that he is a known person

in 1. Bev. 182. 4. 2. 380

To generally where the words are not actionable at all as they refer to some collateral thing which

conducted the ground of the action and to which the

words do not themselves in the fact of them refer in

an account or a colloquium is necessary, as to say of one

who is a trader. He is a cheat. 4. Bev. 301. 2. Howard. 302

II. 521. Stann. 1169.

Colloquium is not by § 514. To be necessary when a

trader is called a bankrupt. i.e. given no only for

then sec. 1. Bev. 280 where the words mean he is a

possible thing - a colloquium was held necessary

by Bev. 415.

To calling a physician is a relation to held actions

i.e. 4. Bev. 314. 4. 518. Bev. 5. 220. 126.

To of a brickman is called a cheat, don't agree with

him - a colloquium is not sufficient. 4. Bev. 281. 4. 518.

Bom. 9. 226.

If the words themselves don't show their own applica-

tion by designating the person, excluder and unless

by § 482.

The 4. is that nothing which would otherwise be

main uncertain, can be reduced to certainty by an

example. 4. Bev. 416. 4. 382.

Any thing that taken in connection with all that

has led them the factor, as to the combination.
Privee Wrongs.

Private wrongs can be made certain by intimation. If you be made certain, you are to the thing as before that is expressed. (Comp. 687)

Intimation therefore can never extort the meaning of words, beyond their proper import, nor if I burnt my brains, meaning a burnt salt of corn is not good. But if it had been assured that the salt had a burnt salt of corn and that in a future concerning it, the salt of the other words, the inaudito is good. (660. 661. 664. 674. 694. 695.)

So he twice half an arm of corn, audendo, meaning the corn that was on half an arm after two covered nine the inaudito is bad. (660. 674. 694.)

When an inaudito is unnecessary, a bad one is sufficient. (660. 674.)

So if the person is uncertain from the words published, he can, be made certain by an inaudito, then one of the requisite of J. S. is a thief. audendo meaning the salt, is not good. (671. 680. 694. 695.)

When an action is brought for words, tending to injure in trade profuse, either he must appear in the debtor that the words spoken. the salt was in the office, (681. 694.)

But the salt has been many years, a ladder is insufficient. (694. 695.)

(Comp. 682. 683. 692. 693. 694. 695. 696. 697. 698. 699. 700. 701. 702. 703. 704. 705.) That he shall be punished to have been a ladder at the time.
Private Wrongs

Do in the case of a buyer and seller, i.e. a trade who
spent his living by it, a company, b.c. 419. 1 Sid. 241

Words of heat and passion are not not to be actionable.
 Eph 320. 1 Da 522. 1 Evr 59. 3. 36. 182.

Words that denote no definite things or vague, vari-
able, are not actionable. A sentence which unau-
rivally provoked by the plin seven of in a parenthesis of
unprovoked ager utrae actionable words

actions of handle, actually were rare. Of timely never sequent, no man be adopted. Stat. 747
divinari. Rule of construing words in number some
are unexplained, they are now to be construed in
that sense which the heavens would necessarily
understand them. Eph 411. 32 397 bowe 638 278 Rabb 195. 4. 205. 275.

Said terms words in a foreign language are not ac-
tionable unless understood by the heavens. 5 Da 456.
1 Rob 76. bow 6 569. Hott 126.

All the sentence is to be taken together for the sake
quantum words may so explain the former as not to
amount to stander. b.c. 411. 460. 196 Bull 3. 9. Hott 197.

Let not we violence to language, to find an innocent
meaning. Tob 511.

This your 4th deed of a word that you gave been
sufficient that the words might have been given by

So a forced construction shall not be given to make
words actionable, which have an innocent mean-

The law is that words in an actionable must import a distinct meaning of something scandalous, and not more than by inference. Thus if I got his money by false swearing is not actionable. Yet where the intention to charge a crime, or something else actionable is clear, the words are actionable. This they are somewhat inclined. 

I will make you an example for a firm word to be actionable. 1. Bell 2d. He 2d.

So too, I will make you know in actionable. 1. Bell 50. Ezo. 2d. 4d. He 3d. 1d. He 5d. 7d. So when shall you return the sheet upon being stated 1. Ezo. 1d. He 3d. 5d. 2d. He 5d. 52. He 5d. 1d. He 5d.

In declaring this usual to state falsely and maliciously, the malice rarely comes unnecessary. 1. Ezo 1d. He 3d. 5d. He 5d. 7d.

The deems usually states that the sith is of good fame, the thin is unnecessary. 1. Ezo 1d. He 3d. 5d. He 5d. 7d.

Alloting that the words were spoken openly and publicly without anger in the presence of. So in the presence of them. sufficient. 1. Ezo 1d. Ezo 4d. 5d. 7d.
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me; face; the wrongs... In the course of the
necessary, under the circumstances, this is one of confidenta... was stated. Ch. 599. Sec. 3. 3. 7. 6.
argued.

So of words used in the course of legal proceedings.
Ch. 598. Sec. 6. 33.

The retaliating slander fabricated by another in gen-
nerally actionable. Ch. 597. Sec. 12.

Sec. 12. Even his actions at the time. 33. 6.
193. Sec. 500. 7. 8. 17. 2. 826.

But circumstances are carefully examined as to
the intent; thus when one is in a spirit of mirth
I have heard that J. S. was hung for robbing, his
action dont. i.e. Ch. 73. 1. Ch. 182. 2. 60 15. Sec. 2. 10.

Both sufficiency in no justification. Ch. 594. Sec. 6. 33.

Words repeated by saying or inquiring whether... the
fait or himself are not actionable - but if "dave you say"
I am a pleased knew? yes if you will have it
Ch. 598. Sec. 6. 8. 294.

The y gene in Eng is either a true or that the
Private Wrongs.

First of all, the words, as that they are not actionable for want of malice, as in the case of a confidential communication. 1 Cl. Mil. B. 4 H. 39, 374. 5 Med. 232.

In cases the words are false, or otherwise justifiable, except such as arise from some act of the party amounting to a discharge.

The general character of the facts as to the same charged by the words, may be proved in mitigation of damages—but other particulars acts of the same kind as those charged in court, when the charge is of particular acts—never when the general. 1 Cl. B. 384, 450. 2 B. T. B. 276. Poole 429, 1031. 1152.

In Doug, a special justification could be given even under the Law—than that the words were true. In case it can. C. 416. 4 60. 6 10. 128. 21. 4200. Doug 379.

In Doug the truth of the words could be given even under the Law, even in mitigation of damages. 21. 4200. Doug 578. 1152. B. 40.

The truth of the words is always a good justification. 4 Ha. 536. 1 Ross. 32.

As also the Law may sometimes justify where the words are actionable and false— as where joint words are published in a case of justice in a debtor brought in the debt. 5 Ha. 570. 72. 82. 82. Doug 304. 1 C. 514. 1 Ross. 54. Ault, 123. 120. 290. 358.

But if the debt charges, crimes not cognizable by
jurisdiction to which the action lies in cases not governed by the law of the land.

So if the person charged with such delicto or action of contempt, who they were never exonerated in an oath, may justify saying they were not false, tho' they are all true, for they in his defense are a test of justice. 4 Bl. 578, 579.

So he may say a witness is prejudiced, by way of objection to his admission. 1 How. 137, 1 Dell. 133.

Slanderous words, in a complainant to a grand jury, or before magistrates, or in an indictment are not actionable. 5 Bl. 599, 599, 603. 6 Bl. 232. 7 Bl. 82. 3 Lev. 138. 6 Co. 114.

This is one falsely and maliciously and without cause exhibits a complaint, an action for a malicious prosecution will lie. 4 Bl. 508.

So in general in the case cases of complaint, the course of justice is made a mere cloak for a malicious prosecution, an action for a malicious prosecution lies. Turn as to grand juries. 4 Bl. 500.

So slanderous words, spoken by a witness, in it are not generally actionable, like as the case may be, liable for perjury and libel, and if he goes beyond the issue, and slander a third person. Such case he is to slander a party in this no remedy?

So if witness in testifying change another matter
Having testified solely this action nos. 679, 503, 518, 1. Sound 131.

So that the words were spoken by the defendant in a court, is sometimes a good defense and sometimes not. No. 378, 518, 4. Ricks 11.

When the words the party are pertinent to the cause and suggested by his client they are not actionable. Ex. 517, 1. Ricks 113, 4. Ricks 498, 519, 2no. 942.

But if the words are unimportant, the suggested by the client, or being pertinent were not suggested by him, the action lies. 9, 36, 22, 6no. 14.

Most of the books however make no difference whether they were suggested by the client or not. Burtell, 6no. 517, 1. Ricks 17, 4. Ricks 74.

It has been decided that for the purpose of mitigaing damages in favor of a client, an advocate may use slanderous words the not pertinent. 4. Ricks 499.

In a subsequent case the Ricks, that an advocate in using issues for slanderous words made use of in de- pending his clients cause to his duty and to prom- ise that he was influenced by his client, but never mention their decision. 462, 4, Ricks 492.

Where there are two courts, one charging actionable words, and the other words not actionable, an a plea to the whole entire damages are given, and judgment must be arrested, and a new de novo awarded. 462, 503.
Suits if the words are all in one count 10, or 130.

If the in box zr. if they are said to have been spoken at one time. 1. P. 142. Sub. 4. 146. 41.

In an action for words, in themselves not actionable, special damages must be stated — this is the gist of the action. Sub. 2. P. 14. 2. 130.

So where the words are actionable, special damages may be stated and proved — but in this case he can prove no other special damages, than what are stated specially — the he may prove general damages or loss of custom or general, such general damage being found. Sub. 9. P. 130. 2. Sub. 133. 4. Sub. 99.

What amounts to an allegation of special damages.


But when the words are not in themselves actionable to holden that special damages may be proved under an assessment of general damages.


Quienied by Sub. 4. 7.

It is not material what the words that are false are, if they are malicious and occasion special damage — thus charging a single woman with being a emits, or incontinent, by which means she loses a match is actionable. 2. Sub. 9. 4. 990.

In case of scolding a little in its is said, or calling an one ahparent a bastard, too sufficient to show mole or profane damage — the action lie here.
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Thus the first author had signified a design to different times - sufficient also that the words tend to diminish him. 4. 60. 17. 61. 51. 8. 54.

The recovery of damages is to be by another action for the same words, whether the words were actionable for se or not. Bub. 7. 61. 56.

In action of slander in general, the first author has an action against the words, stated, may give rise of other words of a similar kind, spoken at another time & even after the action was brought. There are not less in aggravation of damages. Sec. 51. Bub. 10.

This however cannot be the principle, for words not actionable may thus be proved.
1st Words actionable which may also be proved, are a foundation for a distinct action.
2nd Words spoken after the action is brought, may thus be proved.
The true object is to show some malice. Bub. 7. 61. 192. 69.

But when words spoken at another time are given in and under this B, the deft may prove them true to rebut their inference. Sec. 51. Bub. 10.

When words not stated and spoken at a different time are proved they must be similar to those stated. Sec. 52. says the same words and Bub. 10. says words similar. Sec. 51.

Sec. 4 to similar words in bow. Kirby 131.
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The English law of limitations, as to slander, require the action to be brought within two years from the time of uttering it; the same extends only to actionable words. 6th B. I. 119. 7th B. I. 93.

Our statute limits the action to three years; it does not extend to words not actionable.

Formerly it was necessary to show the words spoken by a tending to show sufficient to from the substance. The manner must be the same, and the facts pronoun must not be changed.

A joint of slander by or in two, must be 4th B. 133. 6th B. 53. 1st B. 195. 6th B. 19. 7th B. 120. 8th B. 117.
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Let us consider the nature of slander by quoting 1. Tertullus, 36, 126.

Written slander is a more aggravated injury as it may be more libellous, concealed, maliciously committed. 1. Tertullus, 36, 126.

Exp. 504 says that a libel differs from slander by words only in this that he delivered in writing or printing. 3. Tertullus, 36, 126.

Perhaps the meaning is that words which in the written could not be slanderous are not so when written that they may be actionable as libelous. If this is not the meaning, the 2d is incorrect.

Any malicious defamation of a person living or dead made public by writing, tending to excite resentment or expose the object of it to public contempt or ridicule is a libel. 4. Tertullus 36, 126; 1. Tertullus 53, 97, 4, 36, 126; 3. Tertullus 36, 126.

For libels in general there are two remedies, one by indictment and one by an action. 3. Tertullus 36, 126; 59th Ch. 3, 36, 126.

So that the 4th reading & standing apply to libels also given in the 5th account, in 1. Tertullus 53, 97, 4, 36, 126; 3. Tertullus 36, 126.

But nothing is construed a libel which is necessary in the course of judicial proceedings or in the duty of complaint, affidavit &c. 1. Tertullus 53, 97, 4, 36, 126.

This action does not lie for publishing a true account of a trial in a court where the trial character is injured by it. 1. Tertullus 53, 97, 4, 36, 126.
In a civil action the verdict of a jury will not create a publication, 115. Review 6. 393. Holt. 381.

But in a criminal prosecution, the guilty party

in the guilt. 3. 361. 125. 4. 86. 109. Atts. 482. 495. 6. 100. 102.

This is the real question of the person being

or not a publication. 393. 629.

As material to the committing a crime shall it be

material. But material it originally seems to many,

as published by third persons. See 105. East

486. 5. 127. 139. 143. 146. 148.

Money transmitting it without showing it to any

But this is not a publication if the time be made

public. See as to the first 155. 16: 519.

But comparing it, procuring it to be committed, read

any it after its contents are known or delivering it to

after knowing the contents is a publication in

the eye of the law. For he is guilty equally even though

instrumental in making it public is to incur the

guilt of actual publication. 16. 329. 3. 367. 3. 361. 125. 6. 100. 102.

3. 361. 125. 6. 100. 102.

The 3 concerning a crime by a book seller or by per

and found out of a manuscript here the other two

bands must. See 132. 2. 280. 3. 361. 125. 4. 86. 109. 486. 5. 127. 139. 143. 146. 148.
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A person harboring this in private pace is guilty of a

s. 10.74, 13.45, 15.25.

By writing it to a party or a publication or to

by s. 35, 53, 57, 61, 15.47, 7.41.

Bringing it to the person who is the object of such

s. 84, 185, 165, 53, 47, 74, 13.

This transgression is not sufficient for a civil suit. E.g.
6.9, 11.1, 12.1, 30, 105, 145.

If the letter was a formally request taken to reat

s. 15.34, 7.24, 13.1, 25, 54, 74, 52, 15.25, 47, 3.

An attack that seek support a public prosecu-

tion actionable. 1. Ba 15.8, 13.8, 72.

Words, written are often times actionable, which when

s. 80, 14.3, 72, s. 13.2, 15.25, 74, 15.54, 54, 74, 54, 74, 54, 74.

Writing or publishing any thing publicly that must

92.
Locating parties would a rogue or venal as sufficient — so too alienating domestic peace in actionable
2 Will. 544. Exp. 505.

Writing or publishing of one that he is a murderer is actionable — see also 541. 652. 1 W. N. 126. 261.

The offence and injury of a libel in any case considered or resisted in every stage of its publication
consequently, the venue must not change them 1 W. N. 571. 667. 1 W. N. 176.

The libeling upon the plaintiff, or the true print either of the name, name, or where the libel is intended
or signed manner, the name being such that
they super undoubtably to the person, is a libel. 30
492. 411. 112. 113. Exp. 100.

Painting

Ponder without words, or a libel without painting is actionable— thus meaning a poster before
our door, and hanging their report it is ugly.
Exp. 81. 8. 62. 121.

Defacing our convenient in any piece of
painting is actionable. 3. Pa. 531.

Here the application of the scalable must always be
made by not under rude amends.

Special damages must also be shown — for the
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kind of slander is not punishable in itself. It is
and must understand to be aimed at the self.

By our old common slander is punishable as a
public offence, by a fine not exceeding $34, to go
to the county treasury.

Enjoining the magistrate to be imposed by a fine
in cases of such indecent or base derision.
This action formerly lay only in the pinder of the dead goods of another—and hence is called trauers—or trauers, anciently called trauers and concunem. 9 B. 52.

This is an action unknown to the civil laws—be derived from the stat. Westminster 2d. But that is the foundation of this action on the con. 24. 9. 5. 4. 2 B. 131. 3 B. 148. 2 B. 158.

But this action, when now the in all cases in which one person is by any means possessed of the personal goods of another, and converts them to his own use, is the basing, or taking the goods of another. And thus must lie for the taking is of himself,concert—sometimes, taking the other and thereby, one concurrent.

Silk if one gets goods of the goods of another company, and destroys or sells, or unwrought uses, or right to deliver them, or demands an action of trauers on the same.

Support the basing of goods destroy-or sells or is them when he has no right to do it or a right to deliver them after demand made, Brown—canto. 2 B. 2 & 3 B. 128. B. 53, 53. B. 33, 3 B. 158. B. 18. 3 B. 731.

I have set the origin of this near the stat. Westminster 2d. But the stat did not by the words of it introduce the action of trauers, but action on the same generally, and many of them were not heard of until the stat had been enacted some time—so this action was not known until the reign of Edward 6th. 4 AVMS. 11. 326, 383, 6.
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The fact of finding is now altogether immaterial; the gist of the action is conversion. Hence, then, the finding is mere form, and the to the practice in Rome and in this country to declare that the effect came into force by finding, is unnecessary. B. N. 1, 83. 2. Bui. 31, 82. 2. Bl. 249. 8. Ba. 271.

In most cases these which occur in practice the action is founded on fiction, and finding is not immaterial. 2. Ba. 271. 8. Ba. 271.

Thirdly, some that where the conversion consists in a tortious taking, and proven is brought for it the tort is avoided. Now all that is meant by this is that the tort considered as a trespass is avoided— for the actual wrong of taking is not avoided— for this is the very conversion. B. N. 2, 43.

This action has now entirely superseded the 6th action of detinue. This action is much more remedial, for you need not be so precise in declaring, nor is the wages of its adhered in this action 3. Bl. 182.

Conversion which is the gist of this action is connected with tending to dispose of, or unlawfully to intermeddle with the goods of another as if they were one's own.


A conversion may consist in either 1st in an unlawful taking of the goods of another or 2nd in an unlawful setting of them or 3rd in an unlawful detention of them—and this are all in
Private Wrongs

themselves acts of conversion or are very a con-
version.

So that a conversion always consists in a misfor-
cance... but a misforance may be evil of a conversion
the be not of itself such. 5. Pa. 167. 284. 4. Ed. 65. 4. Rol.

In the first place then a wrongful taking is a
conversion. So if one man takes the goods of anot-
er unlawfully... and the pilfer and
9. Wilts. 156.

In this case breaches is concurrent with breyers.
9. Bury 262. 2. Ecc. 239.

In the next place breyers may be by the unlaw-
ful use of the goods of another. This mode of con-
version presupposes that the possessor of the toll was
originally lawful. So if a finder of goods uses
them... he is in factis guilty of a conversion... and in
certain cases goods bailed can't be used and if
the one used by the bailer... he is guilty of con-

Misusing or injuring the goods of a third person
when the original possessor was lawful in a conversion
—consequently if a carrier of goods should offer
a bail of them, he would be guilty of a conversion.
2. Rol. 322. 4. Ed. 65. 2. L. R. 393.

If a bailee or finder of goods destroys them... he is in
guilty of a conversion... for this is an unlaw-
ful use of them... and in such a case, breaches is con-
current with breyers... the in general an unlawful
...and when a number of such as men drew up a part and piled it up with water, he was guilty of a commission of the crime. This is seen in 114. 124. Mr. 570.

But on the other hand, for the negligent keeping of the goods, and another the action would lie. For this he was guilty of negligence. So if a person, for instance, keeps it till the moth can eat it up, let that not lie. So too where one pound balke and kept it till been, was put in the case the cr, known would not lie as the powder which keeps slightly, nor any other action. This is not to his timeless according not to trouble in brown boxes used in some other action. 246. 247. New. 248. 249.

The proper action in such a case, is an action on the case. 246. 247. 248. 249. About a censer.

When the unlawful act consists in selling the goods to a person apt is concurrent with brown, and in such case the party shall determine which action to bring, according to what the goods said for, if they said for a small sum, money is the proper action, for such small recover only what the goods said for.

These are cases in which known and therefore included shall not all concluded as yet if the party is unable partly taken 8. 21st. 2, 11. 2. 33. 38. 2. 40. 155. 2. 83. 8. 92.

In the third place an untimely delivery may be...
concerning if one being in possession of another good refuses to deliver them up on a demand be a conversion.

Thus if there has been an actual conversion of the goods then it is no necessity of making a demand. So if one man is in posse of another man's goods, if there is an unimportant use of them, it is a conversion. But where the taking was wanton & there has been no demand, there is no conversion. 1 Coh. 251. 2 L. & E. 297. 3 P. 589. 590.

But to pursue the discussion between an unimportant detainee, if a refusal to deliver for the want of a demand is a conversion, but the last is only one of a command for it may be justifiable to refuse to deliver them on demand. But a conversion never can be justified. 1 Salkr. 314. 1 Bean. 527. 2 Le. & Ky. 87. 10 T. 338. 4 Bro. 222. 1 Moore 161. 3 B. & M.

There is one case in the 1. Mod. 112, in which the act seems to be denied - but this is not s.

Hence if the jury find that the goods belong to the plaintiff in an action of trespass, if there has not been a demand of a wanton detainee the court will give judgment for the plaintiff, for this is only one of a conversion, if there is no fault to which the act can apply the 2. 10. 60. 56. 226, 227. Sir. 35. 491. 4 Bro. 229. Hard. 44.

A finder of goods, however cannot detain them after a demand, on the ground that he has a lien upon them for the value; for he has none. 1 B. & P. 112, 2 14 36 254.

If one person having the goods of another takes them in to the hands of a third person, contrary to the owner.
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If a person, goods by the command of the A, and to his use, the A. Indemnity is not justified, and both are liable to recovery, 12 Mod. 267, Bev. 813; Bev. 247; 11 M. 328.

We may maintain a recovery.

It sometimes happens that either of two or more persons may maintain the action, and this most frequently happens in cases of bailment. So if A sends goods to B to be made into garments, B cannot maintain the action, but A can, for he has the right of possession. 12 Mod. 267, 813.

On the other hand, suppose A sends an order to B for goods, the goods are delivered to A—now if the carrier consents then, A is the proper person to maintain the action.

So if A sends an order for goods requiring them to be sent by such a carrier, now it may have an action on the carrier provided he consents then.

But if the order appoints the carrier, without the request of the buyer, he can maintain the action on the Bailee.

There has been a question of this kind. A sends the goods of B and claims them to be his. Now, in order to deliver them, he must recover them. He recovers that he is not the owner. Afterwards, the true owner appears, claims the goods again—the supreme court in this state decided
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that I was a wrong trustee to the true owner. But, still, I think, this is not so. I suppose a possessor may be compelled to pay damages to the true owner. I think, too, who first received should be considered as having received money for the use of the true owner. 

Baisment.

It is not necessary to maintain the action that the possessor should have had the absolute ownership of the goods, converted to the use of any other. The possessor may maintain the action in many cases, even when he had the goods in his keep for he has a general right. 

On the other hand, a trustee of goods, who has special title to the goods, may in most cases, if he conveys in all maintain the action in a summary. 

As also a sheriff who has taken goods by execution may maintain the action in any person who takes and converts them. I understand the B. 1st, the B. 1st, the same as if the goods were taken under an attachment. 

Upon a similar principle it is held that a tree of a house that has been blown down, may have been cut off in a storm for carrying away the timber. 

And it has long been settled that a mere tenant of goods gives the possessors a right to maintain the action in any person.
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But this is under some qualifications, for the
house must have been omitted under some
different colour or title of right—i.e., that it
must be unlawful for a man to take it unlawful
the action. For can a this in a person who has stolen
696.

This suppose one finds the goods of another—be
may have known or any one who takes them away
—he has been lawfully. But if the goods were
stolen, or taken by an act of trespass, the action
would lie in any person who takes them.

He is then stands that one more house when allowed
at again, or under claim, or colour of right and
entitle one to this action.

And he must settle that a right of house only is
sufficient to maintain this action, the there is no
actual house—for a new right of house requires
some relation in the body.

So if the goods are no stolen from his servant
A may maintain this action, for the house by him
is house for the M.

A right of house is a right to the present actual
house of the goods—without this house could be
maintained.

As if a horse is bought, he go to France and the bail-
or has not the right while the horse is perform-
ing the journey. He should be in born from the
viceroy during the journey, the viceroy, not the mar-
ior may be entitled to this action. [Ref.}
To maintain this action, it is well settled, that the

If he has presently some kind of the order a delivery to his

This is well delivered, or unacknowledged, the buyer

This may be a delivery, to bind or his

This is the only one which may, that before, when, obtained

An un

Bankrupt may maintain this ac-

This is false, no such

But in an extrava-

And the mode of declaring in the case are to other

This is an agreement that the goods of the lessee

This may be taken in this by being a

The mode of declaring in the case are to other
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How the law is uncertain—The status of the goods in the lifetime of the bailee, was a topic viewed one, if the is a conveyance of title, the title being the fact was after his death. 56, 60, 61, 59.

To see by some that the bailee's right to maintain this action is founded on his convenience over to the vender i.e. the personal interest of his convenience. For whether he in or is not liable cannot be determined unless he is can inventing with the wrong-doer.

Act Bearer is liable to no vender in all events and cases, in is liable in some situations. 247, 14, 42, 56, 69.

It has been said that a deposition in a bailee of the first kind and maintain the action. They think he can. The foundation of the bailee, right to me is grounded on his special right to the thing vended. 61, 62.

If one deliver it of the goods of a stranger, & I deliver them back to the bailee he is discharged as in the stranger. 60, 61, 62.

If recovering by the bailee costs the bailee of his right of action is the stranger for there can be no recovering by one wrong. If the wrong of the bailee recovers the bailee costs. 60, 61, 62, 63.

The right given there the bailee or bailee must sue the wrong-doer and the other in his right of action and recover for the full value.

The bailee however can have an action for special damages but this must be action in the case dependent.
from the person its not harmful for the same cause.

Thus if a wrongdoer takes a horse from B who has hired him to go to C. By here B the bailee can have an action or the wrongdoer for the special damage, which he has sustained by his detainee on the road. Lord 12. 3. 9a. 559.

The bailee by suing the wrongdoer discharges the bailee, i.e. his action on him - he hold his election and chose the wrongdoer.

If the bailee were first he make himself liable to the bailee to the full value for he has dispensed the factor of his remedy in the wrongdoer's claim.

Lord 2 in case that he who has the special jury in bailee, may maintain two suits as Know in former and the general jury in the bailee in those cases in which the latter violates the sort of damage. 13 to 9. 9. 72. 12.

Thus I think it is incorrect - he might maintain an action on the case, that I think he could maintain this.

In value of the jury is not even sufficient force the wild of damages - the cost of the case - besides the value of the jury is the sort of damage in times.

Lord 2 says the ornamental may be found in mitigation of damage - but I see no reason for this remedy besides for introducing a new sort of damage. The damage of the jury may be more or less than the value of the thing injured.

In returning of the goods to the jury given in worth.
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The first is death and the right of action - for

The right of recovery in an action of bane is to

And as there can be but one recovery in a

The 3rd is different in court; nothing more of a

Then though known as a concurrent, or any other


tstein to the action in court. Boe. 1:23.

Against whom this action is,

Eventually it will lie in any one who has taken

the goods testimony, or in any one into the hand.
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In any appeal, the owner of personal chattels may not be made the defendant in the suit, and the son or any subsequent holder of those personal chattels who purchased, if the suit were not in that case, brought in the suit, and brought in the suit, if the suit were not in that case, brought in the suit, if the suit were not in that case, brought in the suit, if the suit were not in that case.

In cases of sales, any subsequent holder may be subjected to the action if they have not made the suit, they may be considered of being the suit for the use of the suit. I do not remember, however, that this case has been decided.

There is an exception to this rule, when the suit is money in bills of exchange, that a bona fide purchaser or holder is not liable in such a case to the circulating medium. I should be left free from all embarrassments, besides the difficulty of identifying it. They were first sold at the time of Lord Mansfield, in the case of Whitaker and Lowe. 4 Bur. 352. 7 B. 1916. 7 B. 1916. 7 B. 1916. 7 B. 1916. 7 B. 1916.

For what kind of suits above this.

All suits in general for all first chattels, but it would be for everything real, or that amount of reality, which is in such a suit, the person action. No action can be maintained for choses in action. Yet at law, actions in action are not considered chattels, for every purpose, yet they may be recovered in the
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When a wrong is brought for a chose in action in
unreform, how the lift he state the date of the con-
versation. Nor is it presumed not to have it in
his power to know it.

Some will be for a little deed the time is not
material in a chose in action, it is only out of a right
in posse absolutum.

In this action do not be in general for animals
fierce naturae. If suppose the animal of the kind
the owner has no control in them, if they are ac-
quired or confisced & a new value, I think that the
actor must in. 2 B. 238. 1 Rep. 5. 660. 6 12 B. 4. 52.
238.

These duties go to the 4 that items until do you ac-
quire some item naturae. If they are unanswerable wholly
of any value or not.

My opinion is, authors will be for them if any
confiscated, however slight their value. 2 B. 266.
4 B. 266.

It has been long settled in Eng. 36. 40. that braves
must not be for a rogue place the reason in thing
is that I don't recognize placing in any
degree. If in how the of is not the absolute party
of the 41. The no may assign him. 3 B. 1274.
4 B. 72. 5 280. 2 70. 181. 3 661. 761.

This action would be for a public record. The reason
is that it cannot be considered private party. To the
part
of the public, & they only can commence the action.

But it must be for recovering a copy of a public record, because this is considered private by

Wood Il, Ch. 542.

It has been held that brunns will not lie for money, i.e. specie, unless it can be identified by

being in bags or boxes. But this is an action for the recovery of damages, & not

of the specific article, brunns will lie for money

As it could be identified. Thos. 63, 661. and C.R. 83, 83, 83,

bus. 8, 8, 8, 8, 8,

If any one unaccountably receives money from a man

how he is, the how he may have trove for it. Wood Il, 11,

Ch. 53.

Then goods are pawned, if the borrower repays the

money at the time, or before the

money is to be returned till the

Barnes 240. 1st Page. 266. 39

B. b2 22

But if the goods are pawned, the borrower can't have trove, as the pawnree till he has tendered him the money — how this seems to

be inconsistent with the law that renders all unemiss

courts void.

Now suppose an action is brought, not to enforce

this court, but to be relieved from it, since the pawn

doesn't bring his action to enforce an unemiss court,

but his action of trove operate as a court in equity

in this case, for trove for relief. C.R. 21.

A breach of goods unaccompanied by any act of
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Delivery, doubt transfer the goods. If the donee take pos- 
session of them, without any delivery, known like a 
trustor. But suppose there must be a demurrer, in the 
true for the gift absolute as a bailee. [Bac. 250, 
Epp. E 177.]

A symmetrical delivery, or any act amounting to a 
conversion, in delivery will transfer - at the delivery of 
the les of a room in which the goods are, which 
were given [Bac. 185. 1. Epp. 194.]

A tenant in common or joint tenant cannot main- 
tain this action as a joint tenant - & if the rent the 
be paid after the given in every under 
the home of one is the home of the others, 
there can be no conversion. [Bac. 244. 8. 140; 
1. Epp. 179. 1. Pag. 2365. 401.]

If one of two tenants destroy the rent of a room for 
the lessor must be permitted to say, that he 
did this for the other's benefit. [Bac. 280. 8. 2. 34. 
1. Epp. 183. 364.]

If one joint tenant bring an action in a stranger to 
the may plead in accountability the wrongs of the other 

The act of removing a thing from a freehold is not 
such a conversion as will support this action, thus 
taking a door or window, the master not trespass is the 
prosper kind of action. [Bac. 227. 8. 149.]

For the tresser taking anything, removed from the free 
hold, trespass see. [Bac. 227. 8. 149.]

When a person robs in a lawful behalf of another
good; destroy them from necessity: thou must not die. They argue a master of a vessel thrown goods on board to save a ship. 

**The duty must state the nature of the conversion or loss in substance according to the old. It is now considered on new forms.** Ex. 28, 29, 1 Pet. 30.

The duty should more nearly fit the fact, so if he alleges he was possessed of the own goods to satisfy. Hard. v. Moore 49. 2 Scraed 379. S. 1072.

Thisunnecessary to state a demand & present the ordinary forms do, this is matter of end & need not be avoided.

The time of the conversion must formerly be stated or there a radical defect, not cured even by a verdict not so now. Ex. 358. Exo. 258. Brief 115.

If there be a renunciation or to time, the good after verdict, I think on p. 49.49. Barthe 392. Exo. 9. 138.

The thing must be described in to be known yet not particularly. Ex. 392. Brief 115. 2d. May 588, 111. Rutley 37.

Ex. says the unnecessary to state the value of the goods, but this I think must be done for the value of the thing is the $ of damages. If there must be some thing that is prima face the $ of damages or
Private Wrongs.


To rest there are but two good pleas to this action wi. a y. if in X release, but many others have been used—many plea in justification to know it had to a y. if in. Ex. D. 898. Mt. 10:76, Lkh. 6:55. Ex. 3:3.

In this case a justification must always be pleaded—this in known it must be given in and under the y. if in. Ex. D. 138. Ex. D. 993.

Anything that don't amount to the death of the conversion may be specially pleaded, if it don't a mount to the y. if in.

In law, the act of limitation don't run us known
This action lies to recover damages of one who has been procured maliciously and without provocation to bring a suit against him. The word prosecuted applies to criminal and civil suits. For Bilbe, R. 61, comm. 2d. lib. action on the case. Exp. 3. 522, 528.

The word malicious here imports any wicked motive in general; so intending to get money without cause is malicious.

Without probable cause means the want of any reasonable cause; i.e. in a groundless prosecution.

**Analogous Action**

This action is analogous to the old action of conspiracy, which is now entirely out of use here, it might be brought. For:

The action of conspiracy can only be brought in two or more; it can't be brought in one alone; and it can be maintained on no other ground than a previous prosecution for breach or felony. Sumn. 286. 4th. 335. 1. 139. 26. 2. 357. 27.

Again, this action is analogous to the action on the case in nature of a conspiracy, and it is clear where two or more have conspired to procure one maliciously and without just cause, or where they have conspired to injure a person in his own body or person. The last action lies in our courts, whereas the action of conspiracy is not in many cases where it ought. Finch. 320. 1st. B. 15. 13.

This last action would lie, even the no prosecution had
Private Wrong

but committed, for of itself and from combination to do it, is sufficient.

If a person of the action for malicious prosecution resembles that of slander, if that of an action on the case in the nature of a conspiracy. The gravamen may be the other, the slander, the slander resulting from it is not the actual damage to which the jv has been subjected. So unnecessary therefore in this case to show that the jv has been endangered in his life or property. 1 W. & Sec. 211. 4 B. 3. 411. 1 W. 341.

The action of conspiracy must be unless the jv has been actually prosecuted, and likewise actually acquitted. 1 W. 341. 12. 60. 211. 6 W. 341. 4 S. 8. 116. 260.

But this is the case as to the action of conspiracy, an indictment must lie when there has been an unlawful conspiracy to persuade another, the nothing has been done to accomplish it. 2 Leon. 9. 60. 106.

So also in all actions on the case in the nature of a conspiracy, an action may lie, the no prosecution has been commenced — but I think in such case, that the jv must prove actual damage, for damages can be recovered unless there has been an actual wrong. 1 S. & M. 1. 7th S. 60. 3d. action or case for conspiracy.

Damages without a wrong or wrong without damages can never sustain an action.

There is another variety in the action of conspiracy — if all but one are acquitted, judge can never be in the one convicted by the jury.

But in an action on the case in the nature of a con
The action on the case in the nature of a conspiracy is the same as this action, except that this action will lie in one or more, while that will lie only in one or more, or in one, charging that he is in conspiracy with another or others. 2 Lev. 62. 1 Will. 210. Bro. 6 179. 1 Sand. 230. Per. 190. 4 K. B. 15.

Since these actions are all, or were all unknown to the Ex. L.

The action of conspiracy first originated in the reign of Edward III. It was enacted by the government of that time on some facts which were of a contrary opinion. 2 Lew. 192. 27 Edw. 127. 2 Do. 237. 24 Edw. 4, 5 K. B. 15.

There are but three actions known to the Ex. L. founded on law. All other actions of conspiracy are the case being founded on the city or the state first, &c.

The 3. L. actions are "Conspiracy, deceit, &c." 2 Lew. 197.

To maintain to support the action for malicious prosecution that malice or want of probable cause should appear. Either of these alone is not sufficient to maintain the action.

A man may prosecute another who is really guilty from malicious motives, if there is not actionable. 4 K. B. 44. 1 T. R. 334. 335.

It follows then, that his good defense for the suit that there was probable cause. 

Len. 690.
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This prosecution was in any case more juristic in its nature, and its
true ground for bringing it to a proof, or not, was always a
reasonable ground to support it. But

In this case, we have a vast number of malicious prosecu-
tions.

It will be proper to distinguish between the cases
where the original or former prosecution was as it
was, and where a criminal suit

1st. Where the criminal,

Generally when one is falsely and maliciously indicted
for a crime that endangers his life, or publicly
sabotages his reputation or in any way this action will be,

S. 139. 422. C. 137. 8. 61. 522.

To no excuse, that the indictment is the proof was
true, i.e., insufficient as to that the proof could not
have supported by it, the same reason is sufficient
to maintain. S. 140. 4. 124. 37. 1. 3. 117.

So also, if the grand jury find the suit or indictment
insufficient, the action will lie, & for the same reason
as in the last case. S. 141. 52.

It shall then say the proof must have been injurious in its
reputation as much as in the jury to sustain this ac-
tion — but I think the same above will support it. S. 142.
52. 137. 8. 61. 522.

Public officers, communicating prosecution, or offices or
information, are not liable to this action, but the per-
son giving such information, in such case, if he knew
it to be false, or has no reasonable ground to believe it
is liable to this action. S. 143. 87. 1. 8. 61. 8. 52. 2. 52.
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But if a public officer of his own motion without informa-
tion, malice, and without probable cause, com-
mences a prosecution he is liable in this action. see
2d 140, 1, 1d 226, 241.

The circumstances may be such as to require the ac-
tion to be stayed, for public inconvenience — consequently
the issue is left doubtless the case is one clear:
but only says the form of action should have been to
sue:

In this action it must always appear that the for-
mier prosecution has ended. In action of conspiracy it
is not only necessary that the former action be ended
but also that the party acquitted in the technical
sense of the word.

But in this action, the thing must be a termination
of the former prosecution, there need not be a tech-
nical acquittal. i.e. a finding by the jury, 11, 1d 109.
Aug. 223, Id. 267. 11, 1d 241.

An omission to show that the former prosecution has
ended, is aided by verdict. 1, 1d 223, 1d 392.

If the party alleges that the former prosecution termina-
ted in one manner, if terminated in another, that
is a fatal variance. Thus if he should state
that it ended by acquittal, if a non prosequi was
issued, or fatal. 1, 1d 213, 1, 1d 261.

The defect in this action states all the rights in the for-
mier prosecution. If a material of any material fact
or point is fatal. If it is not material it is not fatal.
1, 1d 231, 1, 1d 232, 1, 1d 392. 1, 1d 392.
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It seems to be settled A. that no civil action can lie in any judge of a ct of record, field, minor or grand juror, for any malicious act done in their judicial capacity. But in the case that they act in their judicial capacity in such case. But those officers are liable at the suit of the king, or the state, for an injury done in their judicial capacity. Hight. 143. 2. Ind. 234. See 233. 1. March 122. 1 & 2. 503. 519. 234. 247.

I should have not that malice & want of probable cause in the former action are necessary to support the.

Now malice may be generally is inferred from want of probable cause which is prima facie int. of malice, but from malice can't be inferred a want of probable cause. 3. Co. S. 533. 3 in 1936.

But the malice is inferred from want of probable cause, its inexpediency, or the fitth to show incapacity actual malice. 1. 681. 2. 531. 3. 590.

The conviction of the fitth in the original prosecution for a ct of competent jurisdiction, is conclusive proof of a probable cause. But if to before a ct having jurisdiction of the subject matter of the prosecution, is utterly void a want prevent this action being brought. 4. Mills 23. 50. Robb. 267. 6. Robb. 162.

On the other hand an acquittal in the former prosecution, is in most cases the not in all, presumption end of the want of probable cause.

But as the acquittal in one prosecution and the one has saved lies on the other hands. 3. Mills 232. Cap. 2. 582.
Acquittal under a defect of the original prosecution comes within the text. B. c. 1. 85. 36. 37. L. 25. 36.

The acquittal of the defendant in the former action is not always prima facie evidence of a want of probable cause. B. c. 13. 44. 36.

The finding of the bill of indictment by the grand jury, or the inditing over by a court of inquiry, is presumptive evidence of the existence of probable cause. B. c. 13. 44. 36. 37.

If the facts be within the knowledge of the prosecuting officer, or the defendant, the inditing over by the grand jury is tantamount to a finding of probable cause. B. c. 13. 44. 36. 37.

The existence of probable cause is a mixed question of fact and law. B. c. 13. 44. 36. 37.

The grand jury should be especially instructed as to the law. B. c. 13. 44. 36. 37.

In contemplation of the crime, want of probable cause may have existed in the mind of the witness on which the prosecution was predicated, even though it was actually committed. B. c. 13. 44. 36. 37.
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out of turn not committed and could not
have excited. Esp. 2 S 55 & 55 H. 2 Har. 2. More, 2. Tour. 179.

Whether the prosecution was malicious or not is a
mixed question — but what amounts to malice is a
question of k as much as what and how amounts to
what the facts are ascertain. 16 May 1371. 1 Ware. 283.
1 Ed. 7. 59.

In a R of practice in Bug that state the action
for a malicious prosecution for felony, the Rff must
have a copy of the original record, granted by the S
of the averting a copy is discretionary with the S
the court of the R is to prevent the Sff from pros-
secuting the S. But where the issue is a
mere maliciousness suit, a copy is unnecessary — an ordi-
nary copy is sufficient to prove the former proceed-
ing. i.e. one certified by the clerk of the S. In reason
of this distinction I don't clearly perceive. 1b A 381
1326. 61. 1 E 59.

Malicious Prosecution in civil suit.

As a R says Lz that all action about it is for ma-
laciously prosecution, when the original suit was a civil
one, the tli ground was, because to set the civil suit in
claim of mischief. If the Rff is liable to be answered, it
is liable for costs.

This is incorrectly expressed. It is not true in any view
of civil that of criminal prosecution. The meaning
of the R seems to be this — when the former civil
suit was ground upon the R. premises no damage
because the Rff was unavailing for form or damage.
Priva{e} Wrong

If for the cause of the det, & he is not liable unless
official damages are proved. Stat. 8. 15. for the old &b.

Bk. 11. bk. 32. 1. 2. 3. 12.

Exceptions to the at. 8. 15. If there was a good cause
of action in favour of one person, yet to another
claiming it, the action, having no right, he is liable to an
action for malicious prosecution, because the &

But when the party in an original suit having
a good cause of action, sue in a court or county not ha-
ing jurisdiction of the action, malicious prosecution
his because the party would not be answered, he cannot
for the deft. 8. 10. 13.

The party now used to have, where that the it have no

And if a person having no right of action & knowing
he has none, sue another for the purpose of evading
he is liable to the action provided the deft has sus-
tained special damages. 8. states & known. Then the b
would not in this case supply damages. 8. Milh. 312. 2. 8.
123. 7. 8. 428. 3. 8. 315.

Here is no case of this kind in the old books.

15. If for the purpose of evading, one man having a
good cause of action in another, to a certain amount
now since it a much greate & thus holds him to
reclaim back this action his but it must appear
in the deed, that the deft was held to exception bail
Bk. 11. 1. 1. 8. 2. 8. 1. 8. 32.

These are the exceptions to 8. 10. 13.
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The specific difference between the foundation for this action on a criminal prosecution & a civil one is that in the former, the 2 principal damages in the latter it does not est. 3 H. 12. 65a. 20. 1. 205. 206.

To a q. of what is the action of & founded on a former civil suit the very quantum must be stated the special damage whatever it is must be alleged in the suit. 1. Wilde. 325. Salt. 1. 623. 1. 523. 2. 1. 256. 929. 934.

When the action is founded on a former criminal prosecution, stating the damages generally is sufficient

But to this there is one exception: if a man, stranger secures A to commence a grand jury & to & a grand jury, it is sufficient, the means of a former criminal prosecution. The stranger proceeds in this case the suit to be brought, he does bring it in his own name, he cannot be assessed or taxed with costs nor is he liable for the damages or the nominal suit is but jako evidence. 1. 256. 926. Salt. 1. 123.

I have so far that when the former suit was a public prosecution, it must be determined before this is brought. But where this action is brought for a former civil suit is necessary that actual damages have been suffered or that it should be unanswerable to say that the former civil suit, should have been determined in order to maintain this. 1. 256. Salt. 1. 123.

Due to necessity that the former civil suit be determined, it is not necessary that it be the punitive of the plea for if he was remedied, it was sufficient to support this action. 3. H. 12. 65a. 20. 205. 206. 927. 1. 256. 929.
In the action for slander, one person may sue another in an action of slander despite any number of co-slanderers. In a private wrong, there is no community of interest and no joint or common right violated. Each wrong party may maintain an action separately but not both jointly.

There may be two defendants in this case: it may be an action on the case, in the nature of a conspiracy, or an action of conspiracy, or an action of malicious prosecution — this is strictly a test in which two persons may be joined, but there cannot be two defendants in an action of slander. 16, 191, 29, 40, 3.

In an action for true joint slander, how the damages be assessed? Thus, no true joint action can have the verdict in a false action. In A & B v. C, if the joint damages are $500, whether C is joined in, both actions, if not separate, in an action of slander — false imprisonment, slander, &c., similar cases.

When the parties have made separate pleas, judgment may be given in each one severally, but the jury may receive but one — i.e., he has his election — why then should they when the parties join in the plea, they cannot. 29, 24.
Assault & Battery.

An assault is an attempt to do corporal hurt to another, without actually touching him - this is an
injurious violence to begin & not complicated - if
for this injury, an action may be maintained.
Actual violence is something more. (Ba. 184, B. & B. 193, 3, Bk. 6, 12.)

A picture which would otherwise amount to an assault
may be so exasperated as to fail short of it - thus one
lays hold of his sword & says if it were not for me,
I would beat you - this is not an assault - it
follows then that the intention must cooperate with
the act to constitute an assault - but in a battery the
intention need not. (Ek. 112, 1, Mod. 3, 19, 20, 19, 2, Bk. 121, 29, Bk. 121, 29.

Threatening words consequently cannot amount to an
assault - forming intent, otherwise. (Ba. 184, 2, Bk. 121, 29, 1, Bk. 121, 29.)

Battery consists in an actual violence on the person
of another - & is generally agreed that the least
degree of violence committed in an angry, illegal
manner, or without amount to a battery. So striking
in another place or pinching his nose or touching on
his toe are all if done under the aforesaid circumstances a battery.

When the injury done is merely nominal, in manner
that it be done in an angry, violent, rude & violent
manner - and if an actual injury is done, it not in
itself, to be done in any particular manner - acciden-
tally doing it, makes one liable. (Ba. 184, 6, Mod. 139, 137, 2, Bk. 121, 29.)
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B has evidently given an incorrect definition of the word 'battery'- he says it is an unlawful beating of another'- now to clear that battery is sometimes justifiable- thus if parent whoso his child, he commits a battery- yet it is justifiable- an unlawful act is not justifiable- consequently Bel definition is incorrect.

A battery is an actual violence committed on the person of another & is not always unlawful. 2 Bl. 180. 3 phot. 499.

Every battery includes an assault- every consummated violence includes lessor violence- consequently every proof of battery will support an action of assault. 3 phot. 594. 1 B. 183. 1 Hamb. 184.

Threatening words are sometimes actionable & sometimes not, when they occasion actual inconvenience, they are actionable- the Bel says it trespasses without one.

Such of a trespass B is such a manner that he is incapable of attending to business, an action will lie- but I should say an action on the case for quiet, is the question one- & for the graver one of this is namely the interruption of our business- to a new omission & the damages are consequential- threatening words & menaces are not from an injury & there is no act on which the action of trespass in amen can be predicated which is not new in an injury. 2 Bl. 180. 3 phot. 553.

The injury which will support a battery must be direct or contradistinguished from victim.

If the injury is produced by a constant tort of physi
caused effects arising out of the original act of the defendant he is considered as the author of the whole & this action lies. See the rule case 26 Ric. 2o. 892. 7o. 645. 3o. Will. 509.

If a further B & C, then injuries to D is liable for B & C in this case a mere instrument. Est. T. 911. B. N. P. 16.

If a horse is suddenly frightened, & runs in a person & injuries, the rider is not liable.

If however the rider knowing his horse to be unruly should ride into a field, where was a large number of people, & one is injured, he may have trespass on the case for the violence was by the carelessness of the horse - lies in no way his own.

If another person should strike the horse, & he should run in a man & injure him, the striker & not the rider would be liable - the action in this case would be trespass for assault & battery. B. N. P. 16.

So in the former case if the rider rides his horse into the field, for the purpose of injuring persons, he is liable in assault & battery. Est. 875. 1. Mod. 23. 4. 70. 798. 80. 81. B. N. P. 16.

When a man receives a bodily hurt he may in some instances maintain this action & in some he cannot. Here it is when the act is lawful he cannot maintain the action - but to as when the act is unlawful, it lies. Est. 919. 1. Ric. 4. 994.

This is exceptionable. If two persons consent to play at cudgel
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No one is injured by an action brought by one to bring about, increase, or preserve strength, or promote digestion, but his his own tenement, room, or hall. If two persons consent to fight, one is made the action for his unlawful act.

This I doubt - I take this to be the 65th section, where two persons consent to do a lawful or unlawful act. If one is injured, he can only maintain an action for his personal injuries.

This consent considered as cont is merely void.

I take this to be the distinction: consent is no excuse where the public can gain its remedy.

If a man consents to let one whip him 40 lashes with a raw hide, he cannot maintain a civil action for the injury. The oven to a breach of peace the public has its remedy. Comb. 216. 5 G. 47, 17.

So clearly a good excuse that the injury happened in an amicable contest, as something it exp. 2, 54, 73.

If a attack, & c. in defending himself, throws his fist back & strikes b accidently, & involves him in the action, he is.
2, 32, 392. 7, 56, 56.

For maintaining this action, a malicious intent is clearly unnecessary, the above example corroborates this.

O K says, that to make the action maintainable, the injury must have been done wilfully or occasioned by a due want of care.

This definition is exceptionable for idiots & infants are liable in this action. In view of this, they are more machine
have no will & in one case an action was sustained in a child of 4 years old, who lost out a man, e.g.


But to maintain a public prosecution for a battery malicious intent is necessary in criminal & the in

tent, as well as act is regarded.

As a B. that in trespass on the case amounting or

judge, innocence of intention occurs.

According to Toulston, it is sufficient to subject on
to this action, that he has been the physical cause.

This is too broad for support, a man falls in another
in a fit of apoplexy & injures him, clearly he would
not in liable in any action, yet the principle inclines,
this case — I would qualify the principle thus nothing
will occur a battery but inevitable accident or in


By inevitable accident is meant physically inevitable.

First in the book where there is no negligence in an in
voluntary accident, this action would lie where there is it

This is not always, tho' generally, correct — If one man in
lopping his hedges, furnishes the tools to work into his

neighbour's land, he is liable in this action. If any man
in unloading a gun furnishes it go off, & any one is in
jured before it, he is liable in this action. (Doug. 57.

In. 183. 2. 187. 1. Est. 349. 2. Will. 165. 7. 1057. 7. 639.

I take the better opinion to be, that in no cases, it
that the injury was involuntary, unless tacitly
suitable in the case I suppose the sheep to be agent
consequently the dog can do B. is not analogous to
this, for then the owner was not the direct or im-
mmediate agent. But 20%.

There is no doubt but that, if the injury was inevi
table the duty is excused.

There is another distinction — where the act causing the
injury is unlawful, the author of it is always liable to
some sort of action. This is an observation that applies
to all actions sounding in tort.

The lawfulness or unlawfulness, doubt determine the
kind of action — it may be an action of trespass on the
can. & be immaterial as to his liability, whether the
damage be immediate or consequential, consequential
or not. So if C throws a rock into the street, D's horse
breaks his leg over it, D is liable in case, but had he
thrown it in B's house & broke his leg, trespass would
the proper action.

If C discharges a gun into a field
where there are a number of persons & injures one,
not guilty in the action.

But in a b. & that when one does a lawful act in
juring another from it accidentally, he is not liable.

And this An unquieting accident applies equally to all
kinds of trespass — as well as to this particular case.
This are three - 1st. Denial of the charge - 2lome or which saves the 3d. 2nd. Justification.

1st. Denial is made by itg the d. ifun. & matter of excuse may be pleaded in the d. ifun or pleaded specially. The d. ifun in this action is "not guilty." B.C.P. 19.

A baity in many cases justifyable - Justification is different from an excuse - to justify is to maintain the act done & excuse abides the unlawfulness of the act & doing at the same time something that will excuse it. If an officer having a legal process to arrest a person is opposed in the arrest, he may use any degree of violence to complete the arrest, that is absolutely necessary, or to prevent the person from escaping.

1 Hanh 130. 133. A. 150.

But in the case of the officer, violence can be justified unless there is an actual attempt to escape or actual resistance.


A mere right to arrest will justify an asft but not a baity. Ed. Bay 223.

If one is sued in asft & baity he may justify as to the whole by an imposent matter moliter - i.e. when there is nothing more than a nominal beating he may justify by this plea of imposent. But he must justify the violence complained of as a baity, if there is violence & an attempt to escape. St. 149. 2. Roll 156. 1. B. H. 19.

The plea of moliter may be made to a change of asft & baity - the justification goes as well to the asft as to the baity, but not to the wounding of a person.
such idea is bad in case of an allegation of wounding or mayhem. Rev. 171, b. 89, 9. Lev. 424, Ezek. 915, 2, Lec. 129.

The & gives no definition of wounding — it doubtless meant something more than a beating. I should say it meant a continuing or laceration, some visible hurt.

A beating is justifiable on the ground of self-defense — thus if one man strikes me first, I may strike him in return — & if he sees me, I may justify by a plea of *non-assault damnum* — & an assault by the plff will justify a beating by the deft. B.C. 171, 18. 1, b. Men. D. 599.

But there must always be some proportion between the assault by the plff, if the beating by the deft, to the degree of the beating must be proporctional to the degree of the assault or beating which provoked it — tho the & dont require this proportion to be exact. B.C. 171, 18. Mod. 59, Salk. 52, 1, Lec. 246.

In this case the plea is *non-assault damnum*, & the amount of it is this, that at such a time & place mentioned on the decler, the plff then & there with force & arms assaulted the deft & would have beaten him & that the deft in his own defense, assaulted & beat the plff. Salk. 642, Lec. D. 915, Bacon, Eff. 547.

But in such case of a mayhem by the deft it is not justifiable by the plff, aggression, unless twas such as would have endangered the members or life of the deft — but if twas such he may justify a mayhem. B.C. 171, 18. Mod. 59, Salk. 642, Lec. D. 915.

The proper replication to the plea of *non-assault damnum* is by way of traverse, de injuria

*60. 66. 1, B. 66, 171.
And in some cases the defer is justified in a bating when the deft is the blameless cause of it, tho the deft did not strike nor attempt to strike him. So when the deft tilted a lance & threw off the deft - & the deft hit off the deft; now the deft was not held liable. But this case is reported differently with regard to the circumstances. See R. 177. 20th 52. H. M. 173. 69.

Again, the deft & deft were gambling, & the deft put his money into the deft's head, which was the largest & demanded half the deft had a struggle with him & was guilty of bating but was held not liable. Ex. 9366.

In many cases bating is justifiable on account of the relation of the parties - as in case of parent & child, schoolmaster & scholars, goatherd & his W. & according to B & H & W - in the case the chancellor must be massed. Ex. 176. 1. Rec. 230. 3. H. 18.

These relations except H & W constitute special justification. & according to the 1st of long the H has a right reasonably to correct his W. If it has been so decided by Justice Butler.

So also a man may justified a bating in defence of his W. or a W. in defence of her, too. In parent & child - & in such cases, the & places the person interfering, in the same situation as one of the parties - hence the H may use the same violence that it might have used. See R. 62. P. 61.

The settled also that a H may justify a bating in defense of his W. Whether a H may, in defense of his H is not well settled - the I take the better opinion to be that he may. See M. & S. 3. 256. R. 62. P. 18.
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But the one may justify a battery in defense of his W. & the plea must shew that he did it in his defense to prevent her from doing injury—this & need not in such case allow a vindictive battery. (St. Day 5. 4 C. P. 32.)

A man may justify a battery in defense of his home when forcibly invaded. This A. contemplates actual force, not nominal merely—actual force consists in breaking a door or window &c. but if the man peaceably enters on the land of another the owner cannot justify a battery on him, till he has requested him peaceably to depart—then he may. (Han. 130. Salt. 69. 3 C. P. 19.)

According to a great number of authors, when the act complained of is an entry on land, & the owner commits a battery to drive off the intruder, he must in his plea state it to be a wrongful & not an actual battery.

There seems to be no reason in this A. & let him you demand it & all the authors, the law have fully established it & it is always practiced on. (3 C. P. 62. Fall. 307. 12. Mod. 56. 3 N.B. 166—Dor. 14. 18. 19. 8. C. P. 78. 3 & 60. 78. 15. 124. 915. 913.)

The last A. contemplates the owner of property relative to his right of defending his property. When he is invaded or dispossessed a very different A. obtains the act to real injury, not known at b. b. At b. b. one who has a right to proper or entry or land, was allowed to regain same by force from the deforser or displacer. (2. 2. 18. 4. 18.)
Private Wrongs

By general English, states, the right of which is this; if one may not enter on lands &c. of which another is in peace unless in a peaceable manner. But in the
States, 602.

Then stub contemplate a person which is in some way or in some degree abandoned, as in case of a house where person is given to the use. In case of land, the person of which is neglected by the owner &c. &c. Mere taking a journey among wretens &c. is not such an abandonment as to preclude the owner's right to use force.

In case of real folly, the lawful owner was not permitted at & c. to regain before by force, as to make judge the & c. was unanimously practised. See s. 5. c. 2. book 2. SS. 6.

Provocation never justifies a battery but may mitigate damage.

The right of taking goods from a felon belongs to any body as well as to the owner founded on the right to apprehend felons.

The owner must take it on any other grounds or for any other purpose than recovering the felon for punishment, & the party for the true owner, he may use it himself, but the latter, if the latter were in another by the decision of the c. 1. Viz. 6. SS. 397.

A S. court justify a battery in defense of his All. goods, unless he is transformating them, when his property is good in all, but the owner if he may defend it, but.
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If one commits a battery on another at different times, they cannot be laid in one count with a continuance nor to have been done on divers days & at divers times. Bann. 321. Hall. 333. 3. 38 214. Esp. 316.

When a battery is committed on a marriage woman the H & W must be joined in the action. If the damages stated, or at damnum quantum. Ed. 387. 1. Colb. 382. Ed. Roy. 1204. Esp. 316.

If in such case two former join as H & W who are not really so, advantage must be taken of it by plea in abatement. Ed. 480. Esp. 371.

If the battery has been committed on the H & W be a done must not join that on herself & for that on her they must join—but if they both join in both batteries, I judge the damages are entire. Judge is erroneous—but if the damages are apportioned separately judge is erroneous I may be answered so far as to the H. & battery & not as to the W. Esp. 316. 1. Colb. 372. Esp. 632.

A Hiff may lay in his deaths may suits for which he could not recover in themselves for the furnishing of aggravating damages—so entering the house, beating the W's children may be laid in these deaths—they are considered merely as the consequences of the battery—they may be proved if not stated in the deaths. Hall. 652.

When a death arises on a justification he must plead it especially— he cannot prove it unless the justification the as may in basin. to. Litt. 352. Esp. 317.

If the death pleads the justification when he has matter of justification he may give it in ever under the
issue in mitigation of damages.

So also words spoken at the time of the transaction may be given in ext to mitigate damages, tho' they amount to the of if it is a mitigation. 6th, 7th.

If the deft justifies an act & believing he must confess it otherwise he pleads ill for a man can't justify an act he never did. Salk. 699.

The most usual plea of justifying an act & believing is non act us in me. 1 Chas. 199 & bon. 354.

There is a material in to be observed, if the post of the plea be non act & the deft can justify the plea he must plead it or alledge it specially in his replication, & give it in ext under his traverse. If this is the to in bon. 5th, 917.

Matter of cause may be either given in ext under the plea or specially pleaded. If it goes to the action its mitigation of damages, it is to be given in ext. 6th, 119. Salk. 631. 4. Mod. 434.

So the plea of non act & the deft may either reply de non act us in me, or an enormous plea, allude the material cause in material. The former denies the justification, & admits the gentle laying on of hands. The latter denies the gentle laying on of the hands, & admits the matter of justification to be true. Salk. 331. bon. 61. 611. Harry.

In this, as well as in the other actions of trespass, the deft is not bound to buy the true day of the battle, & of course is not bound to confine his view to the day laid in the deed.
In both the law of limitations law, this action must be brought within 4 years. In bringing the suit, the suit must be brought within 3 years. If the suit were to run for the full 4 years, it would not be considered timely. The suit must be brought within 3 years of the accrual of the claim.

In the suit, the defendant may argue that the claim is not timely. The defendant may argue that the claim is barred by the statute of limitations. The statute of limitations is 3 years. If the claim is brought within 3 years of the accrual of the claim, it is considered timely. If the claim is brought after 3 years, it is considered untimely.

The defendant may also argue that the claim is barred by the statute of frauds. The statute of frauds is 4 years. If the claim is brought within 4 years of the accrual of the claim, it is considered timely. If the claim is brought after 4 years, it is considered untimely.

If the defendant argues that the claim is barred by the statute of frauds, the claim must be brought within 4 years of the accrual of the claim. If the claim is brought within 4 years, it is considered timely. If the claim is brought after 4 years, it is considered untimely.

The defendant may also argue that the claim is barred by the statute of limitations. The statute of limitations is 3 years. If the claim is brought within 3 years of the accrual of the claim, it is considered timely. If the claim is brought after 3 years, it is considered untimely.

The defendant may also argue that the claim is barred by the statute of frauds. The statute of frauds is 4 years. If the claim is brought within 4 years of the accrual of the claim, it is considered timely. If the claim is brought after 4 years, it is considered untimely.

The defendant may also argue that the claim is barred by the statute of frauds. The statute of frauds is 4 years. If the claim is brought within 4 years of the accrual of the claim, it is considered timely. If the claim is brought after 4 years, it is considered untimely.

The defendant may also argue that the claim is barred by the statute of frauds. The statute of frauds is 4 years. If the claim is brought within 4 years of the accrual of the claim, it is considered timely. If the claim is brought after 4 years, it is considered untimely.

The defendant may also argue that the claim is barred by the statute of frauds. The statute of frauds is 4 years. If the claim is brought within 4 years of the accrual of the claim, it is considered timely. If the claim is brought after 4 years, it is considered untimely.

A claim of assault and battery is in rem to a change of

wounding is bad.
A plea of non culpa doesn't reach the whole gravamen. It comes, the plea of bating & wounding.

A plea of justification standing in the relation of parent & child. It should state it to have been done by way of preventing an injury, not of revenge.

Act. 39 Cl. 2. Bro. 42. Bell. 256. 2pt. 7. 318.

A former recovery of damages by the pleas for the same injury, whether it be the deft or any other person is a good bar to the action. This is the R. in all cases of trespass. Bro. 240. Bro. 479. 1. Bro. 185. Hall. 11. 2. R. I. P. 720.

The R. is different in costs. For a recovery of judgment or of two obligors, will not bar an action to another.


So also in trespass generally, a former recovery is a bar to all trespasses with a continuance committed before the date of the suit. I. R. 370.

If this injury is committed by several, the R. may sue any or all of them. I. R. 631.

Here too, a release to one is a release to all. 2 pt. 415. Bell. 56.

When a jury, there being several defts., may render damages in, must settle or distribute in the hands. If two or more persons are charged jointly in an action of bating and wounding, & found jointly guilty, the jury can render...
damages, i.e. they is pretty clear if the debtors were in one plea—of think the jury can’t even if they plead severally. 1296, Jenkins 112. 1st 327, 32. 11, 60, 8th. 19th. June 2nd.

If judge yea is one by default the jury can’t move.
1296. 3rd. 326.

But in one case only it has been decided that if the debtors move in their plea, the jury may move in damages. 11, 60, 8th. 320.

But in this decision there are many antithesis. 1, 60, 67.
B. N. P. 27. 1st 319, 32. 34th. 12, 3rd 660. 6th 32. 6th 19th.

But in cases where the jury have no right to recover damages the plea may prevent error, by remitting one affidavit & taking judgment for another—of he takes for both of them. He has this decision to take judgment as to one or to enter a nolle prosequi as to the other—this too may prevent error. 19th. 11, 60. 70. B. N. P. 20.

But in a case of this kind the plea may always require that the damages be consolidated. 1296, 127.
1st 34th. 19th. 30th.

To do so overplus the jury may find one of the debtors guilty as to part, & another as to the other part—of then recover the damages—for the debtors are not found jointly guilty. This is doubtful I think & the case is to be is not for the A. There is that the jury can’t recover the damages unless they are found guilty at several times—our it has adopted this. B. N. P. 20. 1st 34th. 6th. 7th. Single
11, 60, 3rd. 320. others.
Private Wrongs

I have no wish to insist that it made us different whether two persons joined in their plea or not — that the jury must find entire damages — let so in our favour.

In such a case brought as to renew debts before judge, discharges the whole — if the case of a moment or the same — to not so in our favour. Holst. W. 128, Barth 19, R. C. 250, 251.

When a debt has brought this as any other action in several, the it will permit him to strike out one, but the action will proceed as the others, but the debt must be willing to have this done as the debt cannot compel him to it.

It sometimes happens that the debt will arbitrarily make a stranger to the transaction, a debtor, to prevent the other debts from having his testimony — him the it will permit him to testify for the other debts — but he must be tried first — if then is any testimony as here, if to every slight, the it will direct the jury to find a verdict for him & then in may direct


All causes of action arising ex delicto are several, i.e. each party concerned in the wrong may be sued by himself — the they may be joined. 5. Co. 631.

In this action the jury may vary from the debtor they may find him guilty as to a part of what is complained of, I not guilty as to a part — but there is no need of this — for if any part of the gravamen is proved, they may find him guilty generally, & after the damages accordingly.
Private Wrongs

A finding by the jury of more than is just in equity is ill - than if just in traversed & just is determined to, the can find only on the just traversed. If they do, the verdict may be set aside.

When there has been a mayhem the it upon novo of it may increase the damages given by the jury at their discretion. & this, the mayhem is not exParte charged in the deputy provided that the judge certifies that the defendant has committed mayhem.

Damages can be increased at nisi prius.

The party must be present at the trial that he may be inspected.

This is founded on the A. that by the b. b. on an appeal of mayhem, the question whether mayhem or not was decided by inspection. Ed. Ray 176. 1 Will. 8, Batch 323. 1 Sdr. 173. 9, Bl. 392.

The judge can never increase the damages in case of mayhem, unless he proves that the hurt inspected is the same as the one found by the jury & charged in the deputy. 2 Will. 21.

In analogy to this A. it settled in b. g. that damages may be increased in case of wounding or atrocious battery. Ed. Ray 176. 9, Bl. 393.

A. established A. not to increase the damages, if the judge before whom the case is tried, declares in opinion that the damages found by the jury are sufficient. 3 Hill 5.

For entirely unjustified for the jury to give more dam
Private Wrongs

... than are demanded in the debt — indeed it
may be said — for if judgment is rendered the whole
verdict is bad — to avoid this the party must receive

I don't see the necessity of the suits resulting — I should
think the it might think this is mere surplusage.

Every suit & battery is a public offence, & may be pun-

It was formerly a question whether an action for an
aff could be maintained when two or more
committed it — it decided that it may. (Nov. 10.)
False Imprisonment

This is every unlawful restraint of one's liberty - or violation of one's right of locomotion. The technical term is a man in custody - it may be in the street, in a house, or a private house. See 201. 1421.

To constitute false imprisonment two principal ingredients are necessary 1st actual detention and this detention must be unlawful, 2nd Intent.

The unlawful nature of the detention must always count in the want of duty i.e. lawful duty to imprison.

Lawful duty may arise from legal process or the circumstances of the case, which will amount to a legal justification.

There may be lawful duty without any legal process - thus any person may, may by duty to arrest a felon. 3 Bl. 127. 3b. 528.

This action would lie on a selfish crew captured as a prize, tho' she should prove not to be a prize - for the injury is reached by the law of nations of ad maiora in damage, sometimes to a very great amount. Doug 512.

Every arrest of a person in a civil suit without any duty, amounts to false imprisonment. 1 Bl. 169 2d part 81.

A private person is not liable in this action, when he is commanded by an officer having proper jurisdiction - for the private person is bound to obey when he is commanded. An officer must not
An officer having a man in lawful arrest or civil process, cannot delegate his powers to a third person, i.e. a private individual. 1 Boc. 523.

It may be seen under other process, the I know of no decision.

The most usual cases of false imprisonment are where there has been an arrest under void process.

Some distinctions must be observed. It seems that if at any time by a judicial act, from any motive sinister or person, they having jurisdiction of the subject matter, they are not liable to this action.

E1. 528. 1142. Decd. 376. 2 Bl. 121.

A judge of a court of record, having general jurisdiction, of is not liable for any judicial act, whether it happen thru mistake or malice, if he confines himself to his proper jurisdiction. 2 Bl. 1214. Eph. 266. 12 9 23. 2 Salk. 396. Conf. 172.

Ld. Ray. 307. 1 T. 204. 3d. 6 7 8 13 15.

The reason of this rule is that no proof can be admitted to rebut the violent presumption in favor of a judge integrity 10. 6 374. 2 Bl. 1145. Salk. 396.

But if a court of record of even general jurisdiction, goes beyond its limits as to subject matter and acts maliciously the judge are here liable—runs if they do so their mistake.

A judge of limited jurisdiction, transgress their bound, even their mistake, but if they are liable within their jurisdiction, they act maliciously 2 Bl. 1214. Ld. Ray 834. Salk 396.
The preceding rule was made by seven by expression of a rule in Talm. R. 386. C. R. 386. 1 Ko. 590. 1 Pr. 116, 1 Bl. 164.

Et in having power to punish by fine imprisonment - under a case of record is Fagg 567. 3 H. 200. 3 Cow. 291. 3 Bl. 25. 12 Mo. 386. C. Bla. 2 Bl. R. 1192.

Contr. 2 Bl. R. 1192.

Ex: A debtor cannot be arrested for debt on legitimation or intestate - they may for a deponent. C. Bl. 2 Bl. R. 1192.

In this case false imprisonment lies in the party as original. If the rule is general, that action is instrumental in carrying a suit; and liable with their principal. 1 Will 355, 379. 2 Bl. R. 1192.

In this case I presume the officer would not be liable, 10 B. 76, 1 Will 355. Ex. 921, 1 B. 95. 1 Bl. 710.

Suits at it are exempted from arrest - the privilege extends to his person money. Mechanically arrest in this case, at first is not illegal - but a prior debt, issue, & then this action will lie - the debt in privilege, not the fact. 3 B. 77, 1 C. 25, 2 B. 79, 1 H. 695, 1 M. 151, 3 R. 27, 1 Will 779, 2 Bl. 79, 1 Bl. R. 1192, 1 Will 228. 4 B. 664.

This privilege is disallowed in case of collision, as in various actions, - to discretion, with it, to alter it or not. 2 Bl. R. 1192, 1 Will 228, 1 B. 656. 11 Mod. 79, 1 Will 844.

If the officer detains one for fees, too not false might, - never of for his bond. 3 B. 772, 1 Will 89, 1 B. 788.

If it orders confinement in our place, the person is con-
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found in another, is false imprisonment Dunk. 403. 5. H. 295. 5. Ba. 171.

A peace officer without a warrant may arrest a man on a charge of felony. Doug. 935. 5. Ba. 517. 1. Coll. 43.

One with a private person, if the man arrested is innocent — though if he has good grounds of suspicion is not malicious, it seems he is not liable. Bop. 935. 5. Ba. 171. Doug. 352. 1. Bub. 152.


By 6. L. arrests in civil suits this made obsolete. 2. Bal. 412.

To set a bail may take his principal on the sabbath — but this is difficult. B. R. 1295. 2. Bal. 526. 2. Bop. 605.

When St. breaks outer door, he arrests a man, this action is. 1. H. 509. 3. H. 692. 6. H. 682. 9. H. 931.

Burn. When arrests are made on Sunday, or by breaking outer door, or in some other illegal way, may the man arrested on motion. 2. Ba. 907. 2. Bop. 870. 2. Bop. 870. 2. Bop. 870. 2. Bop. 870.

That he can see. 4. H. 609. 1. Bop. 1. 2. Bop. 604. 3. Bop. 590. 3. Bop. 590. 3. Bop. 590.

If an illegal arrest is made, which occasions another that otherwise be good, is it vitiated by the illegal one? decided that it not, if there is no collusion into the contrary. B. R. 839.

If an officer arrests a wrong person, even if the person arrested says he is the one sought for, he is liable. Bop. 935. 9. Bop. 498. 2. H. 582. 9. H. 582. 4. H. 582. 9. H. 582. 4. H. 582.

A private person may arrest person fighting, and keep
A person arrested on some process, may be discharged on motion, but the officer is not liable to a g.r. that an
arrest warrant for arresting a person ought to be in writing. See 92: St. 127. 1 Scho. 886. Bk. 72. Doug. 648.
St. 119. 2 St. 19. 10. 627. 6.

False in one case, that confining a man for a short time
under a jailor warrant of a Justice of the Peace, is not false
imprisonment, but false in another case that it must not
exceed 9 days. 5 St. 172. Moore 407. Rev. S. 829.

A private person may without express warrant confine
a man of discretion, who seems inclined to do
mischief. 5 St. 172.
Actions founded on Bonda

These consist of ass't, debt, covenant, account & duties.

I Ass't. Promises which lay the foundation for an action one of that kind, viz. express & implied.

1st An express promise is 1, where the terms of the conteund by it are agreed upon which is out of or as it says, where the terms of the agreement are openly uttered & assumed at the time of making it. 2, 36, 457.

This promise may be by hand or in writing & the form of action is the same in both cases even if the requires by the stol of 43 to be in writing, you need not declare on it as such, the you clearly may do it you may give it in court under the y name.

Implied promises are in many ways be defined them to be such as reason & justice dictate, which the 2 therefore promises that every man understands to perform. 2, 36, 457.

On the otherwise expressed, when the terms of the court have not been carried into execution, the subject matter is such that a court may be made out of it, this is not an express, but an implied promise.

The implied promise which reaches a vast variety of cases, says, the foundation for an action, when all ideas of a court is point of fact are exploded, as in the case of mystery pond, or where a man comes to hold of it. This it is not founded on express or court, but on the principles, that he has duty, on the 2 such he ought to do.

These promises lay the foundation for an action of ass't which is of 2 kinds, viz. express & implied.
Action on Cont

In bringing of this action, I shall consider wherein the two kinds of cont. & express conts are concurrent & wherein only can be brought.

Whereas there is an express cont to pay a certain sum they are concurrent. Indeed the party always creates a cont because it creates a duty. Consequently an action on cont will he by to the best way to lay both in one action; for wherein you sue on the express alone, if the witness don't remember the fact. But if on the express above allts, you may give in both the express, to support it, yet you are not bound to do it, but may prove by other testimony the fact of indebitness to the same a mount it recovers accordingly.

In this case debt may also be brought. Debt is a sum of money due by cont & agreement, the sum being fixed & depends on no subsequent valuation to settle it. See 3 Bl 183 4. 669 95.

This action is generally discontinued as the debt was permitted to rise up & to prevent this the action of cont is brought. The allegation that he fraudulently & corruptly intended to mislead is inserted for no man can swear himself clear of fraud.

If a promise is made to do a collateral act & to not do the remedy is in damages.

When there is a warranty & fraud is practiced at the same time, an action on warranty for fraud will lie.
Actions on Bonte

Implied after a term in some cases concurrent with the grantor's tert. As where A goes into B's field taking his horse (not stealing it) he sells it - here the tert. for the entry & trespass for the conversion, & implead after for money had & received.

Where money is taken by violence, tert. for it as in case of theft, if money is taken by fraud an action for the fraud, & after.

Then are some few cases in which implied after alone will lie. Where the consideration happens to fail this is the only action. Thus: I sell livestock to B, paying it to be his land - I receive the money & happen not to own it - after only lies - no in the case of money found on paid by mistake.

This action generally lies where I have the money of another & cannot in good conscience retain it.

This is after, but it requires some qualification. Where money is in the hands of A, which he ought not to good conscience to retain, after will lie if no principle of policy steps in to prevent it. Thus: Money lent at a gaming table cannot be recovered back on that ground.

This action of divided after is similar to a bill in estoppel to extensive - if whatever may be introduced therein is chy, may be introduced here. 2. Bros 1011.

This action lies for money fraudulently obtained or deceit. Some remedy there necessary to go to chy. 3. 29.

A married man coursed a married woman & took the rent of profits of her land - this action lay to recover it back. 3. 29.
Actions on bond.

Part money & part goods, for a grant of an annuity, annually, is not good by 2. Act 2 to recover the money was supported. P. 138. 392.

When there was a promise to lease from one man to another, V. before the lease was obtained V. after the money was paid, oft say to recover the money Sel. 19.

This action lies to recover money paid under a void act, C. H. A sum of money & forged a power of attorney in B's name, & employed D to sue & recover it to prevent cost. A pays the money to D & D to B. Now A's liability to B is not gone - it must pay him - but can be recovered of D the innocent attorney, from B he could - but B is not to be found - the it inclined to the opinion that D was liable.

When an agent recovers money for the principal & pays it over to him, the principal having the right you can't go on the agent, but you must go on the principal. P. 138. 59.

But where the act is all void you may recover on him who acts under it. But what is a void act? Thos acts seem to clash.

The principal laid down in this - "where the act given is a competent on the act is not void."

[Talk. 22] Fellow of admr were granted, so well being found - afterward a well was discovered. The act in the mean time collected money - afterward there was a refusal of the admr - could the money in recovering out of the well? Held it could - yet had he paid it out, it could not - because there was no necessity it is not liable farther than an act in his own name.
Actions on Contract

3. (A. P.) James B., V.B. die - B forgery a will & make himself en't. he uses A & receive money - afterwards the will appears to have been a forged one. A dies, the acte dies - a question as to, could he recover out of B? no. for B. paid under a concealment only

Indeed it will lie in any case when they would rescind the contract, as in the case of extortion undue advantage, oppression &c. Doug. 601.

A note was given on a compromise by A. ent. that was a fraud & undue advantage - the money could not be recovered back as the note could never be enforced.

There was a principle in Doug. that this act would not lie to recover money of a felon, because all the felony is perfected - this is now done away or evaded by an action for embezzling the property &c. 219. 129.

If money is embezzled & paid out to a person, it can't be recovered back, because it is the circulating medium & it would be dangerous to allow a recovery - 'tis not so with any other felony as a crime.

But had the money been paid over on an illegal cost, this action would lie to recover it back. 219. 129.

Indeed it will lie to recover money that has been paid on a judge which has been received - when in action will lie. Attempts have been made to subject the party in tort & in contract as guilty of wrong - but they have been found to be, perhaps will not lie for money recovered on a judge, recovered by a
Action on bond

188. Action on bond
At having competent jurisdiction, 2 Bl. 131. 6th. 470.

Just as if the lieu to recover money paid on a judgment of the judge of a court of competent jurisdiction. On the ground that the suit ought not to be heard in justice, for a reason that the judge could not avoid himself of whose judgment it was rendered. 6th. 1540.

When the judge of one at goes to implicate the judge of another in a collateral way, to erroneous. But where the judge is not attached collateral, if the money is unjustly detained judge. who make no difference it may be recovered in ought. 4 Bl. 426. 6th. 326.

A judge cannot be attached needlessly. If in this case the party could have proved his covenant that it could have taken cognizance of it, they would not have supported as it, but would have held him to his action on the covenant. Whenever an action is brought. is brought. for the more fulfillment of the court.

When an action is brought on the implied promise, lie on the ground of no action all it vain the court entirely.

An action of oath lie to recover back money paid or an illegal suit, where the court place both parties in same delict. e.g. money paid to a lottery winner may be recovered. 2 Bl. 108. 6th. 60. 6th. 326.

So where both parties are in same delict the suit was made to protect the one not the other. The former may recover back the money paid in consequence of such unlawful agreement.
Actions on Cont.

Dug. Anson vs. Smith - a new action to recover penalties to the city, corporation, etc. (129, 3rd book).

This action also lies to recover fees of office & abatement on an award. A B. agree to submit a controversy by an award in that if they pay $12, new debt will be as well as made after. If no express agreement is made to abide the award, express will be made.

The agreement to submit to an award makes the foundation of a promise.

Suppose instead of a new agreement to abide the award it had been a covenant - can you then sue on it? For by some you must sue on covenant for it is a higher remedy & takes away the lower. I'll think however it does not.

On this subject he says the Pec. where a remedy of a lower nature, by any subsequent statute between the parties, is reduced to remedy of a higher nature, resort must be had to that remedy - as a bond for a book debt.

But where a party enters into a covenant to perform a collateral act, an action on the covenant, or for the non-performance of the act, will lie - the covenant did not grow out of the covenant, so if T enters into a bond for $120 if he don't build a house, & agrees that he will. (320, 2 C.A. 120).

In time that where there is a covenant of a higher nature no recovery can be had on the lower one.

Moneys won at play can't be recovered if it has
Action on Bond

This is allowed in N. Y. to recover back by statute.

After is brought for work & labour done by men in their profession, as lawyers, &c., for goods sold & money loaned.

This is the action upon personal chattels. When you can't enquire into the items unless one can put his finger on any one & say it is a mistake. John 2:17, 18

When money has been paid to an agent which ought not to have been paid. If the agent has bona fide paid it over to the principal, the agent is not liable - but if he is guilty of any fraud or wrong, he is liable. I must look to the principal for reimbursement.

After upon Sale

are either expressed or implied. If the vendor has no told the vendor may sue on the warranty, or on an after to recover the money. If the vendor wishes to recover the price of the article after is the action.

If the vendor and vendor have agreed & the vendor made a deposit, if then finds the title has declined, he may sue the vendor on the implied warranty - but the one fraudulets rests on him, he is not lining after for the deposit he receives only, but he can't receive any damages. Bus. 3:39.
Achinson Conta

Here the cont was only in pursi I bounded by the amount that only is not transferred until tender. When the property is transferred you can sue only on the tender. 1. A. B. 1. 113.

Sale at Auction. The printed terms are always to govern, whatever the auctioneer may say at the time of the sale.

If goods be sold at auction and the auctioneer breaks the terms he may be sued again. [but] if they are sold for a description then the first sale, the first purchaser is bound to make up the deficiency. 1. H. B. 282.

But where the party is vested in the buyer he must stand to his bargain. If there is none on express or implied warranty.

If the sale is conditional, the parties are bound to make the contract. 1. D. B. 153.

Singular case in Doug. Weston vs. Town.

The defendant requires in such case that the party be examined before you bring the action. 1. H. B. 17.

But a separate suit between the parties may make it necessary.

To suit party to unnecessary that actual manual delivery should be given if there is no misdescription to taking it it amounts to a delivery. Hence the party vests when actual delivery is made, or when there is no misdescription to hinder taking it. Sometimes the vendor is obliged to deliver, if thin if he fails, damages
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A man must make it good. No action will lie in favour of the vendor vs the vendor. Lomb. 236.

If a man sells an article & pays to be made at a certain future day, the bargain is closed.

So rare settled that is a man bids at auction to may occur before the hammer is struck down. C. R. 198.

If the vendor after purchase makes a deposit & then refuses to perform this agreement, the goods are sold again & the vendor brings an action to recover the deposit, this is as settled at 2. in being to decided the action will not lie. 1. P. R. 747.

A covenant to sell at auction, is a court with all mankind - consequently to void illegal to lie any person to bid unless the goods go at a certain price - this is court with all mankind that the highest bidder shall have the articles.

So settled that if the employer tells the auctioneer not to strike off the goods until at a certain price, if the auctioneer does sell for less, he is not liable to his employer. Co. 923.

When an auctioneer sells goods, he may bring an action to recover the pay in his own name, he has a special right in them. 1. H. 80. 91.

About in cases of wages.

So a received opinion in both that no action lies to recover for a wages. At P. S. there are many kinds of wages. Lomb. 495. C. R. 690.
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To lay a foundation for an action the event must be ascertainable to the partie not in point of fact. Anr. 2503.

Thus a wager, whether a decree in chancery would be rendered in the house of lords. Bref. 37.

Wagers to introduce an illegal act, or indecent behaviour or indecent testimony, or to part with the benefit of others are void. Bref. 37.

The action on a wager is ending. Bref.

By a statute, an action of account is brought to recover rent on a yearly lease, of the agreement between the parties as to what is to be given is the object of damages. In such a lease as no such rent, the action here is after the quantum meruit as in a tenant at will.

A tortious holding is not a subject of such action. Anr. 174.

In bond, if a promise is in writing you must declare on it as in writing, contrary to the b. k.

If a court of any kind whether bond, note or covenant is joint, the suit must be brought in all the contracting parties, if not it may be pleaded in abatement, but no other way, if the debt is due any other way to waive the nonjoinder.

If the court is joint & several the action may be brought either all of them, but not in part of them, it must be at joint or all several.

When you sue on such a court you need not state that the obligation was joint.
The distinction if you are 1/2 averred to the manner of the others, whether the debt is good—this more settled that it is. St. 76, 212, t. 89, 2.

I have seen that a lower court is often destroyed by a higher one—as a promise to pay a bond—but to set if the promise to pay is founded on a more consider- ration, an action may be brought about as in this case. I have a bond in B to calls on him for pay-
Y says produce the bond & if promise to pay it—here an action may be brought on the promise be-
cause there is a new consideration viz. the trouble of getting it. 18, 2. 348, b. 39, b. 398, b. 2, 53, 1. Roll 11, 317.

For instance the damages nominal, & that the amount of the bond could not be recovered except on the bond.

A mere voluntary cestui que vestra cannot an action—yet if the thing be in its nature a cestui que vestra, yet if the person was led into it by the offer or request of the other party, the jury will decide if there shall be a recovery. 1 C. P. 103.

Upon the principles of the S. At a recovery can be bad for a voluntary cestui que vestra, i.e. A draws a bill of ex. in favour of B upon B, if the drawer refuses to pay at the time—D pays, upon protest for the honour of the drawer. An action of indorser lies here in B's favour in A. yet to a mere voluntary cestui que vestra.

So it can in favour of a mere carrier who takes goods—when the consideration of a contract is illegal or tending to an illegal act there can be no recovery—but where I promise jointly am engaged in an illegal contract, if I party pays the whole sum the other party is, so it is not obliged to contribute his share, according to the following A. v. 1. If I undertook
to pay the whole or the ground, that the other on account of his brethren refund the money, no action will lie—score if he pay it with the fineness or consent of the other. 3 U. S. 518, 518.

But a knowledge of the filthy, that an illegal act was to be made of the thing sold, shall not prevent a recovery, if the sale was a legal one. E.g. if I sell goods to another to smuggle. (Johnson 381).

But had the sale been illegal, no recovery could have been had. 4 T. N. 566, 3 D. 455.

Bonds of indemnity to produce illegal act, are void but this require some explanation.

When a man does an illegal act ignorantly, he could not know that was illegal. I had no reason to think it was a promise or bond of indemnity in good. E.g. A person agrees another on a void promise. X gets a third person to be his. X gives a bond of indemnity to secure from harm to go. 3 S. 15, 30.

If I promise to pay to another a certain sum for doing what he ought to do or is bound by law to do, the promise is not binding. X if money has been paid in consequence of such a promise, it may be recovered back again in after E.g. A. B. makes a promise. I takes money to secure a breach, it may be recovered back again. But 925.

This action is never supported in T. where the claim is unconvincing; any more than in any. (Johnson 793, 116).

Involved conditions are no foundation for the action—what they are can't be defined. 4 N. L. 93.
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When the question of indebtedness involves one of right, that can't be tried in, it's a writ. An action does lie. By writs taken damage isarrant a common is claimed in the land. Where the we're taken - the owner pays the damage - gets the cattle. I brings oft to recover the money paid - it don't lie.

In a y. B. that the person to whom the, the person is said to be the only one to bring the action - but is now settled in Eng. I think that the person for whose benefit was made may bring it as a certainty. See 5 Th 592.

So always bind their employer as far as their employer give them duty. This is to be determined from the nature of the business. In these cases the S. themselves are not bound unless they make an express consent to that effect. 13 El. 6 1 L. 192. 170. 694.

When there are a number of partners all must be sued. St. 43St. 2. 39. 284.

If not to be sued in abat. 2 H. 693. 1 24.

So this B. there are 2 exceptions. 1st. When there has been such a severance by transaction between the partners, that there is no ground of claim in all, but in only 1 of them as when there are 3 timber traders. I pay, but I won't - he may be sued by the action sustained.

2. Where one partner dies all the right of party he held in common goes to the other. But the right of doing & being sued goes to the survivor. If the money can't be recovered from the survivor you must sue the estate.

A partial agreement before breach may be discharged by partial without consideration - but if after a breach then
must be a consideration, or there is no discharge. 23d 662 b. 51.3 24.1. 545 452.

A court may also be discharged by another inconsistent
with it - as a promise to marry 3 in 3 months & after
wards in 3 months.

Tender.

Tender is a good defense in all cases where there is a
debt certain to be performed - when uncertain depending on
the judgment of the court as to the value of the
property - as in case of a ship & bales.

But where A engages to build a house for B - A tenders
performance & B refuses to accept - the tender is good.

The debt need not be certain in point of fact - yet if it
come within the meaning of certainty & every pecuniary
expense, tender is a good plea if it can be measured by
some known standard - even if it cost. Tender is generally
a good plea, in an action of debt on a quantum munit.
Lev 5.36.

Tender is offer to pay a debt or perform a duty: the tender
is must declare on what account the tender is made.
otherwise the tenderer don't know to what debt it design-
ed to be applied - this is dispensed with if there is but 1
debt. Excit 12. 5. 60. 1. 114. 9. Lev 103.

So when he tendered the bags 3rd time, he should have prevent it - he need not
count the money.

It has been decided that if the tenderer comes to the tri-
dence & he accepts, tender is a good piece, without actual offer.

To undecided whether a tender is necessary when the tenderer comes & the tenderer says "go off I wont treat with you!"

It is decided however that an agreement to transfer, an offer, is a good tender - an actual transfer is unnecessary.

"nor formerly Str. 77, 1 Ed. Ray 646."

The tender is not good unless the whole sum be tendered - for a man is not obliged to take his money by halves.

"If more be tendered than is due to good. Str. 416."

Sometimes a debt is payable in money, sometimes in something else. If it is payable in money or other articles at the election of the tenderer, a tender of either is good - but if at the election of the tenderer, the tenderer must go prepared.

If money is to be tendered a question arises what money, answer is, that money which is made good by t. bollus coin is good to make change, but not to pay any considerable sum.

"current coin of the U., & is good tender, there is no præcie 50. as to the quantity of change."

If money once tendered depreciates in a second tender of an equal sum good? it has been decided in Ireland to be good. & on principles tri clearly correct.

"As laid down in both Eds. that if money is tendered & received, & happens to be counterfeit the tenderer has no remedy. 5. bo. 115. bo. Litt. not true."
Action on bond

If both parties suppose it good, the note is discharged, but after has to recover the balance due.

In the U.S. bank notes are not tender, the reason is, our banks are so numerous.

In long it has been decided in chancery that bank notes are a tender if no objection is made to them on that account. If tender be made in articles they must be merchantable in point of quality. If this is to be determined by the circumstances of the case.

The effect of a Tender

This is different, in different cases. Sometimes it discharges the debt or duty. Sometimes only the damages. In all cases, when a lien is created, tender discharges the debt. E.g., A mortgage of land - tender being made when the money is due, discharges the bond.

When heavy articles are to be tendered, a tender of them discharges the debt or duty. E.g. A promised to deliver 100 head of cattle - tender of them discharges the debt. The tenderer is not bound to take care of the cattle he may let them go.

But as to small articles or money, tender only discharges the damage. The debt or duty remains. Not the same debt or duty - for after tender, the tenderer becomes bailee. So there is no liability on the note for non-performance. The moment the tenderer brings money into it the judge is in his favour. If he has made good tender - if the tenderer has his costs to pay.

The tenderer is a bailee if is bound to use ordinary care.
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As it is the law of tender, that whoever tenders money shall receive the same advantage as if he had paid it on this ground it is, that the case of the defrauded money is reconcilable.

When a tender is once made, it is the duty of the tenderer to have the money to pay over when called for. Not that he will be subjected to an action if he dont, but that the effect of the tender will be destroyed.

But this the demand of the money ought to be reasonable, i.e. made at the tenderers house. (Ternouth, 9, 9, M 9, 9, 9.)

After a tender is made if the tenderer wishes to destroy the effect of it, he must make a demand at the house of the tenderer— a demand these accomplished with produce this effect. Where the mortgagor tenders money to the mortgagor, it destroys the lien. &c. &c.

But in this case he must make an oath in an adjustment in easy, that he has made no use of the money. i.e. the mortgagor must— swear he must account for the money.

The absence of a party so that no tender could be made under a tender unnecessary. I say that he has to know is that he was ready to tender at the time & place agreed on.

Tender must be made at the time & place agreed upon by the parties. If no place is fixed when it must be made to the person wheresoever he is. This means it must be made at the place where he was presumed or supposed to be.

If the party has removed & the old place has ceased to be his fixed residence, & if you know of his removal you are subject to it.
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Although a bond is bound to go to his residence, yet if he finds him in a different place, at the time, tender to him there is good, and must be made.

To see if the mortgagee desires to tender, go to some convenient place, if not, the mortgagee to receive the money there, the tender is good.

In Eng. there are some exceptions to this rule, and not obliged to go to the landlord to pay rent. Tender on the bond is sufficient.

As to the tender of heavy articles, there is difference. If the place be agreed upon by the parties, the rule is the same. But where no place is mentioned, the bond is delivered at the dwelling house of the tenderer.

But if he has removed, if it will be no greater detriment to tender at the last place of residence, he must tender at that place – unless if it must.

If the debt is assigned to a notary, you must tender to the assignee if you must know if you don’t, you must go to the assignee’s house & be ready to tender to the assignee, if this operates as a tender. You must not pay to the assignor.

After an action is commenced in tender is good, i.e. after sum – but if the debt is tendered, the debt interest & cost will stay the suit, see 6.664.

Support the place is agreed on & the time is the 1st of July or 1 month after them, when must the tender be made? If the tenderer is to be found at the place on the first of July, it must be made then – if not on the last day of the month – the reason is, because the
at his election c. 8. 19.

So if on or before such a day, the same principal now

If to made on the last day it must be on the most
convenient part of the day. Pope 172.

If money is to be tendered, it must be tendered so as
to be counted by day light. See of heavy goods put into

If tender can be made on the utmost convenient
time, it must be made within the hour of business
regulated by custom. 6. 744. 9.

If A, B & C have a joint demand, & D a separate one
or in or D, D offers to pay A both the demands, which
A refuse without objecting to the form of tender, on
account of his being entitled only to the joint demand
D may plead the tender in bar of an action on the
joint demand. 1. he should state it as a tender to A.

Dott can not plead more of so to joint & tender so to
part. 9. C. R. 195.

Now can he plead more of so to all count, & tender &c.
3. Will. 143.

If no time is fixed the debt is payable on demand
& in such case the debtor must give notice that at such
a particular time, he will be ready to pay. Not such
a time tender will he made, unless there is a reason-
able objection. 6. Bitt. 311 & 6092.
When the time is no fixed, a tender at any time at the place mentioned is good. S. 10. 115. 6th 15th 116.

Tender to an assignee is good when he is a proper person to receive it. This depends on the circumstances of the case. 6th 7th 78.

If doing a Tender

Here the offer must state the day on which the tender was made, that it may appear to the court that a proper time has been stated at a proper time. He must not only state the day, but that there was the remotest convenency from the day.

He must state that the party refused to accept the money unless he was absent, if the party was absent he must state as before. He also that he himself was at the place mentioned. Ready to tender in that no person was ready to receive. 1st 19. 1st 28. 3rd 162. 2nd 152. 6th 103. 8th 103. 6th 206. 6th 206. 6th 248. 1st 129. 1st 129.

If the debt or duty is discharged by the tender, no one before director is always sufficient. 6th 103. 9th 104. 79.

But if the debt or duty is not discharged by the tender you must say that you are still ready to tender & actually do tender in it. 1st 129.

If the debt or duty cannot at the time of the court you must say you have always been ready to tender 10. 6th 51. 6th 51.

Concerning lucky articles, it is not said whether you may
Actions on bonds

bring them into it or not, to tender, concerning some of them there is no doubt as cattle, hogs, etc. 3. 629.

When issue closed to a plea of tender & found in the form the money belongs to the form & a verdict is given for the deft. 627. 597.

The deft cannot plead non assumpsit to part of tender or to part 9. 1. 3.

Nor can he plead both non assumpsit tender for the plea would be inconsistent. 5. 3. 185.

Award

An universal A. that an award is a bar to a suit founded on the original cause of action submitted.

An award is the judge or decree of persons elected by the parties or parties to arbitrate on the things submitted to them. 9. 3. 185.

On this subject the law has undergone a great change to constitute an award 5. things are necessary 1st. A matter in controversy 2nd. A submission 3rd. Parties to the submission 4th. The award in arbitration 5th. Giving up the award. 2. 12. 3. 54.

1st. A matter of controversy is absolutely necessary.

2nd. A submission - this is of 2 kinds, by consent of the parties or by A. of it.

The former may be either by favor or in writing. 2. 54.
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When the submission is by parole, it may be quits a simple agreement to submit, with a promise to abide by the award, or with such a promise & this promise may be quits or without a consideration.

It's formerly was different, that the promise must be with a consideration, if the award respected any collateral act or thing - necum would not be enforced.

Ld. Ray. 248. 249.

But the A. always was, when the promise was to pay money & not to do a collateral act, the promise might be without consideration & they would enforce it.

The A. more is that there is an implied promise to abide the award in the submission. C. 1806. 36. Sack. 74.

Ld. Ray. 261. 262.

The common way now is to give bonds to abide the award, which are forfeited by a refusal to abide.

We however sometimes submit to an arbitration by form from them in any controversy. E.g. A & B. enter into a partnership - they agree that if any dispute shall arise between them it shall be left to 3 men, such an agreement is good, book d. lit. arbit. d.

For such an agreement to submit or not to do any act of their jurisdiction - or if an action is brought by one on a bill in chancery, can this agreement be pleaded in bar to the action or the bill? being have decided that they can give no relief to the parties till he offer to submit. If he does & the other party refuses, or the arbitrators refuse to set on such, or will make no award then the suit will grant relief. 2. Att. 1808. 2 Br. 62. 396.
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It was decided in a late case that a ct of d. is not subject of its jurisdiction, but that they will support the actin.

It has long been settled that such a restriction cannot be made upon it or move by a third. 12 V. & Sk.

Who may submit, or the parties? Any one may, who can make any other cont. 15 V. & 0. Ribl.

consequently idiots, lunatics, infants, &c., courts cant.

So a yd. that an infant cant submit to an arbitra-ment—see former—be he bound only for the value of the article. 1 R. & D. 269.

An adult may bind himself that an infant shall sub- submit to an award—see former—it is the reason is, that the submission of an infant would be void. bomb. 519. sec

An cont. may submit, the suit of his testate is bound by the submission to abide the award. 1 C. & A. 139.

But the the cont. may submit, this dispute, yet if the cont. can prove conclusively, that the cont. could have got more than the award, he must pay the balance out of his own pocket on the deficiency of of cont. & if the award is published, if the cont. refuses to abide, the action is in sight or claim he cant plead deficiency of of cont. for he may be attached for said pay. 1 C. & 559.

The submission of an cont. is no admission of of cont. in an action brought to him by another cont. if not a party to the submission. 1 C. & 559.

This submission binds all the parties, & all those who hav
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given others only to bind them - so if joint partners in
matters of copartnership should submit, the submission
binds the others also. 2 Mod. 233, 238.

So the act of an agent in submitting binds the princi-
pal, of submission by the H. in all cases where the
subject matter is such, that he can dispose of deeming
court. time binds the H. Style 391, 1 Roll 246.

If the parties submit to an arbitration & the dies, this
submission binds the est. formerly no action of debt
would lie on an est. per leg. & void submitted by the
petitioner. 2mod. 8, 600 - the now this action may be brought
by Act. 538.

4th. What things may be submitted - All first actions &
things may be submitted, I also those whose nature is
uncertain. born. or Arbit.

As a dispute respecting a title to a freehold of land
of inheritance cont. i.e. no title papers by the award
for that don't compel either party to give a deed.

As on this otherwise, that in long as freehold can con-
mense in future. An interest in an estate for years
can be transferred by an award - for this is a chattel
marked. 2 Dec. 180, 126, 823.

What sorts of things does this submission extend? - these
funds on the words used - suppose they are "all actions
& complaintes" - but if only the word "action" it includes
only the actions pending at the time. 1 Roll 245.

If too "of all demands" it includes, every thing. Heinyre 32
If all debts, it includes all obligations & judgments. 2 Sam. 190.
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If "of all differences" it means all demands

When may a submission be revoked? At any time before award, 1 Roll 281.

If the partied a suit lies on the original cause of action, 3 60 91 20 6.

If two or more join in submission is revoke, 5 60 30. J. R. thinks one can. 1 Roll 991.

The act of one is the act of both.

If a submission is made before award by one sole owner winner before award, to a revocation in 6,

A submission to another person submits on our part, if 1 Roll 991.

If there is a submission and a bond given, a revocation of the agreement is a provision of the bond. if no bond is given it now buys the foundation for an action on the case, 8 60 329.

A revocation is of no avail unless notice is given to the arbitrators, 1 Roll 991.

If the same persons who are selected as arbitrators by

the parties, are made commissioners by the court to
determine the same differences, their last appointment is

no revocation in t. of the submission, 1 Roll 991.
Persons of sound memory or those who want discretion reviewed, persons who are not geniuses, former court, those who are actually present, persons alarmed of minors or parties came in action. 4. Mod. 226.

If the parties don't agree, the the submission of the parties often is, that they will stand by the umpire which is sometimes chosen by the parties and sometimes by the adverse, according to the terms of the submission & if the person so elected is called umpire.

When the parties have the forum of election, they cannot change it, if they do the umpire is void because the parties have it the sound discretion of the arms to choose an umpire & not to change. 2 Ko. 583.

The umpire may make his umpire at or before the time, the arms make their award, & if the arms make no award the umpire is void. Con. form. 162 & 64. 110.

If the arms fail to award at the time they were due their failure is concluded out of a refusal & the umpire to good.

The arms when they have the power of electing may exercise it at any time, & they usually do it before the process to arbitrate. 2. C. R. 635.

Secs. formerly. 1. St. 9172.

The arms can continue to appoint an umpire till an umpire accepts. 9. b. s. 269. 1. Bent. 114. 1. Secs. 96. 5. Mod. 147.

4th. Award itself. Awards are to be construed liberally & favorably. 1. Po. 204.
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To constitute a valid award it must have certain qualities. It must be pursuant to the submission i.e. it must not respect any thing not submitted. 3Bd. 389.

So far as it relates to a part not submitted it void—twas once set it contaminated the whole—now that was all good— but neither is true now. The B. now is that if by concluding any part of such award, manifest injustice is done, the whole is void. But if no injustice is done by concluding that part to be good, which the submission intended, it shall be found sound—the rest is void. 2 BnB 389.

If the controversy is concerning the security can the court award a sum of money? to do this they can only decide the right of party, they can even in that case award a sum of money. 2 Rob. 1st.

Can they award any collateral thing in satisfaction of general injury? 3 BnB thinks not. The court can to the contrary. 3 BnB 1st. 189. 2d.

It has been decided that when partners in trade submit "all matters in dispute" if the court award that the partnership shall be dissolved, it within the submission 18 B. 124.

If the reference be of all matters in difference in this cause, if the award is general, it good as to matters submitted, it void as to the matter. 3 BnB 117.

This differs from the distinction, that a submission of all matters in difference in this cause is simply a submission of the cause in question but a submission of all matters in dispute is general. 2 BnB 124. 3 BnB 626.
An award that some claims arising after the submission may be given in satisfaction of something existing before is within the submission, and of course good. 1. Roll 226.

Formerly it was held that no award compelling a man to pay costs was good. 1. Roll 284. 2. Law 266.

Reason: awards are usually made after submission, but are rarely judicially settled, where the power of awarding costs is necessarily incidental to, or consequent upon the power conferred upon the awarder of determining the case. When a provision is inserted in the submission to a restriction of the jury power of awards, 2. R. 655.

2nd Rule. An award must not extend to any one who is a stranger to the submission, if it does not purport to be a submission by the old A. void on this. 3. Lev. 62. 1. Roll 239. 1.

But if by modern decisions, the award to a stranger is never void, unless it be more beneficial to the stranger, or unless be complain of it, 5. co. 77. 11. 60. 11. 1. 1st. Aq. 123.

So always to be presumed that when an award is, that is more pay so much to the other is beneficial. 1. Sall. 94.

If that it included a stranger to the submission, if he refuse to comply, the whole award is void, unless the party in whose favour it is, takes up with the award without his compliance.

When the there is a submission of all disputes between A. B. and C. on the one hand and D. on the other, it means submission of all joint disputes, between the just, i.e.
between A. B. & C. D. on the one part & F. on the other.

3. An award must be entire, i.e., it must not be
    concerning a parcel of the thing submitted, it must
    be of the whole dispute. 1. Roll 236, 6. 80. 93.

The old A rear that if the award was not concerning
the whole thing, then void in toto.

The B. now is that it must be assumed that no other
things were known to the parties than were awarded.

If there were the parties who objects to the award
shows the other parties, if he can prove it, it may
be set aside. This presumption arises from the reason
that when a man has a trust committed to him the
trustee is required to fulfill it suitably. Book
15. 1. Test. 24, bks. 663. 490. 200.

4. It must not be its thing contrary to be void.

Under this had been formerly held, that is under a
ruined that damages should be given when now void
be recovered at l. to save void. 1. Test. 24.

This if not now, for if change B with being a kind
of they may it to action will decide that he shall pay
A. 5. 20. in a good award, the no action would be made.
2. Hint 248.

An award in the 5th place must be feasible—receiv-
to void. 1. Roll 236.

But if it becomes impossible by the act of the party
himself, or a stranger it valid. 1. Med. 273. 17.
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6th. It must be reasonable. Many things are unreasonably at law so that a party must sue the other this is void. The reason is, it was not in contemplation of the parties, generally, if any thing is awarded that cannot be enforced to be contained in the submission to void. Br. 226. 3. Ew. 153. 1. R. 37. 143. 1. 144. 3d. 4d.

So that one party pay part of a debt, where the clearly one part of a joint debt, it is void. For a man is not obliged to receive his money by force. B. B. 324.

After it must be left to a jury, if it is reasonable or not.

7th. It must be advantageous, i.e., not necessary or that one party work the hands of the other would in some manner necessary.

Thus, it must be in a certain case of each other if good. 1. R. 322.

An award that 1 shall enter a verdict in a certain suit is good. 4. Ew. 135.

8th. It must be certain. The old 6th must be uncertain or the case of it. But now 1st certain or 10th of the thing can be uncertain, by any known reason. S. but to good, as an award to pay the debt to a certain suit. Br. 1. 92. R. 37. 1. S. 12. 2. R. 8. Br. 243. 1. S. 157. 2d. Bay. 125.

But that one pay as much as in good conscience thought is void, for want of certainty. 2. Sam. 232.

So on award that one party should subject the other 10 words given to that effect without specifying the sum is void. Br. 127. Br. 8. 422.
An award that the fifty shall have so much money paid him by the debtor unless within 21 days, he shall recon- wite himself by an affidavit from certain pay to or credit, in which case he may stay a left uncertain - this is uncertain & unconsidered. 16976.

9th: It must be final, i.e., such an act must be put to the matter in dispute, that no suit can be brought on the original cause of action, hence if it is to stand by the award of such a number of men the act, it becomes, it not final & 12th: acts can't delegate their duty. 1 Roll. 224. 5 Ex. 272. 1 Roll. 271.

An award that each pay his own expenses, i.e., 16929. 263.

After, may award a thing to be done at a future day if the thing must depend on a contingency. 16927. 16928. 1 Mod. 931. 1 Will. 243.

If its bad in part, it may still be good as to the residue therefore formerly questioned. 16929. 16928. 16927. 1 Mod. 931. 1 Will. 243.

16927. 16929. 256. 1 Mod. 113. 16930. 16928. 1 Exo. 182.

Who is an award void in part & when is it void when its void in part the obligation rests on 1 party & is void if the other party is willing to accept what is rightfully awarded. 16929. 16928.

Who the mutuality of an award, intended by the award, is destroyed by its being partly void, this makes it void in toto. 16929. 16930. 16928. 16929.

Who was the award is out of the submission, if the award an aggregate sum for the injury intended & 1 sum without the submission is void in toto. 16929.
When one party is to perform several acts, not included in the submission, in consideration that the other party pay a sum in gross, the former is not bound by it, if he fails to perform the latter is discharged - see formerly 10 L. & P. 191. 12 M. & B. 829.

If part only is paid or not being within the submission, if the mutuality intended by the parties is obtained is good as to the rest. 1 B. & P. 332. 2d. R. & C. 114.

E.g. award is, that A pay 40. in lieu of all demands up to the submission, & that B execute a release up to the award, now a release heard up to the time of submission is good, as said only after the that.

If the award is that one party do what is not included in the submission, & the other is willing to accept that part only which is the mutuality intended to obtained, the award is good. 2 L. & C. 246.

The award may be written or oral, provided there is nothing to the contrary in the submission. When the parties used particular forms of words in specifying the substance of the offer, the substance of the offer or form of words only is so expressed in the submission. 14th, 12th, Dec., 1815.

Mode of proceeding when the aute are chosen. There is power to notify the parties to meet at such a time & place, or the parties, the aucts, & this is calling out the aucts.

The aute may adjourn from time to time as they think proper provided, they make their award within the limited time.
They may make an award when one party is absent unless he has revoked.

After the parties have partly finished their enquiry can the umpire take the case as it stands or with the whole? The old rule was that he could not; this is clearly contrary to the modern practice, but...

When a controversy is left to the arbitration of a person or persons, and all of them, they must all join in the award, for their powers is joint. In that case, he has been an award by 3 in good grounds. 5782.

If they have joined in making an award, must they give notice to the parties when the will deliver it? No; unless if the award is not made before the time specified in the submission, but if anything is to be done by either party before that notice must be given. 5782, 620, 6, 193.

If the submission contains that they may make an award provided they deliver it to the parties - how notice must be given to all the parties - but a delivery to 2 is a delivery to both; if the other refuses to come. 5782, 620, 6, 328.

Does a panel award satisfy the delivery thus binding us words requiring it to be in writing? The it decided that was good. 5782, 620, 6, 328.

In a certain case, the words were "provided he will deliver", the award - here both set that he thought the initiative of the parties was that it should be written and the only of the case in 5782 he decided that the panel award was good. But 6, 5782, 6.
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If several things are submitted, the court must make their award at once & at the same time & not at different times or different subjects. (Abm. 100).

But they may reserve a new ministerial act beyond the time limited in the submission. (Abm. 43).

Or, if several articles are to be appraised or their award.

Actors can delegate their power unless empowered by their submission. (Jeb 11).

Let there be the actors may the manner of carrying it into execution. (Jeb 15, Jef 32b. Exm 133. 1 Atz. 514. Pr. 132).

They may make their award on the day of the submission unless new time is attached.

Performance of an award.

Sometimes it need not be literally performed. For if the party on whose favour it is, will accept something distinct from it, or direct it to accept for him two compliance.

Perpetual sense is admissible in this case, to show such acceptance, or devotion.

When it is impossible to perform it literally, a compliance in substance will equally benefit the parties in whose favour it is, such performance is sufficient.

E. Award that I give B such a will. Which will in the hands of the ordinary here a copy will do so if the will is lost. (Abm. 43).
Action on bonds.

When a different performance is accepted, he pleads for
formance. I then show the party accept a different one

Remedies to compel a Performance.

If the submission is verbal & there is no covenant or
bond to abide the award, an action of assumpsit & debt will
only lie; & if to do a collateral act after only lies.

A bond or covenant being given to abide the award,
debt or assumpsit or an action for breach of covenant, or on
bon will lie. Scr 929.

If an action is brought on bond, it proceeds in the follo-
wing manner - the debtor is in common form on the
final part of the bond. First breach of the condi-
tion - meets & pleads no award - the plaintiff in
his replication avows an award, states it at length in his
replication on the record, & signs a breach. The reason
why the plaintiff must so plead, is that the word “award”
in a plea in bar, sometimes mean no legal award &
sometimes mean in fact - so if he don't plead as above
he closes the issue to the jury - a question of law.

The defendant either sues in demurrer of the award is
legal, or may sues for award. This in replication mean
no award in fact - then are the 2 pleas he can make to
such a replication. (Scr 372. b. 382. b. 381. a. 279. 2. Mod 77.
Hard 909. l. Show 951 342.

The plaintiff must also state that every thing was awarded
contended in the submission. (Scrabl 185. 3. Mod. 930.

Sometimes the plaintiff must perform an act on his part, not
certific to his right of action on the award - he must
of no new performance on the repudiation

A tender & refusal will annul the same pursu as performance itself - consequently if he was tendered & the other was refused, he must plead it. Gede 43. 1. Mod. 36.

The plff must assign a breach, or there is no cause of ac-

tion. No subsequent plff will hold the want of af-

signment. Gede 24. 18. 189.

When an award is good in part & bad in part, the breach in the bad part only is assigned, the debt may diminu & there can be no double recovery - the breach

must be assigned on the good part. 2. Mod. 100. 1. kid. Ray.

115. 123.

This is the usual way of plff in actions on the bond.

Suppose the debtors defence is never submitted, then he must plead that there was submitted - he must plead, you are bound - this implies submission. 1. Sid. 320.

If the award is that money be paid on or before such a day, to necessary to aver that the debt did not pay on or before such a day - to say he did not pay on the day simply is bad - he might have paid before 1. Kent. 221. 2. Cow. 299.

But in averment that the debt did not pay according to the terms of the award is good. 2. Salkin.

If the award is to pay money when requested, the re-

quest must be made before the debt is liable & con-

sequently the debt must own a request. 1. J. 169.

If the award is the alternative, the plff must own he did neither.
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In assigning a breach of an award in an action on a bond, formerly was it could not assign but one breach; the reason was not to burden the record & impossible the jury to find a number of breaches which one would examine.

In R. now is, you need not assign but one, the you may a number. 2 Wilde 267.

When the defend admits a breach by filing some collateral act, the petit in his replication need not assign any. 2 vide 300.

When there is a submission of all matters in controversy with a proviso that the amount be made of the premise the defend after proving same may plead that the acter did not award about the premise.

The petit may then set out the award at length, it will then appear on record, which was so made or not. The defend may reply to this in the replication, that there were other matters of which the acter had notice the petit can only surmise that the acter had no notice & lien then is joined 2 vide 206, 2 Wilde 812.

If the condition of the bond were illegal or the face of it - & the defend knows one & writes it, the defend can only demurr to it.

If the award itself is illegal or the face of it, & the defend proves one & writes it on record, I aver that to illegal, the petit replies to the plea by stating the same, & leaves open the point of illegality. 2 vide 323.

But the defend has still a different defense namely, per- possession - then he sets out the award or word & pleads
performance, then the party may rely on unwritten the
part of performance, or by delivering officially, when
the party has unmistakably stated the method of performance

Commonly the party in deed performance must note the
in which performance is made. In modern
it is that an averment of performance generally is

sufficient.

J. A. thinks the time A. i., when any question of B

can arise, by reason of the manner of performance
the manner ought to be averred. I when no such
question can occur an averment generally is sufficient:

But if performance in point of fact has not taken
place, the party may plead tender V pracual, N if the party
was not at the place to receive the things tendered
he must plead minfy tender.

In fled tender to an award you must plead that you
have always been ready to perform.

If the defense is that the fled was to do an act precedent
to the right of action, new performance of the act is
enough to plead.

If the party pleads as caused in point of fact, the
fled may supply a revocation by the fled. If the fled
can make us answer to this, but by to answer 3., 24.
52. & 60. 91.

Sufficient by n. A. of 60.

This a regulation in time by 3. 81. 2nd of 89. but they
were known at E. 3. before they such stet. & 62. 154. 10.
89. 85.
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This act contains that all persons desiring to end suits be
may agree that their submission is made by a R of any
of the kings of or record, it may direct such agreement
in the bond whereby they submit, & on an affidavit of
one of the witnesses thereof a R of it shall be made, that
the parties abide the award of such action or enquiry.
If the party desiring the record, the act in motion shall
free process of contempt which shall be stopped by
any of the judges, unless it appear on oath that the
parties have misbehaved themselves. bom. d. dict.

So decided under this statute, that it have no power
to make a final submission a R of it. 2nd. 4th.

So decided that the it will compel a witness to make
affidavit of the execution, in order to make a R of it.
St. 1. Ramus. 58.

A submission may be made a R of it on motion by
party, & by producing the bond executed by the other.
Ramus. 58.

If the submission is made by a R of it, that it will
in force the award without making a R of it. 1st. 58.

This submission must actually be made a R of it to autho-
ize a process of contempt - for a bare consent to make
that submission a R of it, will not authorize that it or
any other to intervene. 2nd. 175.

To authorize a process of contempt, this submission must
be made a R of it first to making the award, in case
being the submission within the statute - it must be
prior to the publication of the award. 3d. 49.

It will not set aside an award on the ground that
the witnesses were not examined or called, if no such objection was made at the time of the examination.

1. B. N. P. 91

The power of the court, of which the submission is made, is discretionary, to issue an attachment.

1. B. N. P. 98.

If a party does not obey an award rendered in consequence of a submission, made a party of it, an attachment shall issue, unless the same came to the contrary on notice. D. B. 35, 1, Shew. 412, 1, Shew. 89.

An agreement enlarging the time for the party to make the award must contain an agreement that it shall be made at the time. It seems it will be so no attachment will issue for contempt. 1. C. 6. 77.

An it will grant an attachment for non-performance of an award, on the affirmation of a suader — because in a criminal process. St. 441.

An award, made a party, can be set aside only for fraud, or corruption in the parties, or that by the record of the state.

Yet if there are no other defects on the face of the award, the it will issue a process of contempt for non-performance — they will issue him just as if the submission had not been made a party of. 4. And. 295.

An it will a sit do this, finding an execution brought on an award — neither will they allow the party to receive his action for the amount of applying for an attachment. 1. B. N. P. 51. See for remedy. Hut. 250, Stew. 696.
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If the party awardee 
not 

the whole, the party 
not pay the money. 19th Nov. 1839.

The mode of obtaining an attachment is thus—when the party refuses to perform the award, theiffs go into it; & upon affidavit state, that the award was no 

what be shewed it to the done who refuses to perform it. I conclude by praying that a copy of the & of it may in record upon him, I be compelled to answer why he dont perform.

This process issues of course & is served & affidavit is made that he dont perform & a then attachment for contempt issues of course.

If he dont appear the it will consider the award, 

it if they find it legal they will order him to obey it; & if he dont, issue process of contempt. 1St 9th Oct. 889.

This attachment is no satisfaction; hence after it you may take the debtors body or an attachment issue, but if the body is taken or execution issued on judge for non-performance of the award, the right to attach for contempt is gone, because now the body is a satisfaction. Dr. 6th 889.

In this state they wont grant an attachment when there is another remedy.

When the award is to do a collateral act they havent coun 
tended to compel a performance of that thing—

where money is awarded they will never misuse because an adequate remedy may be had at S.
When they dont interpose it excersices a discretionary power, & when submission is made a time to they will interpose to compel a performance of the collateral thing. If the submission is a mere voluntary one, they wont interpose unless that has been an acquiescence in the award, or a foreknowledge to perform it subsequent to the award. 1, 1665, 26.

They wont compel the debt when he has pernissed to abide the award, to disclose a breach so that he may in realife the forfeitio of the bond.

What may be plead in bar.

Any legal award may be pleaded i.e. any award of which the party has the means of compelling performance. A legal award is a bar to the original action. 1, Lab. 69, 2, 6.

But a submission made between the flts & a third person may discharge the debt. As where A who att. B & C, is also of D & B, then submit the difference to action & they publish their award, & may now if good plead they submission & performance.

A meeting in one of 2 or more is a bar to a recovery in either of the others. If that in the flt submit, the award is good. If all the frontiers may plead it bar in the same course of action, as in the case of joint submission, when 1 submits, 2, 9, 23.

A submission may be a temporary bar to an award. As where A & B submit to an award to be published in favor of their own action. 2, 923.

An illegal award is no bar to an action i.e. the original cause of action.
In what cases & upon what grounds the act of &; it can be set aside only for cause appearing on its face. 1. g. &. 315. 2. 323. 3. 493. 4. 64.

In every such case, The g. & r. is, that no award consequent upon a voluntary submission is ever to be set aside whether rightfully or wrongfully made. 1. D. W. 123. 2. D. W. 493. 3. D. W. 64.

To this there are exceptions. Where in comparison with the submission & it appears that the acts have been contrary to the act of &; either by mistake or wilfully or where they have mistaken materially, the award the consequent upon a voluntary submission may be set aside in a set of easy. 1. D. W. 385. 2. D. W. 493. 3. D. W. 64. 4. D. W. 156. 376.


An award which is consequent upon a submission that is made a part of &; can be set aside in & or in the face for 2 reasons. 1. Where the acts are to act on the face of the record, you may draw to the award Hyd. 237. 2. 3rd. 243.

2. Where there is insolvency or corruption in the acts, it may be set aside by showing cause, why the 2. for an attack should not be made absolute. 4th. supra.
To make a legal defence it must have certain qualities, it must be a representation of the thing demanded, it must be a defence to the action, and it must be fair. Dech. 52. 111.

To be a good defence, it must be a fair and reasonable one. Dech. 52. 114.

By an act of provision, it is to be done by the bringer, not by the deed. 2 Dech. 52. 115.

But this is a good defence to an action when unanswerable. Dech. 52. 116.

As a good defence to an action, it is necessary that it be discovered by an act of provision, with or without any act of the provision. Dech. 52. 117.

By an act of provision, it is to be done by the bringer, not by the deed. 2 Dech. 52. 115.

By an act of provision, it is to be done by the bringer, not by the deed. 2 Dech. 52. 115.

By an act of provision, it is to be done by the bringer, not by the deed. 2 Dech. 52. 115.

By an act of provision, it is to be done by the bringer, not by the deed. 2 Dech. 52. 115.

By an act of provision, it is to be done by the bringer, not by the deed. 2 Dech. 52. 115.

By an act of provision, it is to be done by the bringer, not by the deed. 2 Dech. 52. 115.

By an act of provision, it is to be done by the bringer, not by the deed. 2 Dech. 52. 115.
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This satisfaction must be in full satisfaction, i.e., it must not appear on the face of the record, not to be a full satisfaction, if it does not indemnify. E.g., it means of an arraignment of the debt, thereby making the bond void.

In case under this plea of an ac. you may give in anything of value in ext. either in f. or exty.

A plea to an action of assumpsit that the debtor who was the payee of a promissory note, indorsed it over to the payee for the account of the debt, was held good. C.C. A. 51.

This accord must be certain, i.e., it must not be conditional. Yel. 125, 4, 1642, 44.

This is performance is shown by the debtor to have been, yet if the ac. is uncertain in its foundation, the plea is bad. Yel. 126.

The ac. must be executed, i.e., the thing agreed to be done must be done—then must not only be an agreement to indemnify, but an actual indemnification.

Thus are set B. & T. methods of pledging ac. &c. 11th by pledging the account by way of satisfaction, ac., i.e., the pledg & deft agree & ac. that the deft should pay x that the deft shall receive a new ac. in satisfaction of this injury & that he did receive it. This was the old English way of pledging, i.e., now the bond, ac.
that the debtor gave so much in satisfaction so that
the pledge received. 3. 60. 0.

To indite a bill in the hand that the pledge
received it otherwise there may be a deficiency to it. St. 186. 683.

The best is here the uncaused restitutions in the English to
- in the best way because the settled A. that he
if the pledge by way of ac. must show a precise, liter-
val performance 7. 60. 0.

But where he pledges by way of satisfaction the
is sufficient to show only a substantial performance i.e. to enough if he shows that he has satisfied the
pled for the injury.

If a man pays money on a void agree. he can
pledge it by way of ac. I red, or by way of rat. in
cant pledge as an ac. because the ac. is void. 1 call 44.
Infancy.

Infancy is prima facie a good defence in all courts, if he is bound by his contes, as he is not generally, the other party must prove it.

But, in no defence in courts, unless the tort can be committed by one who is delin causas.

It may be a good defence to an action of slander, in conclusive if the infant is under 7 years of age, because the presumption of law is, that he is not delin causas.

If the infant is over that age, & the still pleads infancy, he must show that the infant is within 7 years of discretion, & then the jury must decide it.

But never say an infant may plead his infancy in an action for fraud, & that the plea will be good. This is doubted by some. Whether it is opposed to unities or not may be indiciated for fraud.

In the action of after infancy, may give the infant—because every thing which shows that the party has brought to miscrope may be given in evidence & the jury.

Before long writers say it must be pleaded officially because the courts of infants are absolutely void.

As a proof of infancy in courts only, a notice can be made, if the infant may show that they were necessary for obedience punished in this as a publication that they were Justin to him in good Sir. 168.
If the infant were measure for measure, to his intended. 

But if the infant were measure for measure, he is not liable. For the infant is prior, judge of what is measure. 2 Bl. 320.

Goods furnished to an infant is the way of his trade to his parents. 2 Bl. 424. 2 Bl. 183.

If an infant contracts for articles of use, if he enter forms to pay for them, he is not bound. 2 Bl. 196.

How should the note pay for them out of the infant estate, would be liable for a defendant?

If infancy is pleaded to as infant in the conclusion of which court is enquired into, a replication of measures is bad to discernible. For would destroy the privilege of infants, in not being bound for more than the value of the thing received.

2d. If the defendant is an infant, the suit may reply a promise of full age. This suits up the original suit. For the cause of an infant may be satisfied until voidable.

If the defendant is suitin, too, the fact that he made a promise after full age, or that he made any promise at all, be must prove that he did not promise after full age. The suit must prove only that the defendant promised. 1 Bl. 468.

But such a replication of a promise of full age can be made to a plea of infancy in an action on a contract, strictly said. But if R. thinks an action will lie on the promise.
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Here is a defence generally in all cases—so to find costs for he has his own security been obtained as to make them liable in some cases.

She can convey her hand with her hand with birth.

If this it is with law to a good defence to costs, or else it done by his command in these cases she can't be injured.

Different from the 1. generally as it respects, M. H., they can be united in an action on torts. 1st 2d 
A. D. M.

Limitations.

The principle of this stat seems to have been misunderstood to not only from the elementary writers to collect it. We shall more time of it as it suits costs only.

If a man undertake to pay money for any goods he purchases the stat runs when it.

If a man pays a sum of money on a note of six years, he runs, it takes it out of the state. What then is the principle? Is it that length of time already evidences a presumption that time fair to the legislature that have only they did it without the jury in reduced an uncertainty to a certainty to a certain by specifying the time, when the presumption shall commence.

We will now consider the case of a bond in Eng.
Here is a man of large fortune gives a bond of 500 to a neighbour - after 20 years, the man who held the bond dies. Prior to his decease he circumstances of the man embroiled him. He dismissed many of the stipulations from the benefactor. The note finds the bond, jurisdiction to the obligor, who acknowledges to give it, from the circumstances of its being his writing, but says it must have been paid & found in this length of time. To other circumstances, they a good plea in bar at B.B.

Now this fact says if your note has run more than 6 years, the note paid. If not, it has the stat for the six years time when this jurisdiction begins any proof that will rebut the presumption takes it out of the stat. If a man acknowledges to own a debt barred by the stat, & says he owns, it takes it out of the stat - if he pays a part this takes it out & it runs from the time he last acknowledged or paid.

A claim of B that he owes him a sum of money - B says, "I know it will never pay you to borrow by the stat." A cannot recover. B acknowledges the debt but stands by the stat.

Again A calls on B for a debt barred by the stat - B says the sum is too much. I will pay you it. A replying he had an acknowledgment of the whole debt brought an action for the whole sum - then recovers money - he might have recovered the whole sum.

A man makes a will & directs his estate to pay all his debts - now the execution will direct him to pay all debts barred by the stat. It is not to be the w-
Actions on Bank.

A man becomes a bankrupt if he is discharged by
him afterward. Publishers, that he will pay all his
debts. He cannot be a bankrupt by statute. That is
on the above mentioned ground. To whomever a debt
is due from any other reason. In the same he must pay it.

Never promises to pay a debt barred by the statute
must pay it.

If a man promises to pay a sum subsequent to
the commencement of a suit, it takes it out of the suit.

**Note:** The suit must be plead—If the debt is not paid
full, part or any thing else, he receive the suit.

A suit petitioned that a comissary of bankrupts
might issue a writ against the debtor. It is
true; if he was declared a
bankrupt. Afterwards some of the other suits tried
so that it might be set aside, on the ground that
the former claim was petitioned for the comissary
was barred by the suit. The chancellor refused on
the ground that the debtor received the suit, in fur-
mitting the suit it there to be made.

An endorsement here like takes it out of the suit
you must however know that the debtor objected
to the endorsement, or knew it, or paid the money.
Actions on entry
or there would be a door open for fraud. In 1836
the decision in the superior court of errors has
been extremely contradictory on this subject. But
1873, 8th 51, 8th 85, 8th 85, 8th 86, 8th 87, 8th
1873, 1874, 1875, 1876, 1877, 1878, 1879, 1880, 1881,
1796, 1797, 1798, 1799, 1800, 1801, 1802, 1803.
In a case in the old
of 1828 under the head of aft.

This statute commences its operation when the fifth
year of action occurs unless the other is entirely
provided.

In both years have an action upon an infringing
violation as to those mattifies by 1.

The statute commences its operation upon the bringing of an action.
If after judgment is obtained on a suit of errors,
for some defect in the proceedings, the party may
base his claim in another action or the same.
This arises from an equitable construction of the
statute.

Some persons are excepted from this statute. Some
vets, infants, 1 person beyond sea. But these per-
sons must bring their actions 2 years from the
time that the disability is removed.

But when the statute has begun to run before the
intervening disability it shall continue its opera-
tion.

Since the words of the statute are that no action shall
be maintained in after the disability is removed, only
abated, or to take advantage of it in a special
fitted, that amounts to a bar, as now after in for
vex amour.
Action on Bond

The impracticity of this Rule the Judge thinks do

Suppose there is a bond to be executed in A.I.,
when such an instrument as that can run
in suit in B. S. where the barred in 12 years. It's
is measured for the debt in B. S. and the state be
placed in B. S. more than the live long is to ground. I urge
but the court a recovery can at any time be had
in A.I. where these made.

Yet how can this consistently be done since the
action has once been barred? For a just one residing
for the debt in this state or a debt in B. S. must
be conclusive in an action for the same cause brought
in any other state.

Book. Debt.

If a part of a book debt is barred no part is
not, by the state. If there is a part made, it shall
apply to that part which is barred unless there
is some particular allegation of the recovery. S.C.
A. 1839.
If the cause of action accrues immediately upon the act done, the state may be a base but if the cause of action accrues by reason of special damage, the state would attack as in the case of slander, by way of a suit in themselves actionable but would so by special damage arising from that - but in this case I imagine the state attaches as more as the damage is sustained, by reason of a B just mentioned. It has been a question in these cases of trust, whether the state rises in the cause of action or in the form of action - as if a statereate that no action of trust shall be brought after 3 years now may there be brought after that time for the same thing. If A thinks that were the a new question, whether this not trust would lie - but on the principle of constituting state, that abridge the B, strictly, this is hard to that trust would lie in that case.

Durch:

This a good defence to court in all cases, let them be ever so righteous.

In an action of art. durch may be given in case under the y. if e. but to an action on a specialty it must be filed in bar. If the art is not state in what particular the durch answers. Pake. 805, 85, 9 Bl. B 229, 829, 9 Hill. 240, 904.
Idocy.

In this case we have a different rule from the B. D. viz. any thing may be given in aid under the Gryffe to defeat the suit except the acts of the debt themselves. Consequently lunacy idocy would be a good bar in law under the Gryffe in act of it.

By the B. D. application must be made to try to get a warrant for the see note.

Foreign Attachments.

This defence was unknown to the B. D. except by the custom of London. The B. D. on this subject depends upon the custom of each particular state. The defence is in this way that by a suit of Foreign Attachment the debt has paid the debt of his own, in the fifth out, to answer an original suit between the fifth and the out. Suppose A owes B 1000 £. C gets a warrant leaving bond to the hands of B. B gets a suit for 1, but knowing at the same time that B has nothing of A to the amount of 1000 £. of Foreign Attachments leaves a copy with C. charging him with being factor agent or trustee for A, or an insolvent, having nothing of A, and at the same time C is recovered in the abode of the debtors. C the garnisher refines to pay the money, sicne factor will then in turn B using their suit to, & having sworn oath concerning the duty he has of it, and B must be allowed to testify this to the fifth court with it, & he can know the facts by other act. B is a correspient witness.

The B, in the garnisher is never to be put into a worse situation than he would have been had he
into not run away, except the trouble of proving
that he was factorized & did pay the debt, which is
to be done if sued by the creditors.

If he is to pay the debt in any collateral article, as
beets &c. then, he can be compelled to pay the money
when factorized.

The word "fact" means for tests, as wheeling slander,
not written for tests, it then becomes debt.
If you can factorize for any thing but debt.

Composition with debt.
A man who is bankrupt may make a composition with his creditors, if it saves a recovery of the
remainder.

If any agreement is entered into by suits different from another to void. As if A.B. & C.D meet & agree to accept from G. 10 shillings on the bond
G secretly receive a note for the full amount; this is void on the ground that it defeats the
other debts.

Illegality.
If there is any illegality in the suit, no matter
from what it arises, it is a good defence. The only
difficulty is to get at it.

If the whole suit is not bright will appear on the
face of it, whether it is illegal or not - but in the case
Actions on bond.

of a bond too difficult to come at the consideration as it cannot be set forth either by the will or deed.

But you may always attach its use where it is known to illegality; and it does not appear on the face of it.

It was with the greatest reluctance that that adopted this practice yet it was never doubted that remedy might be pleaded. The theory doctrine on which it was founded was admitted to be so.

3 Mils. 331.

Fully accounted.

The form of usually sign a writing or notice of settlement here this is a good bar.

Merger.

This is where there is a bond when act is brought.

In some cases, where the bond is only a collateral at


solvency, it cannot be pleaded in bar.

But in some cases, as a release there is a sum of money due to a bond is given it cannot be pleaded in


bar to our action for the money.

Former Judge.

It must be a judge on the minutes, is not for mere in


formality- as a defect in the deed.
Action on bonds

When in the original action there is not substance for the debt, in fact, as the receipt, it will be a bar—you cannot change the form of the action & bring another.

In case of the concurrent actions of two or two persons you cannot bring one after another.

The y. R. is if in the second action you are obliged to bring the same kind of suit to support it as in the first, the suit is a bar to it.

Discharge.

Technically this means throwing up a bargain before a right of action has accrued.

But suppose they don't throw up the bargain till the right of action accrues, i.e. if no suit till then suit in such case is a release—i.e. a discharge after right of action accrued. 6th Ed. 785. 1 Ed. 737. 2. Mod. 131. 1 Do. 235.

Payt.

By 8th this could not be pleaded to a bond—it may now by stat. It must be in kind the accord must be paid. If you are sued upon convent broken, place generally, that you have kept your covenant. When a bond is given to save harmless if you are sued upon it for non-disclosure. If the cot is valuable, principle of 2. The you must must be set out—but if in such matter of fact, you may only say you have performed.
A release in writing, need not now be recorded. A found release, attended with consideration is commonly called a discharged. In a written one, a consideration must appear, as to a Deed of Mortgage. If the record you need not state the consideration, the real is left to one.

If the instrument declares the consideration if it appears to be bad, the release is not good; the real only furnishes presumption of a good consideration, which is then removed.

The best of most comforting words in a release are all demands & all claims.

If, at the time of the release there is debt not due, the discharged. Bro. L. 306. 6: Litt. 296.

Suppose a man has a farm for 100 & for omission a release of all claims, don't include the rent to grow afterwards, because the enjoyment creates the rent. Bro. L. 606. Bro. J. 487. 6: Litt. 151. Salk. 545.

There is another set on which a release went of rent, & covenant not broken, as a covenant to receive a house, this is not discharged by a release as there is nothing in sale to be discharged. Bro. L. 176.

But still a discharge of all covenants will reach them. Bro. J. 170. 6: Litt. 293.
Covenant.

Covenants, covenants, and agreements, are often used in a synonymous sense, tho' they clearly are not so. But in a general sense, they include all kinds of agreements. For in that sense, synonymous with agreement, agree denotes all entering into.

A cov. is a court written & sealed—hence its no hocus pocus expression to say a written cov. tho' it sometime used in the books.

This written cov. may be by indenture or by deed.

1 Bow. 255. 1 D. 526. C. & N. 340.

But tho' a cov. is by it indenture, or sufficient to support an action in the covenantor, if he sealed it whether the covenantor sealed it or not. Bow. 242. 14 F. D. 266.

The usual remedy for a breach of cov. is an action at l. for the recovery of damages. Where the damages are reducible to a certainty, debt will lie upon the cov. as well as upon a single bill. So if a covenantor pays 300. £ on the event of a string debt, will lie to recover it. So an action of debt will lie for a penality, tho' in a cov. as well as if torts in aband—, but where the damages are for nonperformance debt must lie. St. 1083. 3 Co. L. 107.

But when a cov. is to do some specific act or to make a conveyance, the most proper remedy for a breach of it, is in chyng, for an specific performance. I don't mean that in action at l. must lie, for tho' this is that you can't obtain relief in chyng, unless you can recover damages at l. 1 Port. 77. 132. 106.
Action on Bond

When a party can obtain adequate relief in ct of
b. be sent inst to chg - but if he can't at b.
he may go to chg. Damages must be ascertained
in ct of b. V not in chg - this is the business of a
jpy. 1 Ch. 530, 518. 1 Com. 64. 1 Corp. 144. 1 Vent. 19.189.

Even in these latter cases, where damages only can
be recovered, if the relief procured be consequential or
collateral, to a ground of relief, properly cognizable
in chg. the bill will be retained. Hence if a
matter of fraud is mixed with the damages, why
may retain the bill the relief lic in damages
only. Thus A ass B in cow. Broken at b. A files a
bill in chg for an injunction in the suit on the
ground of fraud. A may now file his own bill
in cty for the breach of the cow. if no fraud
is found, chg will give damages. if the comman
tee will have his relief by a
off damages. if
in beg an if at b. may be divided, to ascertain
the amount of damages. 1 Corp. 6. 216. 1 Bk. Corp. 13.
1. Bk. 69. 526.

bowl one of 2 kinds - cows in bed. 2 cow, in b. A cow
indeed is an urchf cow. i.e. an urchf cow, writ
tin entirely for the partin. 1. Bk. 89.

bowl in b. are such as are praised or revealed by b.
-they are the urchf cows. Thus if a cow
lodged to b. for a certain time, to b. raises a cow.
that b. shall quietly enjoy it during that time.
also that the labor has a right to make the
lease. 1 Corp. 43. Bk. D. 266.

Here is no cow in time - it runs them from the
creation & forms of the agreement.
A real cov. is when the agent is annexed to the prin. cov. or concern the pr. personally. As if covenants to do work for B. or pay money, or build a house. If the subject matter is real, the cov. is real. If ti tis land the cov. in poss. 8 Co. 16. 17. 1 N.B. 10.

To make an executory cov. no precise form of words is necessary, any words shewing a concurrence of the parties in the agent are sufficient; hence within the word cov. ess. agent need be used. It maybe a proviso. Thus, if A lends to B running a charriot &c. to B. now this is a cov. on the part of B. the lease that the lessee shall have the lessee to B. therefore no a safe B. that any words implying an agent being an sealed instrument may unions to a cov. 8 Ser. 240. 8 Nerb. 913. 2. Mod. 16. 8. Kent 46.

If A lends to B &c. in the lease there are than in form. "Running somuch rent" or "paying somuch rent" YB accepts it. in an executory cov. on his part he pays not. if be don't an action will lie in him. The deed may by fall or condition. 8 Ser. 16. 8 Ser. 5. 262. 60. 8 Ser. 141. 1 Kent 23.

A cov. may be concerning something present part or future - generally in future but not always. If of part - a man may bind himself that he has done something.

B not of sinister the present kind - cov. of warranty. is of the future. Bow. born. 208.
Actions on bonds.

Sure im & differ from cases in deed in this, cause in deed are founded upon the words, in this deed, bow in i. am not satisfied from the words used, but from the nature of the cox or agreed upon. 5. 60 400 ch. 17. barth. 83, Dyev. 257. Palman, 988, 4. Mod. 92.

All cases in i. may be set aside by an express cox. in deed. Gev. 125. Cyp. 7 238 273.

A cox for quiet enjoyment don't extend to the tenurial estate of a stranger because the lessor may have his action in the stranger for this.

But if the lease be ejected by the lessor himself, the lessor may have an action for coven broken. 11. 24. 4. 60 90.

A recital in a deed of a former agreement creates a cox.

Thus if in a deed between A & B to sell "that whereas it has been agreed upon between A & B, or whereas it has been hitherto agreed upon that A shall pay B a sum of money..." now this recital creates a cox for the recital confirms the original agreement. 9. Heb. 460. 1. Sam. 172.

The technical words are not necessary to constitute a recital cox, yet there must be words which warrant an agreement to constitute a cox.

Hence in a lease where the lessee coven to repair during the term, provided the lessee will furnish the labor - now this provision is a condition precedent to the lessee's obligation to repair. This provision is not a cox that will bind the lessee. If however it had been thus - 11 provided I agreed that the lessee furnish labor should be a cox. If bind the lessee, him would binding agents. 1. Rob. 138. 2. Horn 5 569. Ref. 4. 967.
But by this it is not meant that a cow can't be created in the form of a promise, for it may be created in any form, if an intent to be bound is manifested. Thus, when a lease was made for 50 years, provided the lessor died within 20 years - his estate shall have the lease for the remaining time. This is a cov.


If the party to a deed executes a bond conditionally, for the performance of covenants contained in it, this constitutes a bond in deed & in law. Thus A lesions to B by deed, deed & concept, which makes a two fold cow - then executes a bond to perform these covenants, this bond extends to both.

But whenever a stipulation is in the nature of a defeasance, it does not amount to cov. in law. Thus A covenants to pay $3,000 by a certain time on condition, provided B does a certain act before that time. Now this is not a cov. to bind B - to a mere defeasance.


construction of cow

Sir a Y & Z that covenants to be construed literally according to the true intent of the parties. It must strictly in the case in granting executed. Poss 138, 1. Sept 454

1. Ba. 89.

Hence it is that often is literal performance of a covenant occurs a covenantor as one action - for it may not be the true intent of the parties. So when I covenant not to deliver up a horse to B, which I kept in barn on a certain day, but before that time to mark the horse & collect it, & at the day appointed
delivered it up as he was liable for a breach of law. Because there was not the sincerity of the promise, it should be made. 

In the other hand when the coervator does all that was intended to be done, he is deemed to have done all, the sin, just lies not a literal performance.

2. Even 52.

So on a cow, to leave his Thirteenth on the bond, the coervator cuts it all down & leaves it, this is a breach. 

A cow to deliver a piece of cloth to B, he cuts it to pieces & then delivers it, cow broken. 1. Ba. 629, 942.

So when the devil or sin is, that the fifth shall have his grain, & thus short them, cow is broken.

This question has arisen as to construction, viz., what 50 pounds avoirdupois weight in a collateral article was what was meant by 50? - decided that it meant money. 1. Ps. 151.

Another is, that where the words are ambiguous, they shall be taken, most strongly for the coervator, not most beneficially for the coervator - this A office to all costs, executed as well as executory.

Thus where the coervor to pay the fift 50 to an amount, if he would marry his daughter & limited no time - he was held, that the coervator should pay during the life of the coervor. 

246.
In some cases, an exception will amount to a cov. I say, in some it went - the distinction is very important. This is when the thing is of a certain subject except a certain part of the subject, this exception is not a cov. So a lease of a manner except a certain lot is not a cov. But by the lease, that he wont cut down on the land.

But on the other hand, when the exception is of some thing, or some things, or some sort to be derived out of the thing desired, this is a cov. And if I have to a farm of land except a right to pass over it, i.e. a right of way, now this is a cov. A wont derive it while passing over it. A lease a house to B except a room I passage to go to it - now this right of passage is a cov. For to a thing derived out of the thing desired. E.g. x 687. 1 Roll 52. 101. 591. Barth. 239. Salt. 196. III. Med. 176. 1 Cow. 5. 238.

There is an important distinction between the exception of expres. V implied costs, express costs are considered more strictly than implied. Thus when I expressly contracts to perform a voyage by a certain time, he shall be liable when the cov. even tho' he was prevented by causes uncontrollable by him - as by a tempest x. E.g. 1632. 9. Barth. 239. 3. C. A. 52.

But suppose he had given a final bond conditional that he would go the voyage by a certain time, if he should be prevented by unavoidable casualty - he would not be liable to the penalty because even tho' we express agreement.

The manner that no one shall be liable for a loss occasioned by the act of God, applies only in those cases when the b. makes the cov.
Actions on bonds.
If a person owes to pay rent for a house during term of time, & the house is destroyed, till the lessor must pay rent for the whole time he was entitled to the.

But in case of such an event, inevitable accident will occur, the lessor must, A tenant for life or years, by such an event, as to the lessor, the rent cease if loss should be occasioned by an act of God, or an inevitable accident, as by a fire, etc., he is excused.

An exchequer cov. to be sustained by the party, that the covenantor shall become insane at all events, see in misshapen cov. 1. Fort. 366. Doug. 289.

The Y. A. is, that the performance of an exchequer cov. is not discharged by any collateral matter—thus a man undertakes, to go a voyage if it is prevented by storms of weather, this is no excuse.

But there are exceptions 1. If one cov. to do a thing which at the making of the cov. was lawful, but which by a subsequent state is made unlawful, the covenantor is discharged & the cov. will be annulled.

Concerning the A. a question has been suggested—cov. this A. exist under the constitutions of the U. S. which says, real shall be exacted which shall influence a covt. Mr. Y. thinks this do not affect the A. of itself, for it do not operate immediately on the covt. to nullify or set of public policy not relating to any covt. which may have been made, it do not influence the obligation of a covt.

2d. If one cov. not to do a thing which a subsequent
Actions on Bank

If a man makes it his duty to do, the cov. is cancelled.

Thus if A should enter into a cov. with B to remain
from 10 years, B agrees not to leave his service during
that time, & a subsequent stat. should require all
young men to go into the service of their country
the cov. would be cancelled.

A cov. to do an unlawful act, is an act of the
same as a cov. to do an unlawful act. 1. Sal. 198.

But cov. not to do an unlawful act is not annulled
by a subsequent stat. making the act lawful. 1. Sal. 123.

In 2. A. it is that covs. are confined to their operation.
to the subject matter of that which is in being at the
time of executing the cov.

Suppose the lesse cov. to pay the term on the de-
mand premises now this extends only to each term
as are in being, at the time of executing the cov.
& not to those of a different kind that may be en-
tered afterwards. So if a man cov. that there is only
a land tax when the cov. is executed, & afterwards
a tax is laid on rents, the lesse is not bound to
pay this tax. 1. Lew. 61, 64; Shot. 429, 431, 1191, 3. Co. 972.

A cov. contrary to & not good policy in void. 2. of all
costs. 1. Ben. 1514, 9, 47, 72, 100, 329, 354; 1. Co. 165, 176.

And to the A. that the performance of an enforce cov.
is not discharged by any collateral matter. It has
been made a question when a lessee has consented
to pay absolutely to pay rent for a certain time
if the house is destroyed before the term is out, whether
the lessee can be relieved in a suit of eject. 1. Shot. 33,
419. Al. 419. Unstated by any master. 1. Ben. 30, 301.
Actions on bounts.

Aston gives an opinion in this decision & Mr. J. concides with him - 'tis a settled maxim that a cl of eqy cant controil a cl of b. or cl of b cant controil any circumstance that eqy can - but these things must be very matters of eqy. This however is not of these cases - the party must pay - when eqy is equal, the b must prevail.

This clnt at first think eqy equal - but oh. J. thinks it is - 'tis the b in these cases. During the time - he only loses the in - whereas the b losses the freehold.

To clearly the intention of the party that the b may at all events - this is the construction in st. of b. V eqy cant velcum. unless it can make a clnt for the party.

If one have a foot chattel & co. so that the b may have the use of it during the time, & within that time it becomes useless, for want of repair, the co. is not broken. It is not the duty of the b to repair the b to repair. 130. 59. 128. 465. 116. 329. 152. 52.

An ejectment of a chosen in action if to by deed, amount to a co. by the assignee. that the assignee shall have the benefit of it.

If then the assignee receives the money or receives the co. he is liable on this account to the assignee.

St. Ray 839. Both 125. 20 W. 609. 1 No. 113. 1 Raw. 6. 170 01.

By this it is not meant that chns are negotiable at if for they are not but that the co. in this case binds the concession. In box tis usual to sue the concession for fraud, for receiving the money & giving a relia.
Actions on Bond

In any suit to recover on the bond of the obligor for the release of the indemnitee, the indemnitee may go on the obligor for recovering the release in due

An indemnitee of a chose in action, sued not by deed or in writing - for in equity a panel indemnitee will be justified, the less not a cov. but a rel. 4. T.R. 630.

A promise to pay the indemnitee in consideration that he will forbear will bind the obligor, notwithstanding he obtains a release from the obligor. 1. Hook. 188.

A cov. by a cove not to sue his debtor within a certain time, is no bar to an action brought within that time - but the cove by suing makes himself liable on the cov. Ves. 332. 8. Law 46. 4. Ba. 260. 1. P. R. 639.

The manner of the A. is, if twice considered a temporary release or bar, it must be perpetual, for a first action once suspended is gone forever. 2. H. 184. 3. Jess. 41. Hol. 10. Salt 579. Baumb. 63. 2. bör. 593. 2d Day 157, 399. 519.

But if such a cov. makes part of the instrument sued upon, as if it were endorsed on the back of it, it prevents a right of action till the same expires, but still the suit on the execution of a bond, the true ground is that the cov. is a part of the bond; the suit must be taken into new or continuing it to the same as if incorporated in the body of it.

The above A. applies only to first actions. A temporary suspension of a right to a property is not an extinguish.

A cov. by a cove never to sue his debtor in a perpetual
The object of this Act is to prevent the multiplying of suits which would inevitably produce the same effect—for if the one should succeed he would be compelled to refund the whole. 4 C.B. 48, 1 B.R. 170, 190. 5 B. & Ad. 626.

A conv. by any person who has a legal power or authority, or not to prosecute the claim at a cost of practical less your discretion, which was consiraneous of it is void—to a full sum of the. i.e., that all shall go to the cost of justice established for that purpose.

But o conv. by a foreigner, with a foreign master of a foreign ship, not to sue the 1st. in any other than their own country, is a good bar to an action brought by him in the 1st. 9 B. & Ad. 626, 1 B.R. 170, 190. 11 Mod. 214, H.R. 1862.

A conv. not to sue at all of 2 joint & several obligors, is not bar to the other. 9 B. & Ad. 626, 1 B.R. 170, 190. 11 Mod. 214, Kirby, 41.

But suppose the obligation is joint, & there is a conv. not to sue 1 of them—here I think the debt is liquidated—thus is a good plea in bar—action can be maintained. 1 Saund. 291, 300; 16 & 17, 20 & 21, 25 & 26.

If I grant to his duties that he cannot be sued before a certain day, & in the mean time, that person on an acquittance to a conditional lien—i.e., different from a conv. In the nature of a defeasance to a conditional lien. 1 B.R. 199, 3 B. & Ad. 626, 5 B. & Ad. 626, 1832, 619. 2 Shaw. 446, 1 B. & Ad. 626.
Actions on bond

There are certain cov. by the conveyance or a conveyance, which need particular attention. In all deeds of conveyance except quit claims, there are 2 cov. 1st that the grantor has a right to convey.

If the conveyance is a freehold, to a cov. or seisin, if to life, than a freehold, to a cov. that the grantor has title.

2nd. cov. here called a cov. of warranty - including a cov. of quiet enjoyment.

The term cov. may be enforced, they may be complied from words, deed & conveyance. D.B. 777, 352, 784. Roll 8322, Des. 259, 366, 7, 8.

A quit claim deed or release is a cov. to any claim or title of the life.

And a cov. of seisin the grantee may sue a cov. as the deed is delivered, for if the grantor is well secured in broken the moment the deed is delivered. Kirby 3, 8, 60, Des. 299, 960, 967, 370.

But a cov. of warranty the grantee can’t sue till he has been evicted. This cov. can’t be breached till he has lost his poss. Des. 911, 912, 390, 913.

In an action on cov. of seisin it is enough for state that the grantor was not seized - it is unnecessary to state who was - nor does it amount. 1st Supra. 2, Page 15.

After the grantee has alleged the grantor was not seized, it is incumbent on the grantor to prove he was seized. Des. 92, 140, 960, Des. 299.
Actions on Bond

The issue is broken by an existing uncertainty on the bond, unless it is excepted. 3. Pauk. 596. 7. 60 of H. Sandford to Warmbmn.

John.

The grantees in case of a case of uncertainty must allege an existing title. No claim under claim of title. Also, that the eviction was under good title. This latter branch is inadmissible.


It has been decided, however, that when it appears on the face of the deed, that the eviction of the plaintiff was under title, it is good the term is no formal declination of it.

2. 292. 2. 39. 4. C. A. 607. 2. 37. 238.

But it is unnecessary to state what that earlier title was, or in what manner he came by it, or under what title the evictor claimed. 2. L. Sum. 137. 3. 292. 4. Sed. 566. 4. O. A. 614.

The owner of warranty don't extend to the tortious acts of another. Therefore, it is unnecessary to state that the eviction was under claim of title by the party existing. 4. O. A. 517.


It is insufficient for the plaintiff to allege that he was evicted by previous wrongs of A. For them may have been collusion between the parties. 4. 297. 4. 50 50.

But one may if he pleases unanswerably conv. in the tortious acts of a third person, V in such case there is no need of stating eviction. 2. 293. 5.

The general conv. of warranty don't extend to the tortious acts of strangers, yet a conv. of warranty in the acts of particular persons, extends even to tortious
If the warrantor distinguishes the grantee, even by a tortuous act under claim of title, he is liable on the coo. If the fifth word not state that the object纯净 title, or even that he claimed any of the act affirm from the delito to be an objection of right. 1. Roll R. 201.

The heirs, executors of the warrantor are included in the coo. of warranty Exp. 902, 2. Com. D. 563, Dyer 257.

Question by the lessor suspends the vest-seen of a mere trespassing act. 1059 262.

It has been said that a coo by an act as such us to quiet enjoyse, the li in terms us all persons in by construction only in himselfy of these claiming under him 1. A. R. 23. Exp. 1. stone. 163.

I dont see how this out can be taken out of the b. R.

In Bung, upon coo of seisin receives the consideration & the millet - as to the R of damages in case of warranty, no it is adapted in Bung. I suppose however it would be the aheise damage.

Our S on these subjects is different from theirs - see Kirby 9, 1. R. 16, 296, 1. Com. D. 563, A. R. 219, Exp. 1 278.
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no title: therefore that moment the right of action accrues
to the assignee. If a right of action cannot be assigned in
now a men's case in action - this right is lost in the
grantor's case can be assigned. 1 H. 167 268 2 H. 21
326 237.

But on a case of warranty the is otherwise: this is a
R. to defend the title. After a case of warranty has
been broken it can't be assigned. But if the grante a
if the assignee is sued he may recover on the warranty
as the grantor for his eviction. 2 F. 115 2 F. 227.

When an action of ejectment or distress is brought in
the grantor, in usual in law, to notify the grantor of the
penalty of the suit. That be ready to sue, defend, & if
a proceeding, is called wrenching. 1 Inst. 141 365.

Just because deeds or deeds of release don't contain these
cases of which I have been treating.

So it becomes that a quiet enjoyment may be held in so
for defect of title & this by an action of grant.

This is I think unprovided in principle - such an action
cannot be maintained according to the 6 8 of bug

2 pages. 9. this case constitutes that R. the this decision
is not to have been shaken by our judges.

If an action is brought in R. & the title obtained, judge is
1 by default or otherwise. If afterwards bound or to
the other by a special plea in bar, or by if our judge
cant go as either of them. The R is different in case of lento-
for lento are not joint. 190. 9. 361 1. 266.
B. N. 208.
Actions on Bank

In note bonds & all cons for the pay of money, the
frequently stipulated to pay the money by instalments.

The subject is treated very confusingly in the books, the
answers from various causes are in the books make
no difference, between different forms of cons as bills
bills, &c.

1. In a bond mulct condition for payt of an aggregate
sum at different times, debt will lie for the first
bond i.e. first installment. This A. is paid down directly
contraary to what B. &c. in the book & in the reports the
A. paid down by bond applicable only to single bill. N. B.
Wills 88. L. 158. 43. B. M. 168.

But if single bill is to given there is no action, till
the last payt is due. 19.8. 49. 10. 60. 141. 143. 27. D. F. 168.

Now the difference is manifest. In a single bill the
debt is an entire indefeasible debt - but in a pronal
bond, by non-performance of the condition, the whole
penalty is imposed at future. But in bond by stat. only
what is due can be recurred on a bond.

Rent may be sued for when a part is payable whether
or it be by a single bill or otherwise.

It differ from a single bill in that there is nothing
due bill after the expiration of the first quarter. It is
to issue from the judgment debtier in future, solvendum
in futuro. 10. 60. 128. 3. 60. 12.

Bond & promissory note fall under a different A. If
one cons to pay an aggregate sum by instalments, an
action of con. will lie when the first in payt is due
but debt would lie after the con. till the last is due
Actions on bonds.

An A. is in the same as to premises rent, &c. ex. v. 118, centro.
ex. v. 175, 360, 227. 1 H. 3, 327, 4 M. 2, 24, 3, &. 16, ex. v. 118, 360, 12.
Salk. 165.

There is a difference between a cont. to pay an aggregate sum by installments, & a cont. to pay a sum by installments without any aggregate sum. In the latter case there are 2 or more distinct debts, consequently debt will lie. Where is no aggregate sum in the case an action will lie to recover the installments, as they become due. 14. 328, 590, ex. v. 118, 366, 807. B. 1, 142.

When a sum is payable by installments, with a clause, that on one, or part of 1, the whole shall become due, the clause is good. Salk. 212.

This is not in the nature of an unremissous conditional. Salk. 212, ex. 1, 807.

You will see that when a cont. is to pay many by
installments, there may be a number of breaches. Now in
a R. of pledg. that in an action of cont. broken, the R. may
allege as many breaches as there have been.

But in case of final bonds the R. is the receiver he
can allege only 1 breach on the premises of the B. &
- because 1 breach enough a postponement of the rebut fully
- more than 1, than would be difficultly. 3. 1/2, 129, Com.

But 1st of pledg. as to final bonds is the same as the
English. R. as to cont. for our it is chance down the bond
to the privity actually sustained. Self, bon.

In any, by soil of 1st & 2nd. the R. may assign an am-
ning breach or be the plea, in case of bonds, so well as
But this at 6. 6. you can allude only to breach, yet this is matter of joint. I can be taken advantage of only by demurrer official. bomb 237, 4. 2a 158.

Who are bound by 2nd.

The first representations of the covenants are always verified in himself. When he is bound, so are they. Bomb. 123. 1 Roll. 544. 2. P. 144.

There is an exception to this 6. where the conveyance is made. Then in case of an of freedom, the others he can not bound to each other. 224. 1. 3. 564. 1. 2. 20. 1. Roll. 38 893. 2. Mod. 262.

But even where the co. is judicious, there is no material difference between the duty of a first representation to perform the contract his liability for a use for performance by the covenantor himself. For his uncertainty can bind. 2. 20. 263.

So also an uncertain sense in fees may at 6. and his heir by a co. Thus if A sold to fees to convey to B. &c. before conveyance is made, the bare of A may be construed to convey to B. 6. the consideration money will generally go to the co. 2. 20. 217. 2. 226.

So also a real co. will bind the heir of the covenantors, thus in the best case that B. died, his heir might have compelled it to convey. Art. 2. 20. 19. 2. 217. 2. 217. 343.

So deeds executed if the co. mean to the land of the grantee designed to continue after the covenants, such
The liability of the assignee on the co. of the assignor,
The assignee of a lease is liable for the breaches during his
possession, tho' not named if the co. runs with the lease.
1. Full 95.

The & A. is that if the thing so men to be done
on the thing about which something is to be done, is in
the same when the co. is interested, the co. is to run
with the land.

If the co. runs with the land the assignee is bound
the not mentioned. Suppose A leases land & building
to B & B assigns the lease now this assignee is bound
the not named. for the buildings are parcel of the
thing demised, if they are not if, when the co. is made
so it runs with the land.

The notice of co. that runs with the land is this-
that the thing to be done is considered to be assigned
to the thing demised & follows it. S. 60. 16. 219. 4. 60. 56,
2. 95. 359.

So also a co. to pay rent during the term is a co. that
runs with the land, for the rent is potentially in
the assignee as just fruit of it. 2. 95. 4. F. 159.
1. 60. 16. 219. 4. 60. 56. 2. 95. 359.

On the other hand, a co. to build a wall do not run
a house on the land dont run with it, if we do not build
the assignee unless he is named. This is a collateral co.
Action or bond

- the wall is not in 
- lie not part of the thing desired.

[Script from page 261]

So also a cov. is to new with the land & it goes to the rear part of the thing desired, but this A supposes the thing to be in use when the cov. is executed. So if the lease cov. to leave 10 many acres unploughed, it new with
the land, I will bind the assignee the rest named.

[Script from page 261]

But when the assignee of the lease is named, an assignee
he must perform all covs. those that then & those that
dont. [Script from page 261]

But to bring a case within this A. the thing agreed
ed to be done must be something, related or annexed to
the thing desired, otherwise it wont bind the assignee
as the he is named. So if the lease cov. to build a beam
or other than the desired land, no assignee wont
be bound the named. This is a collateral cov. i.e. the
act to be done is collateral & cant be assigned. [Script
from page 261]

When the assignee is bound according to the directions
already taken, he is to bound only for rent incurred on
the broken during the lease.

If the cov. is broken by the lease before assignee, the asig-n-
ee is not liable for such breach. the ground of his being
bound, as he is bound at all, is his profit, or by near-
ness of finitude of estate between man & the lease. [Script
from page 261]

The right of action in the lease, in the case above men-
tioned, cant be transferred. & this is a further reason why
the assignee is not liable for the assignee breach.
Actions on bonds.

On the other hand the affergee is not liable at all for any breach of promise after he has assigned—-for which
afferee, new primacy of estate is lost.

Hence if the affergee assigns to a second affergee, even
the same day before rent becomes due, he is not liable for any part of it, for there can be no appropriation
of the rent. 6th. 1. Doug. 93 p. 96. 22. Ral. 21. 1. 1. Stol. 20. 1. 1. Beb. 7. 159 or 139.

The A is the same if the affergee is to a bigger—-if he
not recently color of altrust.

And if he affirms before the rent day, the afferee may
always found in the afferee & moves on that ground, but
this is not in. Holt. 71. 16. 1. 1821. 1. Mont. 58. 10. 1822. 1. 11. 12.

The A is the name of the affergee affergee over to a same
convet. Doug. 939.

The reason of the A, is similar to that of the former
one— when the estate is passed with the affergee is
gone, he is liable on the ground of surety the afferee is
liable on the ground of debt & statute 960. 22.

But if the afferge affergee over to a vagabond & avoid
paying rent, they will come for loan to account for rent
while he was in Secret of lend. 1. Stol. 20. 1. 1. 1. 1. 183.

If an affergee is evicted of part of the lease demanded,
the rent may be of foreclosed even in at of d to also an
action of debt will lie in the original afferge for this
grown out of primacy of estate.

If the afferge is evicted of a part, the afferge cannot main-
tain an action for caw broken—-the wound lies with the
le fee was evicted of the whole. 9. to. 32. 2. Bart. 77.

It has been a moot question in Eng. whether a tenant of sky
com in any instance was an an assignee from assign-
ing to a voguehead. It unsettled I think they can't.
1. Text. 181. 2. 1st. 52. 14.

Thus formerly doubted whether a conv. s t. to assign
during the term was binding on the lease. 1st settled that 1st. 3. 1st. 800. 2nd. 503. 3rd. 4. 226

If he does he is liable for co. broken.

Under this R it has been questioned whether the co.
was broken by the tenant being taken in executio-
by a creditor. It now settled it seems that his not

It is also settled that an under lease for part of the time
don't break it.

So does that he not broken by the lessee owning
such lease. for this is not an actual assignee. 1. 3. 29.
2. 1st. to. 1st. 100. 3. 1st. 233. 2. 46. A. 4. 66.

The lessee always remains liable to the lessor, even after
assignee, when there is an express con. The assignee may
be discharged. The lessee is not liable in an action of
debt after his assignee, for the priority of estate rogue 3. 1. 23.
2. 191. 4. 1st. 38. 1st. 1st. 379. 1. H. 4. 4.

The true A is an action of debt went lie, after the les-
see has acquired in the assignee. I conceive to have the
assignee his tenant lye 3. 33.

But on the other hand the the assignee him, accepts
the assignee as his tenant, still if there is an express con.
he may have an action of ass. broken to the def. for

property of rent, still remaining. 1 Savard 459, 195. 522.

1 Damer 232. B. 6. 188. 1. 148. 649.

But if there is no express ass. by the def. on the part of
the lessee is implied by & only. If the lessor accepts
the lessee's for his tenant, he may maintain any
action on the lessor. He may, if he has not accepted
renew, maintain an action of implied ass. on the lessor.

The implied ass. is founded on privity of estate so
that it can be destroyed by any act of the lessee, but
may by a consequent act of both, or accepting
the lessor as his tenant. 1 Fl. 369. 3. 423. 2. 148. 128.

There are many other ways of accepting him - one is by
taking rent of him. 1. 148. 573.

As many cases the lessee can sue may with a vicin
now where this is the case the lessor must from
his rents or on an express ass. to the lessor, have action
on the lessee. If he may obtain judgment - but then
may be put on execution enforced but for costs. If the
lessee insists upon enforcing both executions, the fnity
agreed may be relieved by an audit of accounts. brew 149.

By a stat. 82 then. the grantees of a lessor has the same
remedy on ass. broken that men with the land as the
lessee himself had at b. b. by the same stat. the lessor
has the same remedy as the lessor grantee, as he had at
b. b. in the lessor only. 1. Cont. 239. 19. 5. 404. 189. 191.

But the grantees of the lessee is liable only for such break
or as happen during the continuance of his title.
There is a distinction between an assignee, & a derivatee or sub tenant. A derivative tenant is one who takes a conveyance of part of the residue of the term.
Plas and Readings

Reading is defined to be the mutual altercation in
the point of fact put into a legal form & set down in
writing, &c. the allegations on one side & the denials on
the other. 9 B. 273, 10 B. 192.

All pleadings in civil actions in this country, as well as
in those cases required to be in writing, antiently,
long they were oral, delived viva voce, if they were
written down by the mathematicians, hence frequently denomina
ted the manual, because by hand. At Sermon.

All pleadings are now to be in the English language.
After the Norman conq. they were in Norman French
until the time of 96 B. 1831 thence to the 36 Geo. III they were
in Latin except in the time of the Parliaments of Crown
well since then they have been in English. Turn
Brad. 29, 3 C. 317, 327.

In Suits at Law, the pleadings are nothing more or
less than written proofs, such facts as constitute the ground
of demand on the one side & the defence on the other.
9 C. 177, 189 Tang. 238.

Dr. Hume says that the substantial rules of pleadings
are those in the meaning & sense of the sussidet & closest logic
case 23, C. 1759.

The great object of files is to favour the claims of the plaintiff
& the defence of the other in such a view as will most fa
cily admit of a just & comprehensive view, & a subordinate
object is to bring the pleadings to a single point & place
the reasoning in the clearest & most advantageous light.
Reading

Reading is a syllogistic proof; every good fit always
a new matter. If every good syllogism contains the ele-
ments of a good syllogism, e. g.

Declaration in trust is a trust in trust and in trust.

The bill of

B. says, in turn, who cares, possibly an any land I have
a right to recover damages, the effect has possible en-

ünst from I have a right to recover of

The first is the major proposition, i.e. an abstract gen-
elal proposition, which the fit under the second is the
minor proposition, containing the facts to which the leg-
gal principle is applied in this particular case. The

construction is an inference of from the application of
the legal principle to the matter of fact stated. The an-

swer may be by denying any of the three proposi-
tions. If it must always be by denying one or more
of them, i.e. it must either deny, the Z, the facts or the
construction, if he denies the legal principle then it is
called a defense; he denies the facts or turn aside,
but denies the Z or winning some those facts to be
in the fit's favor so as to enable him to measure.
The minor proposition is denied by the law of fact, i.e.
by Z or fact. But if both the Z and adverse the

construction can be assumed over by denying new matter,
for, i.e. the answer is, how he can deny because the

construction. A answer is one in something that
does not appear may render him not liable. But if a

answer contains another meaning. What is it? is this
if he an whom land I have崩崩s and fears from
the trust or, as might to recover has power, the fit has

released to me the trust or, then from his right to me
or has ended. Then again the fit has been void of
those propositions, if the first he denies, if the second
then he denies the matter of fact, if the third he must
Reading

To it is alleges that there was matter, by a special
petition, &c. he might shew that the return was ob-
tained by force. Then his evidence would stand thus
—a warrant obtained by force is null—this was obtained
by force—therefore this is void.

The Suit.

The first stage of the suit in King is a mandating
writ directed by lawful authority to the sheriff, the duty
of it being to compel the appearance of the defendant.
But on the return the suit is not commenced until a bill is filed—on thence the bill is the original
suit— the plaintiff being merely introductory.

In the suit from the declaration of the plaintiff— the
suit becomes the foundation of the suit—the suit
is not the first stage of the suit any more than
the declaration. But the suit is not commenced until
a bill is filed—on thence the bill is the original
suit— the plaintiff being merely introductory.

In King the suit begins date in some town the first
in vacation— but it may also was when the writ
was issue for some purpose— as in the case of tender
— or to plead the act of limitations. The suit
commences then the suit begins, the suit to all purposes
till it is sued— as in the case of tender above. In an
injunction A., that the cause of discretion exists at
the time the suit is valid— so in a suit on bond
which is not due till the day after the suit was
Reading

The court of declaration is but an exposition of the

The court of declaration is but an exposition of the

An appeal is frequently mentioned. It is used in N.Y.

An appeal is frequently mentioned. It is used in N.Y.

By in its most limited sense, it is understood of allegation

By in its most limited sense, it is understood of allegation

The court or declaration is but an exposition of the

The court or declaration is but an exposition of the

An appeal is frequently mentioned. It is used in N.Y.

An appeal is frequently mentioned. It is used in N.Y.

The court or declaration is but an exposition of the

The court or declaration is but an exposition of the
in an action of debt.

The next stage of the proceedings, after the court of the debt, is the debt court, and its form is similar to the declaration. 2. Pl. 291. 4. 16.

These forms are both at the debt court. 1. Dilatory plea. 2. Plea to the action. 3. Pl. 301. 4. Bac. 6.

1st Dilatory pleas are such as tend to delay the suit by questioning the mode of seeking relief rather than by questioning the right of relief itself. 3. Pl. 301. Hence if they can well prevent they will destroy that action—the not the right of relief.

Dilatory pleas have been usually divided into six kinds—but I prefer B.'s distinction, which is into three kinds. 1st: As to the jurisdiction of the suit. 2nd: As to the disability of the party. 3rd: As to abatement. 2. Pl. 301. 4. Bac. 35.

As to abatement and distinct from suits to the jurisdiction. 2. Bac. 35.

The form of plea in abatement is different from that of the other two kinds. As is the conclusion. So also is the subject of effect in abatement different to be run they are in dilatory pleas but they are different from the other. 2. Bac. 35.

2nd As to the action are annexed to the merits of the cause—this goes to the merits of the plaintiff's claim. Hence the cause of action entirely, within six points of law in fact. What is a denial in this case? It may be by denying the suit's right of summary, either 1st: by denying the separate option either as to 1st: by fact, or 2nd: by alleging providing them by new matter, or 3rd: by matter of assumed, 1st: by.
alleging what show the truthfulness of the petitioner making the allegations. It does not deny the truth of the allegations, or conflict with them—but goes to show that it is inconsistent for the petitioner to make the present request vig his right of recovery. 3 Bl. 329, C. Lapp. 39. E. 118, 140, 140.

Dear to the action are two golds at the G. fine. To the civil fine in bar 9, Bl. 308.

But the defendant deny the right of recovery, give pug-wug by demurrer—this is sometimes called a plea. But he not as far to an excuse for not pay. It may be taken to the declaration as one of the part of the plea. It has not the form of a plea, for it was the defendant is not bound to make answer therein. But a plea is always in answer to declaration—But this says by your own showing you ought not to recover—so I must answer. 3 Bl. 130, 1. Int. 52

Termumer has sometimes been dished with partial actions—this certainly is misprision—For it may be in answer to any other part of plea, as well as to the declaration—Indeed to receive for to call it a plea to an action. Thus far of the general division of partial demurrer will be treated of by itself.

1. Be applicable to all pleading.

In many cases two things are necessary 1st that the matter be sufficient in 2nd that it be extended according to the form of the answer, in regard of either of these is a defect in the plea. The former is a defect in substance, the latter in substance and form. Generally the former is the object of a demurrer, the latter of fraud. Demurrer, Habt 169, Bown 653.
In order to proceed to state facts, as it may be
conclusions from those facts--you state the conclud-
ing, only to show what use you intend to make of the
principles of law when applied to particular facts i.e. the
reasoning from certain facts stated.

As I observed before is the setting forth such facts as an
ground of the claim or defence of the plaintiff. If the law is
to be applied to those facts by the court from the conclusions
to be drawn from certain facts do not belong to the serious
of the pleading.

In the same of particular law which the said not er
offices take notice such as local customs or any custom
which is not to be an exception. The law by speaking
nor far off neither stating the particular
as matter of fact unknown to the law of the
of Ch. 56.
5. 10. 70.

Subordinate general sub to inform the first
Every action must be direct & positive not ambiguous
true, or by way of recital i.e. he should directly of-
fain the substance of the act. As for instance in an
action of debt, for the defendant to say he affirm that he
can prove that the debt was due him by bond & executed
true, is not good for this being in only evidence of debt
which may be rebutted, but he must allege that he knew
positively that he owed him an bond & otherwise
the debt.

Again suppose in the action of conversion & conversion the
defendant affirm that the debt refused to deliver up the good
this is mere evidence of conversion & things for a bad
plan--he should affirm positively that he had convert-
ed them for the conversion is the gist of the action. By
being direct & positive is amount, that the debt should state
Reading

in direct & positive language, not the ground from which he proceeds furth, but the facts themselves, it must not be
by way of recital - the term of recital is subjoined - so
of the after, if you subjoin the fact and adjoin this is what by way of recital - for the recital is not di-
rect & positive, or else can be found upon it. Just. 208
2 Cor. 55, Rom. 124 3, 1 Cor. 22, 2 Do. 22 2, 1 Pet. 73.

But this has received some dilution - it has been
bodied that the recital following, quia pro quo quis, is
to suit and the like are sufficiently strict & positive affir-
mations on the part of the plaintiff, that he has furnished
his part of the recital &c., but I think it would not be a
sufficient affirmation of a breach of contract on the part
of the defendant. 1 Sam. 113 n. 3, 12 Sam. 13, Rom. 125 6.

The other point is that the part of each party has to be taken
most strongly in the fact that, using it, for each one is fre-
quently stated to make the best of the word case, so if the construction
is to take to the same idea, the one that makes most
the plaintiff is to be taken. Otherwise ambiguity would
always, in some sense, be of Just. 209, Hab. 264, 3, 1 Cor. 2, Rom. 212
174 6.

As a 1st, that each party admits as much of the descrip-
tion of allegations as he does not deny. This is a 2nd instance
of 1 Cor. 3, 1 Cor. 2 73.

Another 3 or 4 or 5, in fully transmissible facts: he must regular-
ly take in the time & place - someone time must always be stated. The
in egregious always to show that time stated in the declara-
tion. This is necessary in every case of venue in local actions - in
transmitting: you by this, it could not be tried but in the
same county: how to add by fiction. When time 3 place
are not transmissible distinctly, it may be included in the
1st clause. Rom. 53 8.
The number quantity on lease of the thing and not what
to truly, except where a mistake in their subject would
would a variance, but if there was no variance, it must
be stated. Thus we see how our declarant, or our assignee, from
in, or in an action of debt, that the debt assumed to pay
as one of 100 $ when there was 90, how he could maintain
for what is stated is one thing, which proves another.
But in an action of quantum meruit or valutation, the former
and not in state for a misstatement in these cases can
work a variance. Then, can be no variance in case of
misstatement except in excess can. Law 42.

But in actions of debt there is no variance, for the evi-
dence must support the declaration. Law 42.

Another law is that even misstatement does not vitiate the
plan, but unreasoning can vitiate all proceedings, or an
action thereafter under title of plans in law. This is very
mention that misstatement, is something wholly foreign
or unnecessary, unreasoning is such contradiction, that one
part of his own plan contradicts or destroys the other. 3 Co. 353.
1 Black. 309. 4 Co. 92. South. 283, 9.

As so in some books that every thing must be pleaded ac-
cording to the legal operation. Law according to the strict
fact, so if one point tenant improve another tenant, this
must be pleaded as a nuisance, for he can't improve him
he being already improved, so if granted by tenant for-
life to another, as in fee, this must be pleaded as a
winding up he can't grant, so if our common, not his
defendant it must be pleaded as a nuisance.

This is because it is not correct as it stands, the in the
most legal sense of it. Yet it may be that there is no in
propriety in it, it according to the strict fact, the
thomson ought to be it away in pleaded as a nuisance.
not it must be. 2 M. Bl. n. Inst. 308. 240. 1 De Ray 404.
1. Bac 104. 263. 1 L R 446.

That which affirms an accident must not be placed. 1 Inst. 308.
1 to 50. n. 6 to 25 a 2 bust. 247.

All该案 circumstances implied in fact, states need not be alleged specially - thus in the assumption and not state that lives by living of them. The subject, we are turning simply living - yet there are many good cases which seem to simply, that it is not good to determine - but there are not judicial decisions. They seem to have been passed without replication. 2 n. 920. 930. 931. 760. 50. 865. 94.

3 If estate in fee simple may be alleged generally - but a particular estate must [be] stated specially - for any estate may be acquired by other means than legal means as by purpure of purchase, but a particular estate count.

8 De Ray 333. Law 82.

Impermanent ornaments, such as another's personal ornaments, as contrasted with the immovable must be found to sustain (the not always) permanence - but an immoveable ornament in a manner not to any consequence. Where an immoveable ornament or value into the cause of action as to make a variation in fact, it must be found. 2 Bl. 466. 640. 9 a. R 446. 2 East. 497. 3. M. 1802.

If the site on either side means power to regularly act by the adverse party's plea or - and it is not subject to otherwise - The proof is cited not on the ground that a judgment over a plea but on the ground of reason. 1 M. Bl. 438. 2 M. 519. East 66. 1 East 193.

But if the fee on the other side in the battle can
The answer, as a matter of fact, is this: the law admits that a man may answer the question whether he has committed an act or not, and that he must answer it, and that he may answer it, in three different ways: by denying, by confessing, and by avoiding. The law is thus: A man who has committed an act must either deny it or confess it, and if he denies it, he must prove the truth of his denial; if he confesses it, he must prove the truth of his confession; and if he avoids it, he must prove the truth of his avoidance.

In the case of assault and battery, in which this happenings more frequently than in any other, he may deny the assault; justify the battery by alleging some one matter of his own—deniers to the wounding.

But to a y. B. that being any one matter is all, either now after the declaration, it must conclude with a remission: if this be ready to remiss. This is nees to give effect to the other B. for if he could conclude to the contrary, he could show an issue in which the other party must not join, if it would be prejudicial to any other matter than denying. Am. 728, 732, 734, 741. Doug. 528.

The first answer is to come from the Y. B. who has then he answers the declaration, he may deny the whole, this if the Y. B. he may plead it in bar of the action, as in every, court, as every, answer to this is confessing of avoiding, or he may answer which is done in bar.
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If the plaintiff in the first place were clear, so also if the

defendants in the first instance were clear, the plaintiff

may recover in the first instance, on his own motion

and without the aid of the defendant's replication, and

the defendant may recover by a replication; to which

the plaintiff may reply by a further replication; and to

which the defendant may reply, unless in a suit

whether no special answer has ever gone farther than this.


In every subsequent stage of the plea, whatever is after-

wards pleaded, the same must afterwards justify

the declaration, or the first plea by answering what is

objected to on the other side. The subsequent plea

must not vary from the defence first set up— a variation is

always called a departure in plea, which is never allowable.

5. Inst. 90. 4. 9. Inst. 91. 4. Dec. 6. 2. Boll. 1449.

This regularly, the judgment of the other party is called

to be moulded upon a view of the whole record. Yabo

judgment, is to be moulded on the party making the first

substantially mistake in plea; then if the plaintiff makes a

false answer, the defendant will not be regarded

by the c. Boll. 179. 200. 4. Inst. 120. 143. 4. Inst. 110. 1. Boll. 179. 1. Saund. 245.

Thus far of the 4. As of Plq. I shall now turn to the

particular subdivisions of part of the

Declaration.

The declaration being the foundation of the suit, must at

ways show all that is essential to the plaintiff's right of action

for he can have nothing that is not alleged in the declar.

ation. For evidence is to know what is alleged in the dele-

ation—each party's proof is to be coincide with the


c. Boll. 179. 1. Inst. 17. 2.
If the declaration admits any material fact to be ill of the
reason the attorney's sufficiency shows he had no right to occu-
tion, the plaintiff have judgment. Thus if the action was on
bond the plaintiff take the debt the day before the bond was
due, he cannot have judgment. The same rule holds as to fact
of the declaration 7. Co. 25, 8. 2. Term. 93. 119, 5. 150. 4, 19
Banc. 19, 42.

In settled however that if the party bound to perform
disable himself from performing, he may be sued for
recovery had before the time specified for performing
arriving. Thus if B engages to repay B. by such action
but before that time expires it. D may recover an
action on A. immediately. But I think this may be
independent and punishable as Mrs. G. for it might
recovery the time have been less. D the time expires B. Co. 26.

Hence you will perceive that the omission of any part
of the action is an inexcusable defect, i.e., by bill,
charge or by verdict.

The gist of the action is the ground of the action, without
which the plaintiff has no right to recover. So in known con-
Revision the taking of refusal to deliver up, but neglects to state a conclusion
he cannot have judgment. 8. 1. 50. 95, 50. 100, 41.

In the law of bill you will find the words insufficiency &
aggravation. By insufficiency is a statement of the main
things in which it took place by way of introduction, this
is frequently necessary in order to understand the principal
matter—aggravation explains itself—whether or this is
the substance of the action. Banc. 66. 9. 10.

Thus far of the gist of the declaration. Then follow.
some particular Rules relating thence. 

but its allegations must be certain - i.e. clear & intelligible.

different degrees of certainty are required in different actions.

the degree to which the utmost certainty is required, certainly
relates to parties, time, place & subject matter. for these
reasons, that the opposite parties may know how to

assume. 2) that a regular issue may be joined & found

for that... it may know how to render judg. & certainty is

required in matters of judgment. aggravation

because they can't be transposed, they are usually,

explained. 3, 2 3, 2, 4, 1, 2

A declaration may be in part for uncertainties &
gave in the matter. 4, 2 4, 2, 3, 2, 4, 1

When a declaration is rectile, advantage is to be taken of
by demurrer, as motion in arrest of judg. if at all, the
the ct. may, & is bound, ex officio to take notice of it. it
can t ordinary by plea in abatement be reached, but mis-

non est to be noticed by plea in abatement, because it

does appear on the face of the declaration. 4, 2, 5

a declaratory verdict cannot, it must be noticed by plea in a-

rectile, 5, 2, 4, 2, 4, 1, 5, 12, 4, 15, 3, 7, 8,
of the state of frauds & havings - this state extended
us now to a P. but a not B. of evidence merely. 6166:38
12 60 240 611 270.

The lttl in any declaration an a deed is not bound to set forth
any more of it than is necessary to enable him to recover.
A deed may contain any number of conveyance jointly or
them be broken nor the iff nor show only the breach. 400
if a deed should contain a provision which would defeat him, he
and not state it, but if lie in the body of the deed if the
a condition precedent it must be stated.

If the facts state that with same a conveyance still
the conveyance must be stated in the deed, except in case of
previous notice of it. "l. lb. 176, Sect. 177.

A affidavit may be either by an official or one can the
suit of the cause of action is more general than it is the
other. 700 in each states a refund - for money had &
received, he might state it generally or he may show
the latter received money to his cost etc. 00 also in an
action for disaffirm, the ittt may declare generally on
divorce his own till. 4, 20, 8.

The finder of a chattel in a deed

The finder of chattel, as a l. P. that whom two or more per-
sons are jointly interested in a sight, they may sought
to join in one action for the violation of it - If this is
the P. and that the action sounds best an court, as in the case
of joint obligors, community v. to joint tenants should join
in an action of trespass, on their joint estate. 1. Sect. 166498
1. Boa. 5 A. 19, 19 2 A. 68.

On the other hand when the right violates is personal or
But the magistrate to join them who ought to have been joined is called a nonsuit. From this it appears that all the credit for our estate ought to join one and one they are all but one office, an inconsideration of the situation there is a greater union between us than otherwise they must be joined whether under age or not. Even if one acts himself to act be must be joined. *D.N.G. 3. 7. 4. 2. 18. 1. Sec. 31. 1."

But the nonsuit is allowable in absentia, only there is no exception to this. As when persons are jointly in
jures happen two persons are wounded at the same time by words, here they can't join in one action, for the injury of one is no injury to the other, though the stakes are separate & distinct - no joint right is violated. So also in a riot, if two persons are beaten by one, they can't
join in an action of battery, each may have a separate action. 3. Co. 1. B. N. 3. 2. Sec. 21. 2. 16. 1. 8. 19.

In the other hand I take the 1 to be a. joinder of
funds, that when the cause of action arises out of the
joint act of two or more, they may be joined in their
But when the cause of action doesn't arise from the joint
action of two or more they can't be joined, because they
can't be joined in action for respecting the same want
at the same time. But if two pairs are publishing a
black, they may be joined, for in the act is joint 2. 17.
* 7. 8. 2. B. N. 3. 2. Sec. 16. 1. 197. 1. 86. 10. 8. 19.

If two or more persons execute a joint bond, they must be joined Vind. It together. For if they make a joint promissory
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in note. You must of course the party be joined. If two or more joint in committing breach, they may or they may not be joined—how all or any of them may be joined as. But if in the action—so you may two or more persons be joined for malicious prosecution. Bac. 68. H. L. C. H. 38.

And according to distinctions later you will perceive that two persons must be sued for distinct acts of wrong committed severally. Bac. 13. 4. Bac. 10. 2. Burn. 28.

If there are two or more joint obligations, commences an universal, and of them decease, the estate of the second cannot join the survivor in suing on that estate. He succeeds him as the heir and he must account to the estate he is a trustee to him. So also in the last survivor has the sole right to sue, it survives to his executors. He must account to the other estate. Bac. 4. 3. 4. 1. 3. 3. 9.

As it stands. If two or more persons make a joint contract, they must all be joined in any action brought on that contract. Bac. 69. 2. Bac. 69. 2. Burn. 52.

But if two persons have themselves jointly, normally so that is all must be sued, but more than one half that all are not liable to be sued. i.e. two of them are not liable—two of two court be considered as either joint or several. Bac. 69. 2. 2. 2. 6. 2. 3. 2. 2.

And I would here observe that if two or more kind themselves by one contract, the court is joint of course in the terms of it equally a personal duty or obligation, so our parties to pay, implies the same as our parties for two to pay. As words jointly normally make it joint, personal court. Bac. 69. 2. 6. 2. 4. 18. 23. 2. 23.
If there are several parties, one of them dies, his estate is not liable at law to be sued, but his personal estate is subject to the remaining parties in the action. 1 East 366.

Thus far of.judges and non-judges. If several causes of action are in one declaration, between the same parties, and all those parties are joined in the same action, of the same nature, this is a vague R. By causes of action of the same nature, one meant those of similar law. This R is not well-explained, born. 1 id. Action. 4 Boc. 11.

What is meant by causes of action of the same nature, is what is to be causing, which requires the same judge at lib. there are to be within the R. If may be joined, the cause by the rest are universal R. 1 id. lib. bon. 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 1366.

This debt one bond debtor on some may be joined in one declaration, making two causes, then one of the same nature. But the R is here same is different. Each debt on bond on judge is an entire court may all be joined in the same debt. Being similarly, the the one would be different in all the others, the judge would be must not more on bond now at for times. 4 id. debt lib. Deb. 201, 202, 203, 204, 205, 206, 207, 208, 209, 210.

Now in these cases, the judge at lib. would be the same, for the rest R. was not universal, but the universally true, that if several causes of action require the same judge at lib. & the same be given, then they may be joined. So the leads may be said what is over Deb. 26. 27. 28.
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I find it has been questioned in some books whether an action of seduction can be joined with an action of battery. I see no objection to joining these—they are trespasses both having the same issue. [Deane v. Tidd.]

Several trespasses may be joined in the same suit, when they are committed with force. For have the force on the same, which is a capias at h. k. an assault & battery quam clarense sont. [The same case.]

So also in many cases, where the force is different & the judge is the same—two causes of action may be joined in one action: thus, if action may be joined in another: the & force is the same—so does not an bond or loan or grant may be joined. [Bar. M. 210, 224, 2. Bl. 3. 351.]

So also in many cases, where the force is different & the judge is the same—two causes of action may be joined in one action: thus, if action may be joined in another: the & force is the same—so does not an bond or loan or grant may be joined. [Bar. M. 210, 224, 2. Bl. 3. 351.]

So also in many cases, where the force is different & the judge is the same—two causes of action may be joined in one action: thus, if action may be joined in another: the & force is the same—so does not an bond or loan or grant may be joined. [Bar. M. 210, 224, 2. Bl. 3. 351.]

So also in many cases, where the force is different & the judge is the same—two causes of action may be joined in one action: thus, if action may be joined in another: the & force is the same—so does not an bond or loan or grant may be joined. [Bar. M. 210, 224, 2. Bl. 3. 351.]

So also in many cases, where the force is different & the judge is the same—two causes of action may be joined in one action: thus, if action may be joined in another: the & force is the same—so does not an bond or loan or grant may be joined. [Bar. M. 210, 224, 2. Bl. 3. 351.]

So also in many cases, where the force is different & the judge is the same—two causes of action may be joined in one action: thus, if action may be joined in another: the & force is the same—so does not an bond or loan or grant may be joined. [Bar. M. 210, 224, 2. Bl. 3. 351.]

So also in many cases, where the force is different & the judge is the same—two causes of action may be joined in one action: thus, if action may be joined in another: the & force is the same—so does not an bond or loan or grant may be joined. [Bar. M. 210, 224, 2. Bl. 3. 351.]

So also in many cases, where the force is different & the judge is the same—two causes of action may be joined in one action: thus, if action may be joined in another: the & force is the same—so does not an bond or loan or grant may be joined. [Bar. M. 210, 224, 2. Bl. 3. 351.]

So also in many cases, where the force is different & the judge is the same—two causes of action may be joined in one action: thus, if action may be joined in another: the & force is the same—so does not an bond or loan or grant may be joined. [Bar. M. 210, 224, 2. Bl. 3. 351.]

So also in many cases, where the force is different & the judge is the same—two causes of action may be joined in one action: thus, if action may be joined in another: the & force is the same—so does not an bond or loan or grant may be joined. [Bar. M. 210, 224, 2. Bl. 3. 351.]

So also in many cases, where the force is different & the judge is the same—two causes of action may be joined in one action: thus, if action may be joined in another: the & force is the same—so does not an bond or loan or grant may be joined. [Bar. M. 210, 224, 2. Bl. 3. 351.]

So also in many cases, where the force is different & the judge is the same—two causes of action may be joined in one action: thus, if action may be joined in another: the & force is the same—so does not an bond or loan or grant may be joined. [Bar. M. 210, 224, 2. Bl. 3. 351.]

So also in many cases, where the force is different & the judge is the same—two causes of action may be joined in one action: thus, if action may be joined in another: the & force is the same—so does not an bond or loan or grant may be joined. [Bar. M. 210, 224, 2. Bl. 3. 351.]

So also in many cases, where the force is different & the judge is the same—two causes of action may be joined in one action: thus, if action may be joined in another: the & force is the same—so does not an bond or loan or grant may be joined. [Bar. M. 210, 224, 2. Bl. 3. 351.]

But when it is to that mutual cause of action of the same nature that may be joined to the understand that they shall occur it, if done and pay in the same right, for if they occur in different right, they cannot be joined to the two parties in the same. So extrinsic joyn money had been to his arm un as rate of other money had been in his arm private capacity, for he then run in two distinct characters, and in this case there can be but one judge—his cannot be known how much he sues for the different rights thus the same are of two different.
Next consider what causes of action can be joined in the same court for him, the judge and jury are different. 

The case of trespass on the case of assuaging ex delicto, as joined, so as to make the same subject of inquiry. For committing the cause to be joined, much more, the cause of assuaging ex delicto cannot be joined. Thus, a slanderer cannot be joined with a malicious prosecution, nor can he. The judge and jury are different, in the former to a case, with the latter to a misdemeanour.

For an action assuaging ex delicto cannot be joined with a court ordinary in court. So, too, if any matter can be joined to. I.e., the same subject of inquiry, whether committed with or without force, can be joined with a court ordinary in court. 

Now, where he joined the judge is the same. If they are both joined in court, the cause of action of account cannot be joined with any other action, because of the distinctness of the proceedings. For in every action of account, there must be a regular judge. If the judge is quid pro quo, if the judge is to account for his actions, then the judge is to account. The judge is to account for his actions.

Perhaps, account may be joined with an action of debt, or debt. I think it is for a sum as an action of debt, or debt may or may not go before an auditor, the judge may or may go before them.

The distinction is this, when the judge and jury are
the same in both or all the actions, they may unneces-
sarily be joined in one suit, the in different courts.

2. In many cases where the issue is different, they
may be joined if the judges are the same. This 3. however
is not universal. 4. This can be only learnt from exam-
pling them is underlining the distinction. The case for
seem to involve all the same issues. In the other hand
when the facts are different, they never can be joined-
a fortress if by issue 5. judges are different.

Different causes of action can me joined than can be
no remedy to one scheme defect. It the that may be
worse, as but the suit go a warrant the judge North. 6.9
Rev. 92 44; 37 108.

A misjoinder of causes of action is totally different
from what is called duplicity. By misjoinder is meant
the joining in one suit of such causes of action amount to
joined. Duplicity is a defect in form.

Why misjoinder is inexcusable is, because there are both
or judge in this action for a misjoinder would require
two different points on the different counts but there can
be but one judge on the same action. Yet there is a ma-
terial difference to be observed where there are two can-
of action and but one cause of action accompanied with
aggravation than in an action of trespass, grant for
breaking house, destroying goods. Heating his own
how is but one cause of action the breaking the house
the gist of the action the destroying the goods. Heating
the same issue matter of aggravation but a continua-
tion of the same injury at once. The the breaking the
house & heating the 2. are the grounds of two separate
actions that cannot be joined, yet he may say the heating
of the 2. by the amnorinted damages with a purpose
means by way of aggravation that there are not 2.
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reap action joined a present that of the defendant's will make the whole of them in no measure except by a record assignment for the loss of service. I do 1822. Code 114 2 263 2 761 6 332 32 333.

Without a fair good there can be no measure of loss of service. The party may join the several causes of action in one decree, tho he is not obliged to do it. In no fault that he has not joined them—when there are several acts to seek for the same value, to seek for the whole to compare the whole to pass them into one decree. They will not set off if there are two different grounds of offence or different rights to or on the party—they render this constitution to two courts. Code 114 2 263 2 761 6 332 32 333.

When there is a misjoinder the party may claim the right of entering a new process against one count as part of the whole. The whole decree is destroyed. He may recover into a new process against the whole. 14 332 32 333.

Miscellaneous Rules

The party must agree with the want for this is the ground of all the subsequent proceeding—of this is a variance to the same as a decree without a want, which is an

When the want of action accrues upon the performance of a condition precedent, the party must show such performance or he shows no right of action. If this is an act of renunciation or an inconvenience. Code 114 2 263 2 761 6 332 32 333.

But when the want of action is qualified by something subsequent, such condition be need not show the method of defence to the party. The party should it is in matters
But it is the duty of every one to put down all that he has been doing in the best way possible. It is not enough to say, 'I did my best.' It is necessary to show that you have really tried your utmost. When the letter is written, the postman will be the person to receive it. The postman will then deliver it to the person for whom it is intended. He will take it to the person's address and leave it there. Then the person can read it and decide what to do with it. It is the duty of every person to receive and answer the letters that are sent to them. It is also the duty of every person to write letters and send them to others. It is important to do this so that people can keep in touch with each other and keep up with the news and events of their lives.
If the jury and greater damages than the plaintiff demand, he may have the whole damages, but he is not under the necessity of doing this for the plaintiff may have judgment for what he demanded only.

1745, 4 Bla. 182, 2 Bla. 299, 3 Gall. 781

And so if the plaintiff should demand more than he has a right to recover, if the jury demand more than he has a right to recover, he may have the excess, but he is not under the necessity of doing this for the plaintiff may have judgment for the excess, or they may have judgment for the excess as they are bound to give the defendant.

1745, 4 Bla. 182, 2 Bla. 299, 3 Gall. 781

If the debt is insufficient in form to render it void, it is insufficient in substance because the debt is insufficient in form to render it void, and the plaintiff has a right to recover in the debt, even if it is insufficient in form to render it void.

...of foundation, namely to delay the action—then deal with the ground of the action, nor apply in the last to the merits of the cause. 3. Dec. 363.

In king's case of Ann v. Selby et al., the court held that the question of the plaintiff's right to recover under the Act of 1792 was not before the court, and that the action was barred by the statute of limitations.

So also when a case comes out of the jurisdiction of a court of limited jurisdiction the plea may take the jurisdiction of the court, 100. 5th, 483. 5th, 584. 2, 483. 107.

But the jurisdiction of aliens holds only where he is sued in his own name, not in their cases where he is sued in the name of another as in the name of another person as a trustee, as when he is sued with another person who is not alien.

Now in an action not cognizable by the court of which he is an alien or foreigner. As in the case of real actions in king, which are not cognizable by the court, 100. 5th, 584. 2, 483. 107.

But where a case has jurisdiction on the 5th of 1. Then it cannot be presented to the jurisdiction that the cause of action arose in a foreign country, if the action is a testamentary one, and otherwise it is a local one. Real, criminal, personal actions are local. And actions such as gifts, leases, and actions for personal injuries, and in any eventuality, the cause of action arose in...
Every sovereign state is as to every other sovereign state a foreign state. As to all municipal regulations, it is to ban as much a sovereign state as another. No criminal can be punished in one, from a crime committed in eXt. One has no criminal or penal action to be instituted in one which cannot in c. y. but boundary actions may.

Another plea to the jurisdiction is the fact that the et has not recognized of the subject matter—i.e. he made not filed for the infringement, etc. as in j. d. the et can recover in eXt. The et can recover in eXt. because one can recover in eXt. No et can recover a criminal for one 10 eXt. 6th 13th 73d 80th 35th 9th.

A plea to the jurisdiction is the fact in the cause of p.s. because he is to be married by p.s. and this is not always the case, as in those cases when the et has no jurisdiction over the subject matter. P.s. 13th 35th 80th 16th. E. T. A. T. F.

According to the English practice the plea to the jurisdiction must be by the party, i.e. by his attorney for the attorney is to get here of the et to place. I.e. asking before we are known the jurisdiction of the et. 6th 16th 6th.

But this is not the case in Iowa. This plea to jurisdiction to the jurisdiction of the et i.e. whether the et will have jurisdiction of the case. 6th 13th 9th 16th. 80th 9th.

Iowa formerly the case the not now in Iowa, that is if the case was dismissed on a plea to the jurisdiction by the et that the et would take the plea with the et’s costs but if he refused to issue the et, they did not take the costs, but the taxing costs in both without a reason. the previous plea
Doing this was to furnish the theft for bringing in suit of the theft to summarize for his columns; but this must be done by another prosecution, which taking into account cannot ought not to prevent.

2d b)blah of defacing places according to my destruction of them are places to the disability of the theft in his disability for some course to maintain the action. True cause of disability arenam... The first of them is outlaying - this is unknown in law the tie in full force in some of the states as N.B. outlaying enables the theft to maintain any civil action in his own right till the nature of outlaying is removed. An outland is one out of the protection of it to maintaining any civil action for injuries done to his body but not for injuries done to his person or character for he may maintain an action for battery, wounding or slander. 3. Ba. 1612. Litt. text. 171. 1. Stat. 128. 1. Ba. 2.

Outlaying when it takes place after the right of action accrues, don't about the suit till a temporary right is made till the outlaying is removed. The theft must then plead to the suit. But of the outlaying takes place before the right of action accrues, the theft of outlaying actually destroys the suit. Yet suit in commences at once after the outlaying is removed. 12 Mc. 608. 5. Ba. 98. Laws 202. 9.

This disability of outlaying extends only to such actions as are brought in the theft's own right not to those in behalf of another as raleigh outlaying the right of others would be unfinancial as no other person can bring an action in such right, while the outlaying exists that capacity. 1. Stat. 128. 1. Ba. 162.

But on the other hand, the outlaying of the testamentary intestate may be plead in abatement for an action brought
Reading
by his order an action for the recovery of the person in whose right the
action is brought, but no right to maintain it as against an
assignee of the heir a right to maintain it
in that right. 1 Barn. Dig. 6

But the son outlaws cannot maintain an action in
such a case for the outlawry is intended to punish
him if not to afford him an immunity. 4 Mea. 761. Nay!

Outlawry may always be pleaded as a dilatory plea. Know-
ing this not always it may be pleaded in bar of the action.
The 3. is that when the cause of action itself is founded
in an outlawry for felony, the outlawry may be plea-
ded in bar, because all the Pitt's cases, bailiffs cases, are
perpetrators of the king, hence the Pitt's has no right to plead
not on the ground of the outlawry, but because they
are men of his. But in this case the outlawry may
be pleaded as a dilatory plea. 6 Co. 1037. 6 Co. 27. 1 Hen. 2. 22. 128.

But where the cause of action is not founded in the outlawry
of the Pitts can't be plead in bar, but only as a dilatory
plea. So outlawry for a crime about of felony would, a
perdition of landed goods, chattels, &c. Hence is not plead-
able in bar. So where an outlaw was for an Act of taking
slavery, malicious prosecution &c. any injury to this
person on character, his outlawry, could be pleaded in bar
but to his disability, for those rights can not found the plea
to the action. Dilatory plea could be pleaded for those new
purposes i.e. this same matter can't be pleaded again for a

The next disability is excommunication, but this
is not unknown. 1. Oct. 1314. 5. Co. 3. 2. Ba. 311.
Excommunication don't abort the suit, abolition of the
duly gave special remedy to afford as a Use of excommuni-
cation. 3. Co. 96. 2. Ba. 320. 1. Oct. 139.
Another ground of disability is aliance. This is new. All cases of a personal disability, this is new. An alien, unless that an alien friend can maintain an action, can maintain the action. C. P. 21. 4. 1. 4. 1951. 2. 4. 1. 16. 2. 1. 3. 8. 301.

An alien, unless that an alien friend can maintain an action, can maintain the action. C. P. 21. 4. 1. 4. 1951. 2. 4. 1. 16. 2. 1. 3. 8. 301.

This is a j. that not a universal. It is settled in this, that he may maintain an action on a reason. Did. W. 219. 359.

And also if an alien enemy without a person, can have a licit as a justification, to serve him under a great, he may maintain a personal action. C. P. 21. 4. 1. 4. 1951. 2. 4. 1. 16. 2. 1. 3. 8. 301.

Is settled whether an alien enemy without a reason, can maintain an action, in the right of another. C. P. 21. 4. 1. 4. 1951. 2. 4. 1. 16. 2. 1. 3. 8. 301.

One of two things seem to be clear, either he ought not to be allowed to maintain the character of agent for another or he ought to be allowed to avoid himself of it. An alien friend may maintain an action for chattels, real in the right of another. C. P. 21. 4. 1. 4. 1951.

The next disability is coram voce. This a W. basis without joining him to the disability may be pleaded, but not if he joins him to the basis of the action. C. P. 21. 4. 1. 4. 1951. 2. 4. 1. 301.

But coram voce says D. H. 1951. 2. 4. 1. 16. 2. 1. 3. 8. 301.

I. D. H. 1951. 2. 4. 1. 16. 2. 1. 3. 8. 301.

So a j. that not a universal. It that sub judice can be taken advantage of as a dilatory plea, can be pleaded on any subsequent stage of the proceedings. C. P. 21. 4. 1. 4. 1951.
Reading

In a 6th Edn that if a woman marries, binding the
not brought in his own name, the not shall abide until
so in view 1. Pt. 34, 4. Pt. 39.

If the fictitious is an infant under 7 without guardian or next
friend, to transfer to his disability. For in case the hurt by
1. Pt. 42.

And lastly in pleading to the disability of the fictitious
he is not in rep. So if an action is brought in the name
of a fictitious person, then plea may be made 2. Pt. 301. Park
P. Pt. 54, Laws 104.

Reus to the disability of the fictitious, conclude to the person of
the fictitious. Now "wherefore the person who is not self
ought to be annull" this is the more when the disability
is a humenual infraction. But when the infraction is
imposed on an outlaw or excommunicated person, he
knows that the fictitious may remain without duly like the
infraction is removed. 2. Pt. 303, Laws 103, 1.

2nd Kind of dilatory, there are pleas in abatement, the word
abatement is a notice, involution or demission, as in case
of nuisance or misnomer, so to abate a suit is to abolish
it. 1. Pt. 42.

Here an abatement generally extends to the suit only, as
that in the court or suit are to be attacked in a differ
ent manner. our by plea to the action, as if the defect
appears when the face of it by demurrer 2. Pt. 301. 1. Pt. 42.
2. Pt. 42. 4. Pt. 39.

In long there is no difficulty in distinguishing the suit
from the debt, for they are separable. But in 6th Edn they
are one joint indictment, then the suit consists of that
part of the record which presents the statement of the
causes of action the debt lies in with the second where
the suit attacks V. W. of suit with demurrer dan-
Reading

ago, if then the suit commences again, will it fail not in the suit, etc. The suit contains that part, entitled to the
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sum, and missing the declaration that brought which states the cause of action demanded damages.

But this is generally, yet not universally true, that the
idea of abatement can reach the debt - a plea which goes to
the suit is always a plea in abatement but a plea in
abatement does not always go to the suit. So numerous is good ground for
the plea, if there is no debt. So also where there is
a variance between the suit and the plea of abatement
in the former plea - the I think that the plea in this
case goes in as a substitute for the suit.

Levi 26, 181.

In case to the court, frequently to take advantage by plea
in abatement of a variance between an instrument declared upon and its description in the debt. In this
advantage is usually taken by bringing a new suit on the
same suit if there by discovering the objection to it in evidence
that may also overcome it.

Thus in abatement can always be made by judge, clear -
given as obvious plea, because the debt goes to the suit at the
case, but only to delay the putting off his suit I find him to another
action. I try a B. that the suit in abatement in a plea of a-
abatement is fatal to it, they are not good against the act.


The causes of grounds of abatement are either extrinsic or in-
terior. The causes may be in the suit itself or extrinsic
as in the service of St. 1st cause of abatement is that of
misnomer. A suit of addition. Misnomer of which is
ground of abatement whether the mistake is in the suit or
the list. 9, 125, 8, 9, Part 163.
Reading

So also a suit of the date addition is in lieu of a cause of action; by this amount a description of that added to
his name, in his title, degree, place of residence, these are in
order to make it more certain. There are particularly required by act 1st Geo. V. 9. Bl. 906. March 16, Dec. 6, 1934.

The et of Roy are not so particular as to the name of a
Deed or the cause in law. In Roy too insufficient to describe the
Deed by one of his titles the he has reason. Laws 106.

The state of the suit, to prove actions absolute & indict
ments. If suit to real actions you in them you describe the
Deed in which he is in favor. If their insufficiently con-

A mistake in Roy; addition is pliable in action as well as

In Roy the only addition necessary is the date, title of
above i.e. cause, we add to title when a Deed is made
in his private character

The place of above is more necessary, because in all trans-
actions, the action must be brought in that coun-
ty where either the filter or effect lies.

But when one is sued in his official as civil capacity
his official as civil character as till recent laws,
for this is insufficient to the action. If this is necessary
to show the weight of action, must you certainly of
description. To show such if its real for a neglect of duty.
If his official character must be added. So too if amici
to send as their extra an action. Earl. 902. 2. Weeks 85. 9. Dec. 620.

But when action by way of indemnity or supremacy to
new negligence or fault initiate the suit. So if an action
should be brought in a suit addition that he is done of
—now if he is not done of B to of no consequence Nor will
not initiate the suit. Law 16 133.
But a misnomer as want of addition must not be made of a misnomer, as want of addition respecting one of two objects, is not plausible in a suit, as the other object he can take advantage of it as a misnomer, the wrong can on the score of variance, for the other misnomer may be well admitted as a misnomer, for in civil actions, 3. Co. 61 s. 2. Do. 36.

2. Holt. 172

In question whether of a suit for a misnomer is abated as to one of severaldefendants to the other, and the question in this generally stated, I think, it can have no decision, for it makes no distinction whether the cause of action is joint or several. If however the cause of action is joint, the suit abates as to one. I think it must abate as to the others, for one can't be sued alone, and this is the same as a misnomer of two joint defendants, but when the cause of action is joint, and several is more usual, I see no reason why it should abate as to all if it abates as to one. But there is no decision as to this point. 4th. 36. 66. 515. 8. Cr. 63.

That which makes a misnomer as want of addition must gain the suit, a better writ i.e. he must not found his right name or right addition, that he may not sue again. After A. is generally true as to all a

But great particularity is necessary as to this idea of the misnomer, the other must not only state his true name, but must mention the name by which he was called as the joint writ. Will. 55.

But he must also state that he was known by another as his true name, at the time of making out the joint writ. Beau. 114. 252. 5. New 957. Sack. 5.
Reading

And if the defendant's true name be not
found in any record or document which he holds as his own,
and he sues in his own name, he shall be adjudged to be in
bad faith. For, by calling himself in the future, the
defendant, it appears, that this is the true name. He should
not have done thus. For now he is in the false name and is suit
by the name of A. B. When sued, the second party

This ground of abatement, i.e. argument of duality, must be taken advantage of, by
suit in abatement or bill of duty. — And to avoid by suit once in which 135, Salk.
3 R. 629, 6 T.R. 766, Court 188.

If one executes an instrument by a wrong name, such
action is brought on such instrument, he must bring
such action by the true name, and not name the
under his name. Now I think this is not the proper
way. I think it should be sued by the true name. But
alleges that he signed the instrument by a wrong
name; this is called a night, i.e., should say the night
way. 121, 13, 14, R. 610, Report 216.

This formerly thought that a mistake in the \textit{abate}
Christian name was not ground of abatement, but a
mistake in name is now on the same footing as a mistake in
the true name. 10, 168.

When true or wrong persons are to be sued, must conduct
their true proper names, naming the firm of a company
is not sufficient as shown to 6 T.R. 298.

But as to corporations, the \textit{Abate} is otherwise, they are to be sued
by their corporate names. 165.

In order to signify for the \textit{Abate} the rule of security to
take advantage of a wrong name, you, if the defendant
afterwards sue for the same cause of action, he may plead the former
Reading

meaning in bar, the trees had in a wrong name. 1318

I mention of just is ground for the plea in abatement, but
a specialization that he is known, stated by that name, as
well as the other is good. 1 East 537. I born 52.

But a wrong addition given to the just, can it be plea-
d in abatement it cannot except as at law for the just is sufficiently
known by his appearing (being at). 1318

The statute as to addition must extend to the just. Show 541.

As soon as mistake as to the just's place of abode is good reason
for abatement at law but, mention was not judicious in abate-
to an indictment for felony, but now by the statute of the mis-
mention may be pleaded in abatement to all indictment. 2 How. 167
1 Hale 432. 2 Cke. 40. 4 Dec. 31.

2d. The second cause of abatement is coming of just. just's coming
in a case for a dilatory plea. 1 Just. 132. 1 Cke. 168.

But if a just ept in mind of finding the suit remain-
will not abate the suit, for otherwise, she could by his
own act abate the suit. 130. 1315. 1 East. 537. 19th. 1838. 1 Dec. 10.

But if a just cannot avoid himself of the suit,
turns in mind alone, she must plead it in abatement if not in bar
for, unless she pleads it in abatement, the remain all inexcus-
for it is denied by foregoing. Lat. 25. 5. 13 39.

As to in some of the book that coming may be pleaded
otherwise than in abatement, at any stage of the proceeding,
but to clear she can't do this. If, when to of that coming
may be pleaded in bar, as under a ground of error himself.
that the suit may do this, for she can't he may appear
3rd. — There must be any stage of the proceedings, if it appear that the parties to the suit have a right of action. If claim of the latter be defeated by her negligence, the suit may be maintained. 

This suit of error cannot be maintained but at the suit of both parties. See St. Ch. 16, 19.

And if that part of the suit was not such as to make it a cause of abatement, but that it is not sufficient for abatement of a cause as his suit in many cases, so if a suit be with another, his suit is not such to cause the defendant to sue again, nor if the cause thereon without his consent, he is liable for them, the republication of many sufficient. Laws. 105.

If an infant be suit, without summons, he being a minor, there is no cause of abatement, but the suit will allow him to summons in the same as he has. If he was not will appear, and so then, if he may be done by any other who have his suit, and he shall be done by any other for whom he is sued, Namely the cause on the suit's suggestion. 1. Sect. 89, 135.

If an infant in suit, or an allocation of his ancestors, or an infant is suit to be heard in, will never be a cause of abatement. But the suit shall remain i.e. the cause shall remain undisturbed and will be recover of age. 1. Sect. 89, 135. Laws. 105.

3rd. — The next case of abatement is the death of parties to the suit according to the 6th s. 6 of 18th cent. if death doth not defeat the suit, the action. Ibid. Part. 19, 10. 60, 194, 210, 252, 187, 32.

The death is the cause if one of natural fits, and preceding the suit was to trust in the case of personal actions, unless there was a reasonable ignorance. This monopoly ignorance is unknown to the law. But in such action, there is no exception 10. 60, 143, 6, 26. 1, 180, 44.
But if one of several defendants dies after verdict but before judge, judge might be reinstated. May 43d.

But if one of several defendants dies during the suit, the suit at law is not abated, but that the suit should make an issue of such a cause that if it proceed in the survivor, 2 Vero. 242, 1 Shaw 156. 2 Shaw 151.

But if in the above case the judge should take a fee until the judge should be a non resident. If I would avert that a defendant is always a non-resident, except in case of a non-resident, judgment is not called in when a cause has been tried and ready to be heard, judgment should be made upon it. If at a point there shall be a non-resident to continue the suit, then the defendant should be ready to move in the survivor, the suit might be renewed upon it. If at a point there shall be a non-resident at the next term, but in this case it does appear on the record, that it was read and after the death of the non-resident, he enters an instrument, bearing, 149. 1 Mass. 57.

There are the rules of the b. b. that if a suit shall be 12. 20. 22d N. 8. 49. The 20th. If by our statutes, there be no inconvenience of statute in a great majority of cases. So that many cases there is no statute. If there are several fees, it will not be stated, and the suit, it must abide an issue of action as such a cause which would remain in the survivor. To show if there are two that one of them dies pursuing the suit, it shall not abide if the cause of action is such as would remain in the survivor. If the other case the death having been made on the second, the suit shall proceed 5 Dam. 42. 130. 18. 1 Shaw 15. Stat. 20. 22.

But the course of proceeding in these cases is very different of a non-resident, where the action shall be resumed on the estate of the estate of the estate of the estate, the estate of the estate, and which is the death of the original estate on the second proceeds with the suit. But of a non-resident, where the action would remain as before.
On att. to the offer, the Jt. must take out for a sum ex a deed, requiring them to share some living; judge should not go on.

Real actions become abate on most cases on the death of the pet or Jt. The law to where the estate descends is not new, but in the same situation with an estate in debt by suit.

But if a real action is brought by several Jtfs, as none will.

If one dies, then remains to the remainder, the same as a personal action, etc. 1 117. 1 Lees. 131.

Another cause of abate is what is called a variances.

By this, means a difference between two things that shall require to be alike. 2 83.

And if the owner varies from the suit, to pleadable as an abate. The truth is it is the act to abate, the suit. 1 117. 149. 2 83.

If the variance is some matter of form, abate is clearly unfair. But if it is some matter that if by its substance, is not necessary, such as to judge may he waived if the act is found to amount to error, etc. But this is not according to the present fiction, to usual to plead in a bolt, but whether, the variance in is form or substance.

1 322. 3 83. 2 492. 131. 186. 776.

Continue 2 83. 3 668. 4 668. 5 83. 6 792.

So also a variance between two instruments and upon its demission, in the suit is good cause of abate. 6 281. 2 121. 131. 2 282. 1 97. 391. 1 83. 1 762. 1 762. 762. 1 762.

When there is a variance between the instruments, and upon the description of it, as the act, the usual method of

Eng. is be able to take advantage of it. Judges, under 5 1 762. 6 762. 6 762. 1 668. 7 1 762. 5 762. 6 762. 7 1 762.
Reeding

There may be a variance where the cont in a verbal and
new advantage must be taken of it under the same
place of abat, for you will sway eyes of the contract

In case where there is a variance between it and the agent, it may take advantage of
by plea of abat. If the same may be done in bug. But
where there is a variance between a written instrument
and the thing, it may be taken advantage of in such
manner. By plea of abat. I knew the 2nd by ordering
to it to the jury. By preying upon writing it an second
removing to it 3rd or earthly thing one treat may show
to the evidence, i.e. write, the brokers state the fact. I therefor
the instrument is not sufficient in it. I knew not that
the same may be suppressed from the consideration of it.


I knew not that a variance as such could be taken advan-
tage of only by plea in abat, but it may be taken advan-
tage of as a variance in any of the ensuing cases. 1 M. 2
686. 4. 50. 619.
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Another cause of abat is the misjudgement or nonjudg-
ment in a suit. If the parties required to be
j aint are not joined, or if there is a misjudgement of them
it is a cause of abat.

The distinction as to merits joins are very impor-
tant. If one was alone when others aught to be joined
the nonjoinder is always pleaded in abat. So if one
of his joint heirs or tenants in common or one of five or
more joint obligors, or contractors, or premises, are
alone to always pleaded in abat. This R. applies to
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On the other hand if several joint join where the
night of action is only in one, his plaintiff, in abat

Thus for the misjoinder of facts may be plead

But then are some cases where the misjo

in case of court if one suit alone where another ought
to be joined with him, the other may take advan
tage of it under the l.i pone. So also if there is a misjo

do the other may take advantage of it under the l.i pone.

In these two cases the other is under no necessity to
file in abat. The he may do it, for he the out de
cends upon is not the sue fiends. It would seem that
according to the late decisions if one returns in bride
without the name being from the paper, but still receiv
from the proceeds, is not void in an action brought
by the company, still no advantage can be taken in the
misjoinder. 1 Cor. A. 468.

Again if in an action of court, one suit alone where oth
ers ought to be joined, i.e. where it appears on the death
that others ought to be joined, the actio is not to be
voided by verdict. If in a suit the court he
may prove age of it, writ it to division to it 2. B. 85. 235.

But in suit there is no such thing as variatio. So if
one of two joint tenants sue another person in bunk of
for entering on the land of the joint tenants, he can't
take advantage of it under the l.i pone but only in a plea
of abat. One this reason of this is that the evidence will
test support the death. In the case of court it now then.
Again if true one when the right of action is in one only, advantage of it may be taken under the law, the same as in the case of rent. If the reason is the debt has not committed a breach on their true faith, then you will remark in the case of two or more itself, if one receives all must, judge cannot be rendered for one & in another. But in case of both, judge may be rendered even & not in another. E.g. 158 188a 266.

If one part owns of past debts, none in an action may be taken for his share of the damage, if the debt and debt wi abate the non-juror of the other owner, but sufficient to go in here. Afterward, the other part owns for his part of the damage, the debt can be allowed to plead in abatement the non-juror of the other who in swearing the non-juror in the first action he can't plead it afterwards. E.g. 182 161 161 16 12 5 5 5 6 6 22.

Off the Non-juror of Debt.

If one of two partners who are liable in debt is sued alone, he can regularly take advantage of it only by plea in abatement. So if one of two joint obligors is sued alone, he must plead it in abatement. So of distress an order can only be affirmed in the face of the debtor, that there is another family to the court who is more living. The debt is not bad unless the
Reading

The facts appear thus: owing not to any act by the lessee alone, but to some act or acts by the lessor. The lessor, it would seem, was bound to do something to prevent the rent from being paid, and must have known that the lessee would be unable to do it. This is a satisfactory, the most logical reason, which is that the lessor cannot act for the lessee. Burn. 3, 111, 11, 2 Reg. 9; 5, F. R. 31, 6, 66. P. 122, note 4, 2    H. 6, 6, 3 of.

But in such cases there is no such thing as concurrent

of acts in strict legal sense: for all acts committed

by more than one joint?er, you can see all

are not necessary, but you have

but one satisfaction. There is no exception to this.

the night of active growth of joint tenancy among acts.

For here the action must be brought at all. A new

reason for this. Barn. 39, 11, 5, 2 F. R. 31, 2, Gl. 1821.

Now in certain cases, in any individual, are bound to do

acts in abode as a condition of tenancy, to be enforced, as a

condition to suffer a joint tenant to neglect to do them, to a lost

of all must be sued.

Every one that who is in abode in a land of abode, may

also plead in abode, that there is another joint, who ought not to

be joined. But the one who was joined, this cannot

be done. 9, 292, 90.

If one acts as a joint, who can not be made by them, who

are sued and they must plead the concurrent in abode. 1, 1, 9341.

If two persons are sued on a rent, when only one is held

advantage must be taken of it under the state, evidence

does not ref. point the duties, 9, 292.
And if two are sued an taking the jury by special
mandat, that the case declared when it was made by an only
the judge must be annuled as to the whole. No judge can
be overruled as either-, now the court bind with the dower is
negatived by the mandat. I Part 12

Now can the party in the case enter a nova prorogat
and I proceed to the other- for this would be to charge the
parties I substitute a cause of action for another. 56, 41.

6th cause of abatement is the finding of a former suit
between the same parties for the same thing 1 Part 4, 4; 5

This is to prevent frequent, immaterial suits. It is
founded on the reason that the 1. action a multiplicity
of suits. But the suits must be of the same nature,
at least concurrence, within the cause of action and
likewise in the same

If one sues one, the action of the first instance, not to
brinig a new one for the same, the fungus of the first ac-
tion is res judicata for a plea in abatement. This is done
brinig another action before the fact that has taken advan-
tage of the first.- otherwise, some might be denied. But
not necessary, that the action should always be of the
same kind. For many actions are concurrence which
are not of the same kind. Art. 114. Often once this
is a good plea, the first action is in another county.
61, 52. 463, 4, 643.

The two suits, originally for the same cause, are brought
i.e., finding at the same time between the same parties,
yet if the action is brought for different things, the fur-
gious of one, can't affect the other. To suit cause of-mortgage
then an action of ejectment for the land, a bill of
chase.
Reading

To perceive, may all be brightness. You will not ablate the other, because the objects of all of them are different.

And a plea of the prejudice of a person will, for the same cause regarded, the former must be refused before a different it because a remission it may, various every action from an inferior it by a word of caution. Acts 17. v. 2 f. 4. 1. Pet. 41. 1. Sam. 51.

Under the law there is very little application of the law for the remedy for counties where the is have occurred in jurisdiction.

And for the purpose of defeating the latter suit it not may may of the former suit be actually pending at the time of filing abroad to the mistake to sufficient that it was pending at the commencement of the second. The second when commenced during the former, is always considered as vacating as it is. To suppress a remit or even remitting a remit will not warrant the second from abating. Bothin's Bancroft W. 1. 3. 13.

A suit is considered as finding for the person from the finishing of the suit. Brit. 3. 5. 11. 3. 1423. 1. 14 41.

Law practice has introduced another qualification. The 1. B. law it has been decided that if the suit suit is actually suppressed the prejudice of it shall affect the second, and it shall be vacating. As for instance where the suit attached by the former, it is found next to be the defect, been fully during the prejudicing of the suit may, from another attachment. 1. 42. 966. 80.

The English law requires that the action should be concern. Thus suppose a butcher should bring the fish in where known only amounts to. Now if the suit should bring
Whether this shall apply to cases where a mere spot of dirt in the second suit is matter of doubt. The better opinion is that it will abate as to all parties in the second suit. To clear however that it will abate as to the person first sued. No I think, that unless the action is such that if there is a necessity as are there under he is all the more must abate. But if of such a nature that one may be subjected without the other, he think it will abate as to the one sued in the former action only. Habit 137, Barth. 19, Bar. 15.

On the other hand, if an action is brought as two, & afterwards an action for the same cause by the same plaintiff is brought as one of them alone, finding the suit, the second will abate. But if the first action is unincumbered, will not abate the second. Habit 137, Barth. 19, Bar. 15.

To prevent this. A prior actuating majority on the flint, it is settled that if the second suit is commenced on the same day in which the suit is abated, it shall be presumed to have been paid out after the suit was abated. As it allows a fraction of a day for this purpose—this is a presumption of the suit to be sustained, but in most other cases the evidence no fraction of a day a day is a presumption strongly against. Po 29, De 13, Allin 38, 84. Well that is Sex. 360.

But if no cause for abating that another & prior action for the same is pending as a stranger the defendant has nothing to do with it. This pending— as if several suits for one suit at different actions. Salk. 92, 120, 50, 99. 137.

But this if it applys to indict. The finding of a prior suit for the same offence is not pleaded in abatement.
to a second suit, the reason of that. The it has a direction any forms of a suit as one suit. If they will quash the due on the other as they think best, but generally the last
Sec. I. March 190, 279, 367.

But the case is different as to information. Affirm. Only the attorney has a power to bring one information here that have no such discretion any continued. If there be the same Attorney
how to an civil action. 1. March 110, 376.

If two different informations are exhibited, the same by two different persons for the same cause in the same individ
ual, each will abate the other; if no final judgment can be rendered on either, neither of the parties can claim any
merit for himself. Hence it is that the natural day has
no succesor of time for this purpose— the day is a future
term alone.— At the it would admit no proof, to show that one
was commenced before the other. Holt 129, Moore 565, 1 Barn 328.

The suit is not unawfully suit, as not only authentic
case is good cause of abatement. If only 10 in any irregularity
so too is the irregularity of a suit. Thus if the suit is
made notorious on day after term, that is the next suc-
ceding term of the to which to return, then being
required time for a lawful return, it is abatable in the
next. Or suppose this is the day, if there is not more for legal
service, between the date of the suit & the next, it, the next
may be made notorious, to the suit at the suit 381.

So if a suit is not signed by three weeks time, not only
controllable, but absolutely void if the officer is liable of
no act under it— no asking, if the agent has no date, or any in
possible one, as the 30 of term; it is abatable, and in
less the date can’t be arrived. If the thinks it can’t
A defective return is also good cause of abatement, as if the
wait is made returnable within the time limited for
its return. 2 Blk 63. Ser. 6. & 81. 1 Blk 40; 2 Black 561.

In such also if the service is tendered by the adverse is defective
of the service in the face of the return, to good cause of
abatement. But if the service is sufficient in the face of it
it cannot be construed to have been a return, but the
plaintiff is left to sue action in the adverse for some return
2 Ser. 323. 1 Ser. 322.

In case if the service is actually defective, the third issue
affords in the face of it, the right may plead in abatement
i.e., he may controvert the indefinite

(1.) The service is in the return in good cause of
abatement. If in a letter to a cause of trespass, there is the
place where the cause of action is alleged to have been done
not the county, but the neighborhood, parish or hand
and according to the strict theory of the English law, every
action must be brought in the county, where the cause of
action occurred. In local actions this is strictly adhered to
not in transitory actions is waived by fiction.

The transitory actions the common a return is good
as to cause of action, if generally and in the cause of abatement
at 6. 1. hence to some sufficient in point of fact, to lay it
as it really is the strict law on motion change it did not
continue. 2 Black 62. & 65. 1 Ser. 33. 1 Blk 8. 13. 38. 9. 98 322.

But in local actions the service being merely of substance
the return of it as a service one is good of abatement is the
action can be tried in the vicinity where the

land lies. So actions real & personal, & tenures secure.
...and to this day. 

A body is to the soul, as the root is to the plant. The plant, in turn, is nourished by the root. So is the human body to the soul. The soul is the mind, and the mind is the spirit.

In the case of action, it must be taken as a whole. The mind is the soul, and the soul is the body.

But in the case of action, it must be taken as a whole. The mind is the soul, and the soul is the body.

So, if the action is taken as a whole, the mind is the soul, and the soul is the body.

And if the action is taken as a whole, the mind is the soul, and the soul is the body.

It is clear that the action is taken as a whole, the mind is the soul, and the soul is the body.
Reading it extends to the Decline: it begins & continues with putting part of Decl. 9, 10, 11 & 16. 10th 11th & 12th pro. 5, 6.

This is not universal, for when the plea goes to the person of the plea as that he is a mine owner, if the plea then proves, judge whether the plea ought to overturn the plea's plea on Decl. 9, 10.

But when the matter pleaded is debased or extenuate, i.e., not apparent, the usual form is to conclude with putting part of the matter but done so bagni. 108 129, 130 109.

And finally, when the matter is abated or fact, i.e., when it would be abaited or fact, it concludes with some judge whether the it will proceed bagni. 102 103.

In character of a plea this is defined by its conclusion without reference to the substance or beginning. This is a good & simple b. if it concludes in abt or 3, 30, 55, Decl. 9, 10.

But according to 10th the beginning & conclusion both determine the nature of the plea. He says the thing in place would be good in law, still if it begins & is in abt. too abt. but it is bagni & in bagni, in bagni.

But if the subject matter would be good in law, if it either begins in abt or in bagni, the subject matter must govern. 129, 201 in a plea in bagni, the same time.

But if it begins in abt, if it begins in abt, and in bagni, in abt, if it is bagni & in bagni, the bagni, in bagni.
Reading

But this is a current too complicated for any remedy or settlement. Vol. 7, p. 101.

1. Mod. 107, note 49, 115.

Again, if the subject of the plea is good in any way, & the remaining conclusions are insufficient, the party in whom the matter may take it which was better, in 3. Mod. 281, 1. Bent. 26, 4. Bar. 50, 2. D. Ray. 113, 57, 107, 116.

And if a plea in abate is founded in matter that is in new only, the time that such subject to which the plea is good in abate—now the action have a plea in new, founded in matter at all only is not good, for there in such cases it is to the right of upsetting & not to the merit 1 Bar. 15, 60, 1. Inst. 128, 12, 2. Mod. 400.

But when matter to be pleased will go either where the plea may please either, the the effect is different.

1. Mod. 144, 4. Bar. 57.

To observe by this book that all these terminations, i.e., to the action must be possible as much i.e., not double, but he may, th'one of them, or in all abate, i.e., the action he must plead those, in other places, but not abate. As in that may not plead two different places in abate, or any of abate of the same kind, to the whole on the same kind of the matter. But he may plead all the different kinds of abate, places necessarily in their order of places 1 Bar. 15, 1. Inst. 304.

But he can have but one plea to the action. for the judge must go in chief. bar. 103. Mod. 250, 1. Bent. 83.

When a cause of abate is pleaded a judge must suppose it as well as judge in chief, but not until after judge in chief is ready. But if matter of
The page contains handwritten content in a notebook or ledger format. The text is partially legible and seems to discuss legal or judicial matters, referencing case law and statutes. The handwriting is neat, with some script that is more stylized than cursive. The document appears to be part of a larger collection, possibly a library or archive, given the style and condition of the pages.
But if an issue be joined on the plea, that is, if the plea in abatement is traversed, or if the joined issue, which may always be done, when the matter is shown, is proved, for which the judgment may always pass in such cases, except at the trial, there is no doubt. 1 John 3:33.

But on indictments for capital offenses, the defendant having the plea, the judge is not bound, as it is in civil cases.

Generally, if what is sued for is found in the plea in abatement, it is understood for that part, of the plea, with which it has been joined, take the consequences of the action. 1 John 3:33.

If the plea in abatement is insufficient, it is the allegation in it is shown, the defect may with a fuller known, viz. prove that his own merit was to be quashed. 1 John 3:33.

As an invariable rule, that the plea in abatement is a matter of merit, it is no excuse of demerit, unless it be used properly to the plea in abatement. It means that the plea in abatement to any defect in the merit. Not does it go in again in the same way, and demand to the death. 1 John 3:33.

But in case of indictments for capital offenses, the judge will not go in their case of the plea in abatement to be matter of fact. 1 John 3:33.

After just of merciful nature, a second plea of all cause be allowed, for if it cannot pass another through the same principle, tried in one jurisdiction, for it would be in danger. 1 John 3:33.

But when after judgment in favor of plea on plea in abatement.
Reading

the fifth around his waist, the spot may then be abled to be worn, he now a new waist. Kindly.

It is a G of the English that after a day in the week in the course of day, an exception is the continuance of a case from one term to another. 3. Bl. 316, 2. 7.

After a special in the case of a day of the week in such a way as to give the spot an advantage of all exceptions the members of the Kingdom a G, in the case of that the spot becomes all exceptions that he cannot be to secure an exception as which did not exist at the time of the act done, and if a person is sued to give an exception to which did not exist at the time of the act done, a G, if a person is sued if the saying an exception. Afterwards and where the needy filed his complaint at the next term, men.

9. Bl. 316, 1. 46, 14, 22.

And the R for log in alt is the same when the lien is a G, for day and a day before (in four days from the return of the setting). In the case, if in alt must be made before the R, before the offering of the G in the afternoon of the second day of the term. In the case all that is alt must be made before the existence of the thing which takes place in the morning of the third day of the R. 1. 46, 14, 22, 22.

Dear to the action as bees in a tree.
A the ice bar in an which gives the bees ought to recover
Then to the action as one of two kinds. A the G if it is to be defined by 20 boke to be a sensible right substantial point
Springing out of the allegations of the lawsuit, consisting in the irregularity of an affixation & negation of an affirmation on one side & a negation on the other. This is called the issue. 1 St. 122. 1 Bl. 299.

According to the strict 1. St. 122. there must be a direct affirmation on one side & a direct negation on the other, so on an issue otherwise to oblige the defendant to a direct affirmation, which is impossible in any way. Nor can it be justified by any act of publication. Certainly it is required more than in any other composition. Then if the false affirms that he is deaf, he is at fault, that he is deaf. This is not a strict issue, the if one is true, the other can't be. 1 St. 278.

If the false denies his title, the false affirms that he did not die in peace. If the other says he was never in title, he has a direct affirmation. But the strictness of the law is somewhat relaxed in modern times, this not for the better. It has been decided that when two plaintiffs allege that they were born in France if the other says he was born in the time of great issue but he ought to have or he was not born in France. But, I believe there is no other similar case. 1 St. 182.

There was one exception at 2 St. 191. This is a strict issue, the false says he was born in the birth of the affirn. The other denies that he was born in the same 1 St. 184. But this is not a strict if the true issue is from the false.

But if always must be to show the issue according to the strict 1. St. 122. you otherwise it fails to support the argument. Dog. 1 St. 182. always wrong. Every case it requires nothing but the defendant not guided to the false.
Reading

Giving out of the allegation of the party. Designating
negativity of an affirmation. Negativity of an affirmation on one side, negativity on the other. When
called the issue.

Thus in fact one of two kinds by Aspecial. Judgment is
sometimes called in the books, the if given as res cap
facile on a hand, but that the name, as the if given

If the issue is the denial of all the material allegations
in the deed. If by the if then the proof of them to
so called because it comes then generally. A. Bk. 301.

Aspecial issue is one joined on a definite and particular
case in the deed, which may consist of any number
of facts, each of which is necessary to subject an
action. If the if by denying a material fact may
defeat the action, this is good issue, for if in time it be
true, the ground on which the if then rests his action
To reveal no cause for the if to do this, for he may
filed generally. Being all he would deny, under the if
issue, this is often known conveniently, from 1 A. N. 126. From
132.

To all actions amounting in debits or founded on recipro-
came, not guilty is the if given to debit as sundry out
tie rule, debt. To be sure, one of all stated circumstances,
remains facture. So that on judgment is that second, to ac-
tion of account on bailiffs, mean bailiffs. To action of
assumption, some assume fact to action of suspen-
non except to action of discretion, mean assumed
to action as convenient, mean assumed, second, book.

To debts on bond, I saw, so that may ext facture was the
if issue, but if the that filed not debts, if the if fact de-
lience, he renders all exception of the if is let in to any
From which he would have in said debt an unpleased


In an action to recoup the sum to a final debt, the act


From formerly held that not guilty was a good if found to


As to the action of debt on account, not debt is the prob


The is false refers to the court or debt of not to the merit. You


If you like all issues in fact regularly concludes to the con


By
injunction as in the case of inducing division—so the
attorney of an ecclesiastic is required to know if the
peace are divided—so our manner of battle, but now to
reduce these to any other trial than by jury. But to a
just very important in some cases (when there is a his
sole question a criminal has had his trial) to know, that
the judge do try every issue in fact, thus the common
or intervention of a jury. Thus the manner of the jury
is very the fact. The order of the jury are the same as
a verdict S. 86. 118. 13. 1st. 126.

Suppose the jury don't agree on a verdict 1 retain the
paper. Now there has been no trial for the jury has
found no verdict—there has been no trial but a verdict
is found vacated—so settle in law. 1st. 2.

As a new universal it that the judge concludes to the
country for that of our trial recess court—but which

As to the jury of finding an issue in fact
for the breaker or denial is on the part of the Dort.
In conclusion thus: On this he must himself show the same
time per trial. If the denial comes from the flat, it con-
cludes thus: if this be always may be against of lay the
country. I. 1st. 126. 2. 1st. 113.

The is judging on issue as in other words the one is
not joined—then therefore either party concludes to the
country he must add the conviction, i.e. he also concludes
it shall be bought by the country on jury. 1st. 113. 3. 1st. 126.
The over issue of the suit he in said has been proved,
matter of substance, except the place of time and the place of substance. But the adding of form to the place of time has been deemed sufficient.

In both it has been decided that the omission of the simili-
tor is no fault — then the similitor is neither matter of
ness of substance. But the form has been held in both
the form and the issue to the same or not, but in both
the form and the issue. This supplies the want of the similitor
who only says to show that the party, to whom the
issue was tendered, continued to have it fixed by perjury
accepted it. 1 Pet. 64. Comp. 40.

An issue always close the Papal-Yrath to well known
it on one side must be accepted as the other. An excep-
tion however will be noticed when I come to treat of
favour. If the issue is not well treated the other
party may recover. 1 Pet. 126. 1 Sam. 33.

Every issue in fact regularly contains the words "in
numerus & prompt except in some technical cases" then in an
action of time, the fault is not guilty in numerus & prompt
thence words in numerus & prompt are in some cases
more matter of form. A then they are not included in
the form and in other cases, they are more matter of sub-
stance. They then amount to a denial of the particular
form or made in which the fact is alleged to have taken
place, together with the fact itself.

The is, it is that that the if issue goes to the point of action
these words are words of prompt — by the point of action
is meant the material points attuned in the deed. If however
this is the case they don't warrant the particular form or
issue in which the facts can be treated. As in, the
fact is charged with having accompanied the deft with severe
crimes & the to issue is pleaded that the deft is not guilty
in numerus & prompt — the words were are seriously pleaded.
Reading

If the 6th and 4th know, that the 6th did not know with another club 16, he is entitled to know the remaining.

But when given to a collateral branch given out of the thing, there is no use of the substance of the thing.

If the 6th knows it and not the 4th knows it, made a formative base, and without did the good at law can be found. 587 8th 1st 28th 38th 120.

The above is true and I think rather unanswerable.

In summary, by the 6th and 4th, now two facts were called the 6th is now 119 8th 28th.

If, in any one of these is material and immaterial, a material issue is one taken upon some point which decides the cause of action. If issue is always material. An immaterial issue is one taken in an immaterial point to which he is not entitled because of action, or as an instrument issue.

But of the matter shall not be awarded in favour of one who returns the immaterial issue.

The immaterial issue is one not readily taken in point of form, it may in any point material, being tired form from an immaterial issue, an immaterial issue a section in form only in and by indirect, the subject of it and bound to be good. 58th 8th 28th 38th 120.
Reading

If the debt arises by a charter, hence the date of the mortgaged lands, in
plus that in the case were the date of the
mortgaged lands, the date the same may be all or in part, assuming that,
it involves the mortgaged land, the whole of the

Of the 4th Term.

His coming the whole debt - it includes the whole of the
full allotments of money that they are true. Yet in some
cases the fact in the execution, even in action on special
out, where the facts have in the debt are not required
in dispute, as wherein the cause is void as the absolute
capacity of the obligor to suit. 2 3d. A bond of a sum in a case
and living - who is sued above. But then it can come from
the future to make it, 1. Laws 2 23 & 23 1082.

But if the debt is void in its own nature, in not pursing any
necessity of the obligor, the bond is not proper. But,
wrong will not support the plea of municipal suit. He
is only voidable as in case of suit, 2. 23 23 23.

And if the incapacity is not absolute in the obligor, but
only qualified, i.e. quoad bond as in the case of an infant
that fits in the void "can't" in a terms under the law,
then, because it is not consistent with the form which deme
he made the bond. The case of coercion is an answering
for which I cannot see reason, 2. 22 22 & 22 22 1114. 22 22 668
well &. 162. 1. 41153, 5. 23 23 669.

To a 1. P. of the L that the infant is seen void by that, the
special suits are necessary must be pleaded especially, whom at
pursue in not a proper plea, 1. 22 22 22 22 22 22 22 168.
2. 22 22 22 22 668.
As also in an action brought on a deed that he lost its real advantage is to be taken if it be under the true name. For he may be shown to have a due to the thing without a real title or alteration of a bond at to 11. to 12 to 14 to 36 to 12. 24.

If the alteration is made by a stranger in an unnotified part without the signature of the oblige it does not take the deed. If the plea of unnotified section is it that if made by the oblige himself or by his consent to authorized.

Generally speaking such matters of fact are in foveo and the is true in a plea of non est factum. But there is an exception in the case of a plea est factum by matter of fact on record without correction of fact stated in the deed, Point in law.

This defence arising from the special matter which in legal obligation will avoid the matter of fact so in case of an abstruse issue, the inference turns on question the fact only.

But merely in special matter of fact growing out of the fact to be new, but in reality avoiding the fact it does mean that no question of loan annin under the. June 24.

To a 48A of the law book that action is not a thing which shows that the def has no right to recover at the time the plea is placed may begin in the minister of the please. The question is in non-fiction-turing only the legal consequence of the action of itself. Whatever extinguishes the only decision of the Please so urging, desire, rejoicing, deceiving, when the plea is given in 172 under the 19. June 1844. 2. May, 1317. Doug. 104. 4. 11. 149. 2. Roll 582. 3.

It means that an immaterial this a debt held in special fact but Point said the distinction any when in
But the Act of 1685 must be observed, as the state of limitations may be allowed to be a bar to the party in court, so far as it may be true that the Act of 1685 must be observed in all cases in which it is specially pleaded.

In actions of ejectment, no injustice advantage may be taken of the state of service to prejudice, under the Act of 1685, the party in court, but especially if he pleases.

But the Act of 1685, which obtains in actions of ejectment, is not permitted in actions found out of any more than in actions found in specialities. In both actions, a decision cannot be given in court, under the Act of 1685. So of

in the name of justice of the peace, must be specially pleaded.
so absurd to deny the commission of a crime on this
justifying the act.

In an immoral act, any defense which must be specially
pleaded, may be given in ext under the general law.

The statute may be given in ext under the general
law, this applies in torts as well as crimes. To avoid
presentation of evidence, it may be done in Eng. 2, 4, 40, 61.

It is clearly admitted that the statute must be given in
ext under this Act, because it contradicts the plea.
This is not the case under the bars Act—this Act has almost
abolished the statute as a defence of special pleading from the bar.

But on the other hand, there are cases in which the act
of the party may be given in ext under this Act, this is
operative as a discharge of a venue in an action of debt.

The Act, in any case, don't necessarily deny that a term
promised, but means that he is not more liable.

Of Special Issue.
The Act instead of fixing the special issues which may be given
may make an allegation that is treasonable, going to the gist
of the action, which on the countervailing order is the remain-
der. This is a convenient method of summing up an issue when
there is a number of independent, i.e., distinct facts, which
are the same. This is always made where there are a number
of facts, one of which is necessary to support the action. Scott 4, 2,
Bom. 2, 12, 36, 52, 7, 81, 182, 195, 76, 174, 2, 135.
This appeal of a covenant. Ref. to the law here 100d. If he would have been a known or no man certain at
him there are two necessary points to be proved 1. that
he did wrong 2. that the act has been done. Now the
when this may not any of the facts alleged, would de-
fect the action of the 5th court from both directions
in the other.

And plea amounting to a y. if once inquires any eviden-
tible a special plea & a treason are equally sufficient and
the venue the facts or state, but although new matter or
answer a treason brings some fact although the venue
of the above is that if such the plea were an actual
be said or areality beyond the second. I understand
how to refer to the it was the 1st which ought to
the issue under the 48. Ex. 2d. If in one of tree. the 8th
pleads an alibi, it amounts to 4. if but it also a matter
of fact I ought to go to the jury to be made if a person
had been executed it should go to the 1st for they are
to judge whether is a sufficient defence & Ba. 202. 2d. 3d. 3d. 3d. 127. 127. End. 3rd.

I have no that a s
d plea amounting to 4. if true is only in
admissible but to this 2. there are exceptions 1. and
plea amounting to 4. if true is good if it contains no mat-
ter of justification for this is matter of I ought to

2d. At 2. in actions of ten. Whereas the take may plead
not what amounts to the ly en. by giving colour to
the fifth night. If he pleased take in humanist towards

An giving colour entitle in alleging some great and
w in favour of the fifth night, in order to justify an
accusation to it wise a plea of theft title i.e. a special tit
And the judge may also allow a bill in rem in such cases which amount to 6s. 8d. or over at their discretion, though in such cases the remission may be regulated by an establishment, if the judge or such a name, i.e., if the facts pleaded are such as to

be heard on the bill or bill; but when there the judge may allow the matter to be specially tried, i.e., if to be so as to confine the jury with a question of, whether that ought to go to the jury. And if it be nearly settled, forth the facts, it can come to the allegation in the facts must go to the jury. But 1 & 2 12 Ed. 2, 5 Ed. 203, 3 Ed. 16.

As to the manner of taking advantage of such bills, some doubts have arisen, some partly in good cause of the former, but here we find it convenient with the 6s. 8d. power of allowing it discretion, for a demurrer requires a suit in chief — though we find only a ground of motion to the effect that the 6s. 8d. are a suit that, in some sense or other, must be in the suit. If not, the most reasonable. 1 & 2 Ed. 16, 18.

But suppose the suit will not allow the plea on motion? the plea will not yet plead as such, etc., and shall join an demurrer, but upon the motion, this I think to be the true. If the plea is not allowed the plea of the plea, a plea in bar, the suit may take resort to

But there is a material difference between a plea in bar and a plea in bar, as to the plea in bar, and the latter is not such, which in the event, as the plea in bar, and the latter is not such, that necessarily or of necessity, amount to the plea in bar, as a plea of bar, an answer in a suit, it this is good plea.
According to this distinction it is necessary to plead solely the defense that there was no injury done to the act of the DEFENDANT, or to actions of assumpsit. This is a clear and always clear.

Another kind of plea is taking all facts to support the defense, concluding with the DEFENDANT in point of fact in an action of assumpsit an answer that was sufficient to set up an answer, to be done upon the part of the DEFENDANT in all cases. This was essentially the meaning of plaintiff's defense, it is called a plea with effect which is otherwise round signifying no, because the plaint was the plaintiff in every case, so it is not "No," Gill 1 op. 165. Salk. 274. Tit. 9, 210. Stat. 3.
Moody think, this plan should conclude to the countery
for to really the dispute. Besides it, concluding with a
modification would make it if in fact a slate amounting
to the subject's result, thus to a different kind of fact
from the before concluding with an effect. But after
having any facts of a slate amounting to the subject
was due to the concluding to the countenance, Nov. 26.
 Sect. 9, 31. 2. 6. 3. male. 7. 2. 6. 2. 6. 3. 6. 6. 18. 12. d. 30.

The idea, then, mode of this is advantageous to the whole
coming by notice of the true defense of compelling the out
of the judge's attention to the particular facts stated Nov. 26,

This plan may be demonstrated to the it concludes to the con-
tuating, for the conclusion is from facts do to be a defense
whether the competent or not ought to go to the court. One
views in the mode in the country of those frequently, the
it seems questionable from what to be just cites.

Accordingly, this was the mode in case of countenanc.
ied was well executed in form, but used by means of
something extrinsic or countenance or by matters ex post
facto or manner or intimations, the best must place
with an effect. Hatt says that all such will want fac-
tuous and manual treatment, as they undergo the numerous

Special Rear in Ban.
This, which is, without, the allegations of the date
but cannot these, by the results alleged by the facts. This a
y. that not until. E.g. 6. 2. 4. 2. 1. 1. 4. 2.
Reading

There is not a soul [in doubt] that a man or a woman does anything to come a material point in the деле. Thus in Talmud, the Effet may fall a whom as to have a name in the next. Hol. 109b; Ex. 104b; Lev. 2, Mid. 91.

But a soul plea does admit all reasonable allegations which it did because of ignorance of what it does admit. So the plea of ignorance is heard and comes the execution, but avoids it by the return. Ex. 259a; Mid. 91.

Thus B is not exactly true in the case of an有效. For the plea does not exactly admit ignorance as such the allegations. It shows that the party is when they are under a false idea as stated given running, facts state in the decision, this plea is a null gesture. Hol. 119a; Ex. 356; 116b; Gen. 47; 190; 152; 153; 161; 170.

Thus if A brings a fraud action on B, A pleads that A has not been for the same cause of action A received before, this is flag by way of effective.

But this mischief admission is sufficient in all cases for [a word] B of share two that every plea of justification must declare expressly the act intended to be justified. So when the Effet was charged with driving cattle on the right land, the pleads that they occupy the land, if that it was commutable - it not good shall plea - the thing justified is real the thing complained of. But if the sole resource for this B, the one above is insufficiently explicit. Gen. 23; 15; 19; 3; Dan. 3; 94; T. A. 295.

A party may expressly assert what is in his favour and make it part of his case.

And if plea in has always admitted the matter de usus
Reading

Unusually in the affirmative, the not always. So far as
matters is not meant to mean. In the case of negation, it means the
way to plead strongly is to plead negatively. It is
then not done what he commented to. 8. 33. 109.

And as the plea advances new matter, it must neglige
conclude with a negation instead of closing to the
country, for as long as new matter is pleaded, in the
a further sense is meant, the advocate finally must have
opportunity of presenting it. In either of these ways
viz. either by proving them, or by demonstrating to them, or
doing effect of avoiding them. New new matter. This is the
established mode of doing the thing. Even. 155.
law. 139, 140. 114. 17. 1728. Dugg. 58, 58, 92, 90, 10, 17. 18, 18, 60.

There is indeed introduced into Dugg by stat. 5, 503. 11 a note of
pennyroyal concluding to the country, the country of new matter. But the manner in the 6th mode of
doing, Even. 135, 136, 187.

And a plea that is merely in the negative and not
conclude with a formal negation, since the party
alleging is not bound to know if the party one kept
open without it. Wish Even 135.

One which from a complete it far a wide open
conclude to the country, if not with a negation. And,
this can be held to conclude with a negation, though
it kept open for other new matter. In this way the plea
might come alone. Dugg. 58, Earth. 58. Even. 135.

But notice the plea whether distinct not matter, to a
point of the matter he may conclude at his election
each with a negation or the whole with one doll.
12. 228. Earth. 83. 1. Law. 83. 21. note.
Reading

"And so if of the fact X, not, as incomparably, think, that in an action of two or known for goods, the first should think that he was entitled to the goods of all places, if

this is a fellow's goods— how the first fact is bad for whether he was sufficiently entitled to them or not, as a question of it— he should think the real fact which shows how far he is entitled to them. Exodus 18:3.
In a very important case, it is that a plea in bar must arrest the whole gravamen or cause of action, as to all the parties. Thus, if an action of assumpsit or recovering the debt should justify the debt, that the plea would be bad in toto—so the debt is not allowed, unless any kind of the debt is presumed that only—and, if he might have been might any other. And in other cases assuming the whole debt, he must answer the whole or none, i.e., the plea must be as broad as the debt or null in answering. (Loc. 4, 263; Horn. 204 § 8.)

So in cases of a rehanced motion of law, this is void without a treason of all times, subsequent to the date of the release. So in cases of a plea for the rehanced motion of law, it must be treason all times subsequent to the date of the judgment. So if a license is rehanced, the debt must be deemed without prejudice here as to all taxes committed before or after the license. (Hob. 105, 237, 171, 386; Pearson 195, 105 and 23, note.)

A debt in an action in a bill is to answer the same gravamen on all debtors to the debt, the debt that discharge as to remaining. But if the debt is not to the duty of keeping them, if is then from that also in an action of slander. (Hob. 24, Ex. 46, 2; Rolt 244.)

But it is not required by this R. that the debt should answer the whole gravamen in one plea, but he may plead one plea as to part & another as to the remainder. In as much as the debt pleas not guilty as to part, justification as to the remainder, so may be another part pleas as to part. & another as to the remainder, but all taken together must be a complete answer as to the whole gravamen as a cause of action. But there must be but one plea as to case. If the same parties, you to the whole or to is taken together. The same B. R. holds also in all the subsequent places.
the whole guilt or substance of a plea in law must be averred, so also the republication. 

But with regard to pleas that don't concern the whole grievance, this distinction should be observed. If the plea imports to be an answer to the whole, it is in to an answer to a part only, the plea should answer for its sufficiency for the whole. But if the plea imports to be an answer to a part only, it is in to a discontinuance, if the plea should not answer but to be proved by a demonstration not direct, it is bad because it imports to answer for a part only of the plea and is discontinuous in its own action by accepting an insufficient plea.

The following case must not be settled; thus suppose the debt owed, a plea to a fund which is limited to the whole, would be good for the whole. Here the law thinks the plea should take part by verdict. The rule is summary 135.


But notwithstanding the preceding, this is true that a justification, or only an inference that covers the gist of the action, the whole grievance, if of course all matters of aggravation, it is an answer to the whole debt. As in this for

* repetitive* by entering the plea known of extinguishing him this means a plea justifying the breaking and extinguishing sufficient for extinguishing him is aggravation, unless the plea afterwards makes a new assignment in his replication.

A new or new assignment is deemed to be a new particular statement in the replication of something stated originally in the dicta—li in the nature of a new dicta—

* Ex. 179 1 Do. 626 372. 1 M. 85 1. 81 91. 9. 40 70.

* Ex. 179 98 428.
Suppose the action Supose, stated in the form, to be an suit for the help
m Fisher to rely on the explanation of a decided case of meaning the very part, is not to
in the replication by a way of mere argument. Yet this the Rob was
presumed to a false, i.e. if it were not guilty to two years
any other plea which he might to both if it had done
the only thing in the Delta & Delaw 294. Law 5. 165.
1. 2d 29.

The point of must always contain an event that the
reason, reasons can be argued in. Hence it coming from that
mentioned in the plea, is in her some evidence that the
must in the deception can be traversed, for the suit
should lead the judge to not guilty. If there until of
officer involved that the he, are indispensable, the now
is ajourn must be explained if the offer will still be
voided in the y issue. 1. 2nd 299 note. Law. 165. 251. Learn.

There certainly necessary for the letter, in the forth at the
particular house, necessarily, of any house containing
of the matter of substance. Scott 315. 3. 183.

But now 5. 35 no source, only, allow to avoid privity
if the 55. is not an unsatisfied, the one, that which the particular
is especially not forth without, and to understand, i.e. to
great privity. If they is allowed so where can want
the before, in a case of comments, the performing which
must contain a great variety of facts, to draw an
well as in some of shirriffs. Board of comments, and on
the right, i.e. the security is not how, to plead for
mance shibboleth of using at done in action suit for
twenty years, but he must plead generally. 1. 187.
1. 2d 256. 2d 256. Law. 513. Law. 60. 1.

But this 5. 35, no source of comments can be pleaded to an
action in suit, where some comments are negatived.
reading

and command can't be performed - they are commands not to

so do to the place should be in that the spot his case done the

act which he commands to do. 1 Suet. 202. 207

pros longumnoa. hower of your own concents is most

a moral defect, i.e. no advantage can be taken of stupid

his nature's enemies. 20. 6. 232. 233.

as a g. r. that unfeasancy in a material point

which the thing. But select if in an immaterial

point - but to new refuge may be.

sun refuge is that within harmless in the cons-

feasancy in an immaterial point - refuge may be to

serious. There what is in the different between day Post.


But unfavourance in days is a material point. Thus set

from in an action of love, the first should state in

his desire that on the first day of Nov. 1606, he lost his

quakers. For on the same day, 1606, the post

found them. For the first day of but of the same year

commanded them - this would be well on g. December. Joa

in is it curbed by refuge.

But if the post had state that he lost of the post found

in Nov. afterwards to set in date we come to then

under this would be good often made for but would be required

as man refuge - the post so after mentioned made it

for account. Suet. 128. 135. 159. 161.
Reading

This is a denial of some particular point in the dog's always tender an issue. It may be taken to embrace of the dog's including the duty to any of a dog's loyalty but not all matter altogether not to the 3d issue. 1. sect. 239. sect. 21. 4. sect. 8.

I observe by Isaac roe it does not commit me to any thing that is no. When a treason is punished by any such words by way of indemnity it is a real treason but I observe that this is not certain. The most frequently a real treason is punished by the matter of indemnity. Rome 113. 114.

A treason is treacherous, not so with the modern abusers. I conclude regularly with a reparation. But this is in the common where it is properly taken it concludes with the issue but this is clearly incorrect - a specific treason which does not regularly close the issue but treason on issue with an abuser. I which is the only form of a technical treason. I regularly conclude with a reparation - but a reparation must close an issue C. 40. 24. Law 12. sect. 8. 11. Rev. 18. Pange 51. sect. C. coron 109.

1. Law 103. 109. note.

They suppose the effect to be that the 2d issue is that he did issue the in issue the reparation is that he issued an effect upon. Que he had issued an ease with a reparation. This is a personal technical treason but this treason does not punish French more close the issue - it only recover it. The firm is then formed by the effect. Expelling one that if he be seized we see it manner of force as he has before alleged in his plea an bar.

The words abusers have not words of strong denial in
Reading

The 3. But they are not indefensible to constitute a

traverse—far to settle that in words it soon will do

it. yet the former are commonly and 1. Sam. 43. 4.

P. 442, Laws. 112.

Alleged to cause an order that refers to all that has

been alleged on the other side, Laws. 118. 1. Co. 53.

As a h. R. a st. that is a technical traverse, concludes

with a specification—let it traverse that owns the

whole that has been stated on the other side, considering

reality to the country. Thus from the specification to

reverse it, the conclusion is to the country. An effect in an

action of st. having pleaded non suit. Traverse. There is a h

traverse going to all the defense in these words, "distra-

provida injuria abhors the cause," these words are a bi-

negative of the whole defense. Laws. 118.


Doug. 412. 8. to 64. 7. Mod. 105.

But why is the difference between the conclusion of a

official traverse which is a specification, a h. traverse

which is to the country. And traverse ought to

conclude with a specification for two reasons. 1st. it may

be an immaterial point. 2. so the adverse party

ought not to be bound to it to join in it, because the

plead should be left open that the party, in whose things

were made, might abandon it as good reason so it

ought not to conclude to the country. In yet another case

when the traverse is material the adverse party may

take it altogether. I take a traverse himself in the

injunction which he cannot do if it concludes to

the country—hence a h. traverse should conclude with

a specification.

But in the case of a h. traverse it certainly can't be
monumental because it reaches the whole of what has been said on the other side, to the plow can’t be left open. It is also impossible to abandon a y. Gronov only takes you round in case it makes the whole matter to a denial of it. How it can’t be abandoned without being guilty, if a departure it should then concludes to the country. The moves amount of renunciation are synonymous or a conclusion.

Laws, 1827.

In so far as Butler, an eminent yet plebeian, that a y. Gronov may sometimes conclude with a renunciation on to the country. The reason assigned is that such are the peace state. There is no reason on principle for having the plow opened after a y. Gronov until it be prevented. A plow Gronov never can conclude to the country, but no reason can assign why a y. Gronov should conclude with a renunciation except it is that the plow should be left open. If the principles of plows care never inquire this; in case of y. Gronov. But so is the law that they may be. 2 Ed. 443. Barn. 1724. Laws, 121.

Of historical Gronov.

This is one consisting of the modern unique law, yet differs from a direct historical denial of a fact entirely on the decision, but in the conclusion generally. When the Gronov is 

it differs only in form, yet in conclusion. Laws 117.

This denial of historical denial of a fact in the proven mode when the party assenting the issue introduces no answer to the charge, unless where one itself things to ask that the object is true, the plow whatever be, and be that he is dead. There is at least it be found. But instead of this, the plow may answer by a kind of historical denial. That he is dead. Conclude to the country. Then the plow accords satisfaction, the plow refutes.
Reading

alleging same new matter. Consider with a technical distinction.

But if to sum up, so to argue. The first supposition is not accord, & conclude directly to the conclusion. So the technical be reason. Differs in no direct if resolution. Here, in point. It differs also in the conclusion. So it must conclude, to the conclusion is, to a tech. Is it concludes, with a consideration. Then in a idea of any implication a good & straight consideration above all that turns correctly against the consideration. To resist a consideration.

But the plea is not heard, to state the consideration. But may substantially deny by saying that have not consent, to against is & the act, to the conclusion. If he state the point made, he must conclude with a consideration. Because of the new matter alleged in stating a new consideration. 2. Co. 92. & 111. 61. Mayo. 97. Barr. 1019. 1821. 2. C. R. 494. 1:100. 129.

The mode of proving a particular fact, by way of for than & direct, direct, certain only when room at the answer is given to the nature of what is alleged on the other side. It has been a subject of much controversy in the books, whether a strong conclusion is then consistent with a conclusion or not.

In a b. C. should conclude to the country. You will have a b. C. large, on high and accurately to conclude to the country, should conclude with a consideration in this or fact is, in form or substance. They say for a defect in some or in others, the it seems doubt, follow, the other a defect in some or substance in, whether to all or a clear, decision. Mayo. 94. Mill. 240. & 111. 1:100. 1:100. 1:100. 1:100.

Counsel & Mr. 60.
Reading

To not object to this conclusion, that enough has not been done, i.e. that he has not known all that is necessary, but only that in short, that in a greater number - this may in some sense be the fault which is supposed in a lesser way, this is only a formal defect, it will only come of a minor.

There are 2 ways of denying an allegation 1st by a legal -
cal law, 2nd by way of postulate and denial. Further where an allegation on one side is expressed in 2 different ways, by way of per contra denial, a personal law, or by the other by way of per contra denial, a personal law, or by the other.

Thus for the nature of law, with its conclusions -
now to understand whence to take a law is more difficult. In a by 1, where one party alleges removal in which is associated with many of the contradictory allegations on the other side, but which does not amount to a law. If these allegations are yet many; then of the first place, what if I did notice 2nd if the plott in which, that he did mind me part in this, a part of a regular payment promised, he should have paid that he did name in 2nd, always has that he did mind me in pie, so if one place that his estate did before the date of the same. In the plott in which, that he was claim there also a case of his death is in 2nd place, Sec 35 1 W. C. 354. 1 Sum 9 2 3 10. Gen 115 19 18.

This new matter which has been the trumens to others, the indiscussion of it. Then the first place, that is 2nd to mind in any manner, how that he did mind in 2nd, the new matter preceding the above is the indiscussion. that which follows is the law itself.
Reading

The subject of the term 13 is to show how the facts of the case are not what may be implied
or what may be supposed, inconsequent with what may be known. But the A that there
must be a doubt is, that there must be that sort of thing which is not material, & has been
saved in modern

law, by the rule of law in as the act that. & I have been to say, the A
told this point to be sufficient, so in order to that

which is not, if the point stands no answer, the stuff may

be a reward. As if you the breach, I need not hear

the plea. Sheet 180.

and at this point to be laid down by the D, that

when that, which is affirmatively alleged as an incon-
sistent with, what is affirmatively alleged on the other

that the point can or so much be true, being

material, whether there is any direct assurance. I negat

ex post, but this is a deviation from the strict R of 13

scheme a contradiction, which is much to be blamed.


This 6. 13. (that where the party introduces material

allegation new matter inconsistent with the allegations

of the other side a true must be required) and hold

when the party who alleges the inconsistent matter

takes the Burden proof of himself, i.e. when he

alleges some other matter which he is bound to prove

in the main issue in which it is laid. Sheet 180.

But when a party merely copies a word in what

alleged on the other side by some matter, a true is un-

satisfied of the D’s proof when the cause of admission

were, right that times obtained by proof, he cannot have

the fact that was unless less, when for he has suf-

ficiently committed it, but in this case the right is it contains

new matter must conclude with a recollection with
When a personal wrong (i.e. a wrong done to a person) with a mitigation or mitigation, the same is found by the opposite parties affirming some neglect in their breached promise to the contrary. This is the principle that J. D. cited in 1 Sam. 4:27. 4 K. 114. 4 Sam. 14.

A true issue thus arises to an issue by the opposite parties affirming some neglect of the other's wrong.

What is meant by the word or the word or the word or the word or the word or the word or the word or the word or the word or the word or the word or the word or the word or the word or the word or the word or the word or the word or the word or the word.

If the issue is becoming the issue, the statement or the statement or the statement or the statement or the statement or the statement or the statement or the statement or the statement or the statement or the statement or the statement or the statement or the statement or the statement or the statement or the statement or the statement or the statement or the statement.

As a B. A. that there could be an issue where a breach by this is meant that when one of the parties has induced a material issue the other cannot extend itself. Stated another way, when the indemnitee to the same fault is to the same identical ground of defence or claim, he must join in the material issue first hand as it is. If the issue exists that J. D. cited in 1 Sam. 4:27. 4 K. 114. 4 Sam. 14.
injunction. As in an action on bond, the defendant consented to the agreement; the injunction is for a good and lawful consideration, stating what it was. Without this, a consent agreement, but the judgment is the same, relative to the same point. viz. that there is no such view or judicial duty for the debt to be in the true state, not a consent agreement. If he should gain in the true, it concludes to the contrary. I.e. the 4th.

But a true after a true is given the true, and a train. Habb. 103. 1. Pet. 2:31.

The distinction between a true upon a true and a true after a true is very important - the difficulty of being understood. This part is one that don't go to the same place. The ground of defense, that is explained by the first true. Then in an action of true, the debt, had a variance & traverse all the times after the true been given. Now the fifth may traverse the variance, the debt, comes all the time before the date of the date of the true. The fifth may draw that he enacted the true or was joined in the true. The variance is the injunction to the true.

If the field denies the variance of the true, he traverses the true, and enacts the variance to the true. If there is a true after a true. If the debt has a payment, he must have all true connected before the date of the payment.

If the debt has a variance, he must have all true connected. Now, both before & after the variance given, the true that the debt may be connected with the debt.

But suppose the debt had no variance. Then if the fifth is not allowed to have the fact of a variance, he shall be twisted out of his rights - therefore he may true the
Reading

Indictment—ro in an action of ejectment the defendant
issues a complaint or a license that there is a love after a love
because it does go to the same point.

How far N why cant a love or a love be allowed?
If a love one in not due to the same point so that offered
by another why not join? So does allow a possibility
of this in indictments, as would in the case of this un
allowed.

So there is however there are two exceptions. When
the first love is upon an immaterial point, it may be
be abandoned. Another another another another another
the first love would have the suit the suit some how very
abiding it—in order to no not belong to join in immaterial
this may be demanded to decide for immaterial
by—But this alone is a love to the love for it goes
to the self same point it the self same Connors of defer.

Matt. 10: 14. Jer. 34: 26. South. 116. line 8. 29. 1. 44. 2 97 165 46
1 Saund. 29 note.

E. G. If plaintiff declare that the defendant did in his trespass
an action of waste the defendant he fell thereupon
pains & does the reason there with he did there this is immaterial
for if he did not sell there he is not entitled from
the defendant to the suit in material therefore the
plaintiff may reply that he let them not able that he did
there that he defendant there in repairs him the plaintiff
is not bound to have a new action from the former suit
for he may discern of his own.

2nd When the two times to have been committed in the
county of A in which the action is brought the defendant
pleads a local jurisdiction that two committed in the
county of A with an able that have committed in the
county of A. If it is a true or a law a true. If it is allowed to introduce foreign facts, in the succession of foreign matter, which may be used to aid the jurisdiction of the court in making a decision. If the jury could not draw the jurisprudence he would be obliged to join in the true. The true from the action by means of the true court. i.e. 1845, page 101. Mass. A.D. Form. A, note 4.

C. J. P. 440.

C. J. A. 440 as an act. That the county in the county of B is held that he is a sheriff by virtue of his office amounting to him in the county of D, that he was guilty of the act which in the county of E.

A true point on maintenance may be made at the election of the facts, but both should not be true until a denial of both is necessary. Line 4. 6. 6. 2. 61 B. 2.

To a 4. A. that nothing but what is alleged can be true is a true in an one side of what is affirmed as the other. Since nothing can be known and unless alleged is necessarily agreed upon. A true is not the same as a true in fact with. 50 may be true and B. 22. 22. 1. 2. B. 22.

A true of what is not alleged is ill on the demand and by. i.e. the case of power. Ed. 4. 18. 22. 1. 2. 5 capital. 6. 6. 6.

Any material fact appearing in the judgment of what is not an opinion by suggestion may be considered.

As a y. A. matter of in writing can not be transcribed, but
Reading

When a party justifies another, in a suit out of the contract obligation on the other side, he must meet him, and continue with the verdict on that suit, and when he has met him, he must give the party his right of action as it accrues. Vide 8, 169, 170, 171.

So in suits of the sort, if the party, only all his cause, he must meet him, and then to the party, in order to close the whole controversy. So if the party pleads a license at a particular time, he must meet all the defense before, or after the suit, the moves for the way, is to plead the license as to the fact, not avoided.

If the party pleads justification at a particular time, he must bear his liability at any other time.

There is no exception to this, but when the justification is laid on the same day on which the issues were addressed to have been committed, the day being agreed upon by the parties, if the lien is justified, I shall have to the issue, as to the issue, as to the fact, not avoided.

No end of a two to pasture or money, or

No sooner than without any additional time. But suppose the party, be laid on a vacant day, as the agent, if the party, pleads a license on that day, the party has not to the issue committed on another day, or in other words, suppose the lien is laid to have been committed on a day, November other days, it means that a justification on the day, means it is sufficient.
self must in his repugnance make a new attempt and bring this alteration over, that this law which we actually see of our place was come with us such a day.


Summarizing before I enter the day on which the petition is made, it is not necessary it runs if the act which the debt is stipulated is made to be the same as time complained of. This is the practice in Israel, if in Israel a decree on a particular day should be pleaded at 5 to be current from all subsequent subsequent times.

Yet with us this is not required. If the same in the sense that the time complained of is made the same with their justified, according to the time this time is admissible in the time of the question in some books.

1 Bk 1. 13. 2. 6. 1811. 3. Saun. 4. 12. 1611.

b. 1. Ex. 2. Meb 74. 2. Ba 137.

Another difficulty in this matter is that a time must consist of itself matter, so also must the recitation.

Summarily, a time or direct denial furnishes the time of the culmination, together; but this mode is not always right, will sometimes lead to a very pregnant. Saun. 1863


v. 2. To action of time the act which made a ruling since the date of the suit. The recitation is most his act and since the date.

To in our action of suit in court, first at no before a certain day, the debt is made before the day the bill must come in these words, "that he did not pay before the day" for this time would be immaterial. Clearly a
This a new frequent does show can be found on a new or affirmed frequent; 4, 29.

The latter should have been made then not for an agreement of force de.
The virtuous is that where brevity is in the breach of the allegories, if it leads to a new frequent, it will sooner; but when it does the term may be said.

Rev. 97, 2, 29, 179, 4, 29, 66.

The case is usually followed by the words; which you may not allow. But then words may in 8, Matt 8, 6, 8 then the idea may be so construed as to make their meaning of substance. Hence, for, they are unnecessary. If brevity with other it is good. Rev. 97, 66.

A time not in the terms of the allegory is only in or not discerned; i.e., by a new frequent in too early an not discerned; till it is found early; 4, 29, 71.

Offspring.

A double plea is one coming of several districts. The defendant material allegories to the same point. Inquiring different answers. By the same point is here meant the same ground of claim as in num. last 97, 2, 307, 4, 29, 111, 6, 26, 65, 295, 4, 29, 118.

If one instant should yield in favor of proof or a defect to the same claim towards be duplicity, have them recite
Reading

require different answers. Eux. 21.10.9.

But giving different answers to different facts of the same death as the don't constitute difficulty, you can put it in one or another fact as our sufficient, but other

sufficient so to one may be rendered to be the other, avoided by one answer, otherwise if each returns to the whole. Bo. 304. 6. Bk. 9. 1.17.

So in some cases the fault may fall on one from a single plea to another & distance to a third. 9. Bk. 11. 4.

1. Bk. 304.

So also at & it is there can never before, each may pass a single matter to the whole or various matters as answers to different facts, namely as if the had been and alone

were the R authorities, these would be at the mercy of each other Matt. 70. Matt. 1150. 610. Lk. 11. 12. D. August 18. 1807

Eph. 311. 13. 17. 20.

Duplicity is a fault because it items to unnecessary perplexity to confusion by blinding separate matters. No uncertainty when costs are laid on a great nuisance according to the length of the words besides one defines if good or unions the same function as one hundred 6. Bk. 11. 4. sect. 47.

Every plea must be entirely separate, connected with reference to one point, i.e. a single ground of action. 9. Cal. 310.

The last is however is rather deduced than produced, for the opposite is not connected to need demonstrable evidence. If confined to a single point is incorrect, might.

But a defense may consist of more than one fact, for a number of facts are often necessary to establish a
pleading

nought grounds or law. The fact, however, must not go to different grounds of law as defense in the same suit. So if account be pleaded to recover goods to which the suit which sanctions it is an exception, being pleaded, a great number of facts are necessary.

Rev. 20:4, 26.

...usage never constitutes duplicity. So if there are two grounds of defense, if one of them is insufficient, that is not duplicity. Even if the ground this insufficient, or if a balance is found the next by...th 22, 4, 26.

As to protesting when one pleads an estate with him. 2 Cor. 18.

Off duplicity in the Act.

This court is joining causes of action that cannot be joined to reform and unite of recovery. If a bond is found to avoid wrongdoing in contract and dispute, then an distinct and nonexisting ground of claim receive to reform or unite of recovery. So if the plaintiff should as a result of action that the defect and combined with a third owner to reform the suit, I fear the reason the money has not been paid, this result is duplicity. Rev. 20:4.

...1. West 965.

So in debt can bond, the assignment in the statute of more than one hundred or duels that at the nonexisting for one breach of a final bond made a total, or purpose of the finality. 4, 26, 26. 2, with 26.


The state 20:4. 111 was provided that in actions by the real estate, the plaintiff shall recover subject to equitable...
Reading

But in actions of covenant broken, the deft may assign as many breaches as he pleases; but he might not at all reduce the rest away, but must be upon all the action in the case is brought to recover the actual damage sustained. 4, Bac. 17. 2. Summ. 6. 6. barn. 36.

So too, the deft in deed is the same as the English, and to actions of covenant broken, no more is recovered than the actual damage sustained.

By the st. 4, 14. Anue the deft with the same as paid as many defences to an action as he pleases. The law of it is quanta of cause.

Still such defences are ill at in distinct form, this st. was enacted to remove the embarrassment which often occurred in 4 Bac. 17. 2. 6. barn. 36.

This st. extends likewise only to covenant to the defts, so there can never be two defictions to one vice, or two requittance to one defection. If the, Anue other wise, the, Dept. would be unnecessarily complicated. 4, 14. 3. 113. 11. 13. Lmn. 192. 9. Bow. 2. 10. Con. 36. 65. 7. 112. 38. 4, Bow. 972. 69. 3. Bow. 16. 7. Mod. 77. 6. Bow. 6. 14. 10. 4. Bow. 219.

Defections is a defect in form only, being advantage can be taken of it only by right of demurrer. There is too much at once time the defect cannot be reached by general demurrer.
Reading

(No handwriting visible)

Of Prophet & Ulysses

(No handwriting visible)

Without any cast of uam in suaffy, the dower feeity is not bound to plead, but if the can be reviewed it he can demand it· afterwards. 6. \textit{Mos.} 288, 9. \textit{Sahh.} 119 4. \textit{Ba.} 11.

In any his reneuance to make prject of a promissory not on full of the four they can only end o· a brechtic the promissory is declared invalid \textit{at the note} 4. \textit{Ba.} 153.

But in con. promissory note and did. We are all

unnatural unwritings, so to be treated-therefore prject
may be made on it by duly agoynded.

But it now appears to have been made, unless they can prove, the payee offering such as must be made by affixing a seal.

If a new note or sight be made, the payee having an amount of the note for the sum, it is unnecessary to have it endorsed in order to make bond of what is not payable.

So in buying an assignment of a bond, the bond must be paid, but still it may not be paid or substituted for in any way, even this be done bound by contract to affix without a seal.

And if it cannot be paid or a bond, then the note must be paid, and if paid, made to the demand of person who must be made by the payee under the note, 113. et al. 245, 43.

So a D. V. taken, 6. 43. 42. 2. 43. 113. 7. 4. 14. 46.

But the note must be paid without a seal, if the note is paid, if the note made under it, payee must be made a. 113. 45.

But the aed is paid, if the payee don't make till of it, he is not bound to make a note.

So if the new note of indorsement bond must be made, it done to the said of the debtor, and be transferred, do't not require him to make the bill, that he may make an appropriate defense, for he must be in answer to the gravamen or cause of action. 6. 43. 98.
A stranger to a dud may take it without making the part of it, the reason is he is not always in his parent's do to it. He may not compel the other party to know it, but by a fair form of a decree. 

1. Lev. 59. 1. Thes. 49. Prov. 139. 


And a person who acquires title by a vendors of a person who claims by due, need not make protest as of a breach of promise. For who is prohibited not to know it in his power. Ezek. 28. 5. Deut. 75. 

But to the y. It last hand down there is one person in law of a tenant. In the court, you be so deemed to have 100 A of his. In which ever, the tenants during life. But the title is not sufficient to have all the debts. They are in his hands. 

1. Lev. 1. 1. 1. 1. 2. 15. 26. 2. 21 10. 39. 

2. Ruth 2. 4. 6. 1. 1. 1. 1. 

3. Jer. 48. 2. 4. 7. 7. 

A record may be signed without making protest. A record can be kept in some particular place. He is not allowed to be ready about 5. 11. 2. 74. 5. Deut. 15. 

But this that when the record is in the name of whom the same is, his necessity to point out the number of the roll, so that the opposite party may easily find it. 


B. S. 21. 1. 4. 2. 

But person to the person to whom the deed was not made, as a deed with a prospect, when it would be necessary in the party having it to do so, to aid him at the coming into his father's deed and must do it, Deut. 21. 3. 1. 1. 1. 1. 

1. Jer. 26. 91. 10. 60. 42. 4. 

If the deed is lost by time or accident, or destroyed by any other party, it may be lasted without protest. A deed of time in favor of the other party, when it belongs to the other party, but the con-

...
Reading

...ours for omitting, the furious in these cases must be ta-
...ed in the Table, especially otherwis in they are insensible. 
...1700, 45 M. 1. Board. 2. No. 181. 2 M. 6. 2283. 
...Root 341. 9. To. 382.

If in these cases the plaintiff, with prospect to will be conve-
do to it, be sued continued on the. If at he makes for-
put the opposite party has a right to agree to, be can-
found, all that the plea may be amended. J. 52. 80.
...Sund. 40. 1. Wiln. 16.

When the suit is only incumbent to the action of com-
...is not made under it, product need not be made, un-
...and on the. require it. 6. 5. 551. 6. 60. 98. 11. 50. 99.

But it has long been settled in bar, that prospect is not
...ney, but even is demandable without it.

At 6. 8. the omission of prospect where there necessary was
...of substance. I was added by verdict, but now by
...at 16. 41. 6. 11. 4. 15. which was the usual state of
...t in a sum neither of power, nor in
...t in advantage of only by the defence, so in aid by ver-
...Judg. 6. 5. 175. 10. 40. 72. 2. 60. 32. 4. 542. 50. 621. 
...6. 40. 11. 8.

But if the deed be lost or destroyed & placed without any
...r a copy, so no, nor found, end of its contents; admis-
...i that time lost be, for near the party will always
...ke the loss end win the deed itself, out of the near by
...an ease, whenever found, out of the rest of it is inadmissible, so in necessity only
...to make it appear fundable. J. 42. 51. 44. 4. 90. 
...6.
Reading

The rage of the aduersary may blow away, the aduersey may carry away. w. 4. 1Sa. 113. 1Sa. 293. 1Sa. 114. 5.

He is entitled to a copy of it at his expense. Mat. 21. 4. 1Sa. 319.

But for the aduersary to make incumbrance, or to he not satisfied. 1Sa. 119.

So if no fault of a aad, is made, when not necessary, nor is it

The object of feoffment is to enable the parties to plead as

If it be not made, then he is not bound to sur-

The bargain is, 1Sa. 113. 1Sa. 39. 1Sa. 114. 1Sa. 93. 1Sa. 476. 1Sa. 39.

If it is granted, when necessary, dan no injury, but en-

From this, if no fault is made, he may be heard, on the

When a fault is made, the party is heard, it opens into

The usual rule is, that if the party who holds it, or of

And the transaction of which to save the party from the buried of the bond for ever.

But frequently, all that is necessary is to

The usual rule is, 2Sa. 9. 1Sa. 39. 40.
Reading

So if in an action on personal bond it appears on the face of it as from the condition that time given for an illegal consideration, the bond on the face of it may be deemed to be void if the consideration is not explained, the party cannot discharge, but must show the illegality of it by due process.

If a deed or instrument is fairly written by the party, after his coming age of it, the donee party may sign it, and for want of that or because it to be enrolled in his name by the officer of the court is then deemed 4 P. 370. But


By falsely writing it he is guilty of a breach of trust to a violation of an implied engagement, to give it to the deed as a warranty, unless taken on his part to the trust.

Lass. 100. Dunn. 2 416. 17. 4. P. 370.

Of Delegation in Debt.

This is a delegation or abandonment or defacto from one man to another, one party to the other, distinct from not leading to satisfy it.

The obligations of each party in the execution stages of the debt, without protest of the former party—so the plaintiff, without protest the defendant's.
So if a plaintiff, in his liquamen, sued, and it was
true, he alleged a gift in fact, he laid the
action of ne ex simplici, and it lay plauso. So if
the deft. pleaded res judicia, or recitation of non estandi, or praetor
aliqua, he laid the action of de libario. 3d Ro. 3. 101. Actio 4. 105. 1 Curt. 409. 3d.
Ro. 3. 101.

So in actions of common law, the deft. alleges the law
from one of a condition precedent— the non res judicia
—e.g. the deft. was ready to perform, but the dept. refused
to be known—this is a defantume. But if the deft. pleaseth a
state of the other that hew has suffered—a recitation that
it has been avoided is not a defantume— for it justifieth the
right ground. 3d Ro. 124. 1 Curt. 21. 2 Do. 58. 2 Curt. 376.
469. 512.

But when the cause of action is alleged generally, & the
defendant denies, a more particular statement by way of
novel affirmative is not a defantume. So if in the action
of lia, the deft. justify an one lien on a certain day known
to the same as on the deedly, the deft. may simply
mention it as a lien on a different day, or a different lien
in a different part of the same day with more finite
accuracy, knowing it to be different from the one given.

Indeed a new assign may be considered so as to reason a
defantume— the deft. may merely assign, with as with
out taking it on the deed. Story 529. Lasse 480. 16 M. 2.

Defantume is a substantial fault, fraught, by G. deum
so that in one not sound. says the maker only to st.
Reading

Of Demurrer.

This is said to be an irregular or collateral part of the pleadings. This is not a plea but an exception. It is not an answer to a plea, nor a denial of a plea, nor a plea to the action, if there was no plea. It is not a plea, nor a denial of a plea, nor a plea to the action. If there was no plea, a demurrer

A demurrer is a legal proposition or writ that the pleadings on the other side are insufficient in form. It asserts the question of fact alleged on the other side, if they are well pleaded, but denies them sufficiently in form. In response to the question of demurring from them immediately to the court, 4. Race 123, 2. KB. 36, case, 122, 25, Matt. 129.

A demurrer may be taken at any part of the pleadings, i.e., the allegations on the other side in any stage of the pleadings.

Of demurrer admits that all other facts than such as well pleaded as if in answer of a competent witness the plea admits a prior use of instruments, need name no id. In the demurrer to the whole, the plea will be brought as much branches as can well appear. 4. Race 324, 2. KB. 245, 3. Race 123, 2. KB. 245, Matt. 1325, 56, 3. Race 249.
Reading

A demurrer cannot be an answer that contradicts what was pleaded before, unless it can be shown that the issue was not fully tried. It is evident that a demurrer, if it appears contrary to what the record shows, will not be allowed. A demurrer does not controvert the fact, but it may be used to allege that the record is not complete.


The same principle applies to a demurrer where the record contains a statement that is not admissible. A demurrer in such a case may be used to challenge the admissibility of that statement.


So in an action of assumpsit for taking land in the county of A, if the defendant alleges to have taken it in the county of B, it does not amount to a variance.


Nor can it admit facts which are not material or the record.


It cannot controvert allegations that are not material or the record.


Such allegations must be dismissed as not material, and a party denying them must be liable to confess the same.


It cannot admit the truth of an impost or a material amount. Deeke 6:9:25 Line 16.

After an issue of fact joined, a demurrant may take it up to show whether the parties are adverse, or if the issue joined was for the purpose of further proof or defense, an issue joined close the

**Page 518.**

A demurrant is only called on issue in it, but this is not strictly correct; it rather tends to an issue in it, the issue not being closed till the parties demurrant upon, joins in the

**Demurrant:**

Demurrants are not to be joined until the issue is to be stopped, or the issue of fact is to be closed.

**Page 519.**

If there is a demurrant, a demurrant may take it up to show whether the parties are adverse, or if the issue joined was for the purpose of further proof or defense, an issue joined close the

**Page 519.**

A demurrant is only called on issue in it, but this is not strictly correct; it rather tends to an issue in it, the issue not being closed until the parties demurrant upon, joins in the

**Page 519.**

A demurrant is only called on issue in it, but this is not strictly correct; it rather tends to an issue in it, the issue not being closed until the parties demurrant upon, joins in the

**Page 519.**

If there is a demurrant, a demurrant may take it up to show whether the parties are adverse, or if the issue joined was for the purpose of further proof or defense, an issue joined close the

**Page 519.**

A demurrant is only called on issue in it, but this is not strictly correct; it rather tends to an issue in it, the issue not being closed until the parties demurrant upon, joins in the

**Page 519.**

A demurrant is only called on issue in it, but this is not strictly correct; it rather tends to an issue in it, the issue not being closed until the parties demurrant upon, joins in the

**Page 519.**

A demurrant is only called on issue in it, but this is not strictly correct; it rather tends to an issue in it, the issue not being closed until the parties demurrant upon, joins in the

**Page 519.**

A demurrant is only called on issue in it, but this is not strictly correct; it rather tends to an issue in it, the issue not being closed until the parties demurrant upon, joins in the
Reading

In bow the Dene to the dative in this “the dative says that the

Deter [the matter therein contained] are unassessable in

e 8 henuf being judge. The twcder is and the

jew says that the dater [the matter therein con-
tained] are insufficient in to henuf be twcder judge in

sting the former in longest. Turner 171. 1 Turner 171. 60 Henuf.

Turn 171. 3. 18 af. 29. Turner 243 4.

But in C1uy to unnecessary to conclude with a mini-

teur, otherwise new being added to the dem. Turner.

1 Turner 24. 5. Jer. 132.

Of the Effects of Dem.

In certain jugs in dem unless to solatary plea in roent

ey in e fight or in chief no fight in e. Beu 172. Jer 172.

Turner 172.

And in principal case, short of plea, the case in the same

Turn in no fight even after time concurred in there case.


Condure Hanuf 157 942.

But in pleuri, Yeasold of offans, the better opinion is that

after dem concurred the jilt may plead in e. Beu 172. 2 Vol.

249 2 919. 2. Hanuf 93 4.

But of the jilt concurred in the dexter concurred in e, still

the jilt may join in be I have jilt in chief, the conc-

curred in e discurved test, made sure f in e. This of the

jilt concurred that the ward may be questioned.

Turner 172 3 var 92 9.

Then are 2 kinds of dem. var 1. Jer 172. 172.
Reading

My own opinion affirms no particular cause—a no
in view that the point but of the, the particular defect on which
the term is founded. So that if the first party says that the other
party insufficient to do it, or want party, try it to the law. But if the
other party he says, he will allege that the other party has not
paid the place, in which the inquiry was committed, slight
2 Ch. 192, 1 Pet. 172, 1 Sam. 167, 1 Pet. 192.

To be less known that the term was introduced by the stat
of Elizabeth II. This is incorrect for the case known to
the term that time—that is only makes the term necessary
in certain cases in which they were not so at the. So it
makes them unnecessary in all cases, defects in point of
form. Holt 222, 1 Simon 397, 1 Rec. 192.

But it is not sufficient to constitute a term that there
be assigned by its party assigned to silks a
party. Thus if A says, if for cause, it is of sufficient in
terms and forms, his terms are brought in order to make it
not to move one that the uncertainty can be
venue in lieu of all certain time laid, as
no certain quantity laid to Reg. 192. 146, 213. 1. Nov. 252
1. 252.

All terms were constantly so—this was observed by those
who lived in the time of Eliz. when the state about
was made—he says, for a good to make a t
in all cases he cannot make a plain
for a cause of term. To term also for his sometimes difficult to
define whether the defect is matter of form or substance
2. 252. 1. 252.

As a that all substantial defects that is material
area related by B or all term. But defects in term, only any of
term under the strict 21. Eliz.
addressing.

If, then, one element of the character one should aim to take advantage of a defect in substance, this is not particularly pointed out. To this, 10, 60, 61, Salt 231, 13, Alb. 2, 16, 181, 1, Ind., 1, Holst 137, 163, 292, 625.

We, I believe, in all the states, the st in law have adopted the reasons of the said at 60.

In the 6, 68 of plane the necessity of flag flly is incurred farther than in plane this would be by that defects in power
must be attached by his act done. That extends the 6 to
certain particular cases, subject to be understood, the all
on that. No two it extends the necessity of flag flly. 4, Bac.
139, 4, 5.

The st in making it necessary as to matters of form and
duty to appear, indictment, or actions on personal status.
6, 2, 62.

In all flags two things are necessary. 1st, the matter
alleged to be sufficient; 2nd, that it be alleged in the form
of 6. The existence of either of these elements is good case
of law the form of 6, 62, the latter of 6. Holst 232, 165.
4, 132, 1. Bac. 171, 593, 702, 13, 12, 193, 3, 798, 80.

But what is substantial & what formal defect is an im-
portant question. But they admit only of 9 definitions
being so in this nature instead. The most definite on that
has time gave in the following - the existence of that will
not which the right of action does not appear is a defect in
substance. But the existence of that without which the
right of action was sufficiently appears, the that right is
not alleged in the power of 6. is a defect in power only.
The objection is that the right is not alleged, no division

according to the power of 6. Holst 234, 3.
Reading

This is the 1st part, to see the performance of a condition precedent: this in matter of substance, for the right was only to occur when the performance of the condition, so the null, the cause might not appear.

So if the minister is omitted in respect in substance.

So we know to reject a b k, the answer must know that the dog has been accustomed to kill sheep, but the lament has indeed saved to the A-Y which that the answer shall be held, for all the mischief being done.

But on the other hand, the plea unless in an action of civil baby, if omitted in matter of form only, for the conclusion unless the baby was committed, the action being treason— the cause appears. But the ancient form of it required that the answer be laid.

4. 31. 2. 114. 115.

Again, if the debtor be double the defect in form, so I can't k now, but that is the same debtor, thus if a defect in form, for the cost was wrong, then if a form of error appears in the case, but the debtor is bad a sort of form, so if the debt where it's what amounts to the b. there is a defect in form, then defect appears, but the form of allegation is different.

From what has been of it results, that when there is a total want of substance, as when one or another for not breaking here, it could, or when a material alteration is omitted, a good is in case. So in terms of the plj, dog not state here, or in turn does not state that he was in fight at the time of the evening town, this is rectified by t. b. d. f. for this is essential to the right of meaning. sp. 133. 148. 233. 301.
Thus far of the defect in form of the defect in substance.

If one party pleads a plea by which he appears as the party of the plea to be declared form. He goes to court for he has no right to plead it in this form. Laws 120. 38.

And our reach are other formal defects than such as are by the English or by the plea of bar, or to defects not directly affected to by plea of the statute. In case no right of venue but not the decision of he can take advantage of the duplicity for he has not seized it. 90. 60. 38.

When the judge is for the debt and does not receive an abandonment action for the same cause of action, another is sustained on the same ground as was declared by the first debt. But when the judge, from want of essential allegations, he may declare another action for the same cause, making that allegation. The second action he states on same premises than the first declared on. In this case that we can has a right to have his case tried more than one, but the one in the first case the good cause was not done. The second is declared onin. Laws 240. 328. Est 165. 2 C.B. 779. 338. 667. 7. 11 and 167.

6. Mod. 20.

So one of the fifth memorials, his action he must bring another action for the same cause; for the actions are not similar of convenience. As when the fifth hearing town, when brought to hearing was 6. 60. 1.
Reading

1. Mr. 240. 304.

The same remedy states of the 5th, 304th in the note below - as if our hire 2, 1. 171. 83. 83.

In any case, how the fault or our real action, is not due to us that wronged to buy the same right, but they are not similar or concurrent. 6. 60. 7.

In ton we have but our real action. Defini-

Wherein the events of a case, has been tried, the same cannot be tried again. So if we prove demand if we plead same been stated but not conversion of the debt instead of demanding finds a value. If true is taken and decided for the debt, the debt shall arise again. 6. 60. 20.

A dam. should return to the whole of the goods on the other receives a fact in running in some way - than this dam. should be converted with the facts, not than amended too. 6. 61. 1. 1. 2. 8. 81.

A dam. much back thirty the whole record, all the fault is allowed for. But the fault found, and not as it remains 6. 60. 56. 2. 51. 1. 1. 128. 199. 200. 1. 4. 110. 6. 4. 120. 8. 6. 52. 6. 4. 120. 123. 5.

I say, the same attacks to the fault substantial 0. 90. 11. 2. 6. 244. 6. 4. 120. 123. 5. 51. 52. 64. 8.

But there are some exceptions to this. 6. 1. 2. 120. 6. 1. 120. 6. 1. 143. 22. 2. 3. 21.
Off from the evidence.

This is the rational branch. In some cases when the issue terminates on the issue of just one party may be the examination of the case from the jury to the judge by examining to the end. The case must be taken, before the party examining exhibits his case for the purpose of requiring the jury to weigh the case of each of the two sides; one in sufficient to counterbalance the other. So in Law. Aug. 404. 6, 1. Rand. 172. A. P. 178. 1. Book 170. Syn. 1, 6.

The relevancy of law is matter of fact always to be determined by the court. This being established by the question here for it time to establish the point in issue is matter for the jury to determine.

By the relevancy of law is means its pertinacity to establish the issue — if it concurs in any degree to do this it is relevant.

So in a manner that matter of law is to be determined by the court, matter of fact by the jury — Doug. 380. 2. H. 58. 206.

It now can be proper to discuss to what that is applicable to the whole same purpose such it may be. 2. H. 58. 209. Doug. 58.

The dem. facts are end to the matter of fact of the jury is no more concerning, with the case, than it refers to the thing. Action of the one to the facts shown in ev. 309. 191. 102. 119. 309. 102. 180. 151. 2.
Reading

Sheen, thin, colour, the fact, known by the owner, party on
and to the other party. On the legal operation in favour
of him who exhibits them, on their sufficiency to support the
issue 2 John 10, 1 Pet 3, 2, 11 Cor 13, 6.

The facts must be first established—till this is done no
question of them can exist

Matter of it is a conclusion from matter of fact, the ques-
tion true is their sufficiency. Since the facts must first
be established 2, 11 Cor 13, 6.

Form to this is taken to allegations in support of the
cause, where due to one to end, is only taken to end, advanced or
support of one side of the issue after issue joins. The former
are now to taken after issue joined—the main issue
after issue joined.

This cants agree that when the whole is exhibited in
written—these may always be demanded to, of the party exhibit-
ing it, must either join in the time or remain this side. It be-
ing all written, they can be no danger of romance—this
writing makes it uncertain to, unless a deed is exhibited in
support of a title. On whose a covenant is exhibited in sup-
port of a debt, they may be demanded to, 3, 11 Cor 13, 6.

But what is a person exhibiting, how do, in order to
join due to one, is not settled by the old notion: 5, 12, 1
3, 11 Cor 13, 11 Lev 31.

In lieu of the facts that a party is not bound to join—
facts, matter, in his uncertainty of such issue—but as to this the following is said to be observed. 1, 11 Lev
clarity settled, that it in no case, the facts may agree that
the one may be removed to—here there can be no objects
Reading from his manuscript that there should be a provision

2d It is fully settled that if the testimony of a witness
is admissible on one to prove any distinct fact, the same par-
ty may always by admitting the fact on the record, oblige the
other party to prove or deny it as to vary the case. To th
use of the party offers a mixture to prove the common or
negligent keeping—him if the other party will admit this
he may draw to the case. To be sure if it were the case, part but
in some would be negating to admit. 2 H 31 B 206.

3d If a man now settles, the formerly true, real, that if pa-
ent (which is exhibited in evidence) is certain or direct, &c. until, our party
by confessing it to be true on the record, may compel the other
party to deny in demurrer on receiving it. 2 H 31 B 206. 271.

Yag. 14 127.

remarking the evil to be true is the same as confessing the just
for our necessity follows the other. 2 H 31 B 206.

But confessing the evil to be true does always compels the
other party to prove for. 4th If the evil is true & undenier-
ate the adverse party cannot deny without confessing the
fact, which it must be true, but by such as the party be
may draw to it whether written or proved. By leaving
indeterminate and or in such that which is excluded distinguish
the future evil, i.e. doubtfull. 2 H 31 B 207. Oct. 8. 18.

5th If the evil is circumstantial, the party assuming to it
must admit or prove distinctly every thing which it

The mixture may testify positively to facts, which facts
are circumstantial evil. The judge alone to make me
Claim for damages, therefore, if not admitted, would amount to a circumstantial and a recent injury. In claiming damages, one must frequently in such cases, if the facts and circumstances are not apparent, to produce other facts, or the latter facts cannot be ascertained. Co. L. 223. Doug. 114. 131. Bulk. 213. Slty. 122. 33. 1. H. B. 34. 123.

In such cases it is not competent todamages. Reference to not the duty of the party to join in a suit where he is not competent, but one party to denominate not the other party to join.

But in the last case if the party assuming the duties the admission of the other party to join in a suit, the party is not the party to join at the suit. As well as the relevancy of the case, as much as it may be thought of a capacity to a new. Bulk. 114. 131. Co. 137. 2. H. B. 209.

In due to the point is given on whether the case done to is sufficient, or to maintain the point of fact on issue. It has to be observed that the whole evidence is in support of the point in issue, is to be demonstrated to the party having the evidence in such ease. The question is not as to the relevancy merely, but whether the evidence is sufficient to prove a fact might be sufficient, while the whole might be one fact sufficient. Doug. 209. 13.

The case is not to the plea, therefore in such ease, no advantage can be taken if any part of the other party in issue. Determined advantage of a defect in the pleadings may amount of judgment after verdict. Bulk. 213.

It is to observe that a motion herein is on the new
Reading

I think it stands on the same ground as a motion after
the verdict, as motion in default, as the verdict having
been the jury could not have found the facts unless it
had been presented.

But so far as we can state the reason nothing can be prevented there.

...
But in such case the remedy is by bill of exceptions. And if the party disputes to prove it by exception he is allowed a bill of exceptions as by motion for a new trial. 1 Barn. 341. 2 Term. 341. 1 Wh. 13. 259. 341.

The whole proceeding an done to end is under the direction of the court, who may grant the demand, or refuse to grant what aid there will be. 2 Term. 117. 2 Term. 31. 308.

In a case of diminishing it is this. The party must first state the act or acts. Then he is to allege that he is insufficient to carry on the business for want of sufficient capital, that unless the jury may be discharged the business cannot be done. If at that time the court think proper that the jury may be discharged if the party be able to act. 3 Viner. 197. 2 B. & C. 207. Allew. 113. 374.

In answer to some of these it is to shew on what it is to be answered. In my opinion it is done correctly on no other ground. In answer to what it is answered on no ground that the act remains unaltered. It is done without notice. It is usually done after an act is passed. On a verdict it is found
But this is not universally the case. It may be often disputed, or the law and the current of events may cause the party to be less than the case. It is the rule in the Law of Evidence, 3 Bl. 393.

According to English law, no one can prove intentional causes, i.e., those which are on the face of the record.

Advantage is to be taken of extrinsic causes, for example, a bill of material or the like. So if the cause is extrinsic, the result will be reversed. If not, it will not. So if the cause is extrinsic, the result is the cause, and hence his decision in the case that there is a variance for the result warranting no such decision. 3 Bl. 393.

So also, when the result varies materially from the cause, the result will be reversed. Here the key is not found within the cause. But must cannot be reversed unless the cause is found by extrinsic cause. But facts in question cannot be found—no more if I must be a conclusion from facts. So the issue is whether or not the fact is the fact that the case is wanting a hank. If the case finds that the case is the only fact, a hank. But that cannot be a hank. If the facts on the facts, that is the case, the facts must not be found on those facts, that is, the facts that are found on mechanically, might have been that can found. 3 Bl. 393.
The other hand of the 4th sect declares as lawful a priori suspect is taken for him, which may be accused by the 5th. As if to detect he plead not guilty & the court is here for the fact, it being notorious nothing exists next to the same - his being not guilty don't know that he can not sue the 5th. 4.3.3.33.

So if he plead that he was never called & since joined on this head still this is indecent.

Then it can be clear, but the difficulty consists in applying these to particular cases. To what kind of facts? And in no way must be answered.

1st. The 1st is that judgment may be accorded for any case after verdict, which might be assigned for similar after verdict & next. So the only question is what verdict after verdict & next case be assigned for error. P. 174 B. 516 D. 2774.

This leaves us the 4th Ch. 10, that if the wrong only of the 5th both as cause of action is defective, he adds his verdict. There is no title or cause of action is stated in the sect. 123, A. 740. 17. 174. 179. A. 204. D. 246. 174. 298. 4. M. 3. 201.

So if trial the 5th must receive a certain day on which being commenced, this is added by verdict; for it appears that the 5th has been guilty if the 5th has a right to assume whether the day return was tried on 1st. 32. 218. Doug. 65. Dec. 1723.

On the other hand negates in here. For taking & carrying away the 5th goods but stating goods to help & benefit for the object this is not said by verdict for the object is on the 5th title - he has not alleged that
Reading

they were his goods—so it can't appear that any protest of his has been violated occurs in the copy noted or now.

So in pleading for calling the facts, a pure defect for the defect, there is a pure defect. There is no case for the copy in the words our own action. Doug. 691, 692, 693, A. C. 424, A. T. 1829, June 28th. June 30, 1828.

So if an action is brought on the wrong of a kind of as the facts, not attending to which, as proper to the defect, it goes to his title & not to his statement there. His case never in future would affect.

Some thinking requires mentioning apply to the defect, defect, which the facts, an apply to the defect if the statement of defect only in defective. The result will give it—is of the defect, defect, is defective. So if we shall not guilty in point of his own case in defect & have defect must cure it.

But if account must, explained without mentioning the day on which he was made to, without the defect, this will be after the result for the decision itself against the defect goes only to the statement, 497. 973. 192. 542. 123. 325. 177. 192. 71. 177. 192. 470. 497.

Another 4. 12 is that any defect that will not for an action of right must have been made or would have been futile & to have that in an answer & such, but not erroneous. So if it appears that it would not have support, it will not support a motion in answer of right. But this A. 120. 120. 192. 470. 497. That conclusion will support a & done will support an award of right for many things that would have.
been all on the same curve and so remained uncancelled by the
sect. 9, 136, 529, 15.

And the reason of this is that if the death omits some
particularly crimulatory, without which the party
will not be hard wound, but which is afterwards
added more than which are allowed it, found. And
perhaps after verdict the same is found to have been
proved. So if in some the fill be not, the field be ac-
tually on a time, for if there is no rule of damages
party must not be wound her verdict, and the fill is found
so have proved the value. To verdict are alleged before
and uncertainty that it is damage in the end hereafter
sect. 9, 136, 337, 56, 106, 501, 406, 569, 572, 44.

So if, in declared upon, and no day laid on which the
tree was committed, the day ought to be presumed for it
must appear to have been committed when the want
was, yet after verdict to presume that have been com-
mitted before the issuing of the writ, since the jury
were the direction of the it could not have found for
the fill until it had appeared in Dec. 15, 58, 8, 106,
196, 15, 160.

In other words the principle of the R. respecting a
deficit being added by verdict is this. After it verdict
that it will presume that these facts, not a degree
but one family within from those that are al-
ready found were proved to the jury as
in times above.

The jury my finding subjected the sum of damages
as if placed is without none of remorse
this is good after verdict, for that it will easily
firmness proper for an amount supposed it. If
I suppose this would to be good on time the room
Reading

The same act in different words, the act will then become after more than a year, which is point of fact and not will be
in point of fact and will be

In short, the act will always remain after more than a year, which is point of fact and will not make the

In short, the act will always remain after more than a year, which is point of fact and will not make the


The same act in different words, the act will then become after more than a year, which is point of fact and will not make the

On the other hand, the act cannot be known or learned within the year in which the act is done, and which is point of fact and must be known in order to know if there is

So when in how the act ought to have been done, after more than a year, will be presumed. For the act must not be presumed to mean that which the act can

And if the act should be mistaken, large future due in this declar, this is an unanswerable day. So}
Of the grant of an ownership, it had without laying it to have been done by deed, or found by verdict, nor that it was done by either of the two methods, or that the deed was found to be a part of a deed, as to a jury of opinion that was done by deed in susmene. Hunter 33.

Again nothing can be presumed to have been known except the facts which are admitted or found on such as are not precisely known from them.

So that the requisition of the 25th of March 3rd, supposed to be wholly void of substantiation, as taken or it is found for the whole, the whole is not void. For no fact can be presumed, which can make it good. So if an action of slander is brought for calling a man a jinn 1. Ams. 19.
If an action is brought in the instance of a bail of a suit and the bail being made the defendant, the court can prosecute in this fact, provided the necessary requirements are met; but a court must have the facts to prove that a surety was made of the acceptor, not that the bail was not liable.

In point of law, the surety is required to support the case to be sure when the promise is placed; the surety is bound of course, but it becomes known constitutes the safeguard. If in the wrong act, fraud, or it will produce as an event any fact that was necessary to the promise being warranted. But in respect to what is necessary in point of law, merely declaring to purchase is of 2 parties is necessary to warrant a promise would have to prove that the promise was complete, that the party was competent judge of the 2. But in the supposition there must exist an unanimous verdict. I must be bound to talk of necessity in amount of proof. 1 minister. 22. 26. 27. Kirby 409.

So if we mean what is necessary is something that is necessary of fact to warrant the promise, the surety is not liable if then the promise would be binding, seeing that is alleges to those only to find the facts alleged are against the other. 1 kind 2. 17.

But in point of law, a consideration is necessary the courier, but means that the facts alleged are true, but nothing more. The court promises facts, but that an untrue in point of law. 20. 21. 27. 9. 84.
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But on men cease to act in anything for the greatest object in the floor. It was the doubt, or I am well. The man is in one of the more of the party, or in the whole nature of their to be of the to much the shall have it because really the floor can be no other any in which the other is taken away. 

So is the floor is inconsiderable, also in the been, from been open as the floor. I need to the floor, the floor is not worse no further for the floor is still of them in the action same of men. The floor would not be acted upon indeed it was useful. The motion in almost without had thorough. The whole micro-attaches to the seat fault in the floor. The term removed in favour of the fault it could not in vain for the self to leaning shown no cause or absolute amount it then inside in self. 

Defect from another can the defect is made, but the first of mishearing are both present in the. One on the other, who is found for the self. Here the fifth shall have judge.
Reading

for the only good plea in an his fault & the fault committed the fault fault. 1 Wheat. 24. 243. 1840

And when you take a witness of a verdict is against a verdict is the party you whose the verdict was found, may sometimes be rendered notwithstanding the verdict. 1 Wheat. 243. 243.

This, if the debt is wholly insufficient, the plea in bars insufficient is not the plea in favor of a verdict for the debt, it must be arrested, & done for the 2d venue, 1 Wheat. 243. 243. 2d 2d 2d 2d 2d 2d 2d 2d 2d. 1 Wheat. 243. 243.

Being 417

the plea was, the fifth time, as an example of its, a mischief must be supposed, that he was not aware of, because, as an illustration on a material point, 1815. 125. 216. 13.

5 B. 95. comp. 510. Doug. 390. 1. 4. 36. 44. comm. 34.

But a mistake is never awarded on account of the insufficiency of the plea, in favour of the party who founded it. Don't know any decision to this point. But Bullen on asked on allegory if he knew of any case in which lose was awarded by being on the negligence. Doug. 390.

27. comp. 500. 1. 4. 36. 64.

If then the plea in bar is good, if an insufficiency of the plea was awarded, N is, in favour of the party on their right, the plea has no merit, he should have taken issue on a material point.

an issue may be material if found one way, but material or found another. So if an issue is brought on account of the plea at or before a nuisance day, plea of fact before the plea given. A found for the plea. This is an insufficiency and is found from. A spoke in material. Hence it is that an insufficiency has, in that matter of process, not in material. An issue is an insufficiency, and an insufficiency has never decided. It binds in many cases, the finding may make it material. Nor be singular that the the loss is nothing to process, it is binding and may make it an insufficiency, the reason in the finding makes it certain. Rev. 94. 4. 9.

If the jury after finding a fact specially, such a conclusion of fact and process it, that it is not rendered, it, but will give their own proof on the facts, So if the is decided as to nothing, as far as the jury after finding the fact concludes their. Rev. 94. 4. 9.

This is my language. 11, 10. 10. 5. 94. 9. 156. 33. 36. 52.
No refuge done is warranted when it ought to be denied.
No once done, the judge will be erroneous. The claim is
sufficient to be done. 548. 6. 6. 109.

It can be no refuge after a continuance and it could be no issue here. 329. 591. 19 to 21.

If a refuge were sometimes awarded before such a
request were the state — but if the case is not
caused by a default, it may be considered and no
refuge were done can be awarded upon a demand of
proof. 1. 6. 11. 123. c. Alpha 2. 6. 191. 5. 125. 1. 121. 1. 122. 1. 122. 1. 122. 1. 122. 12. 2. 122. 2.
6. 6. 109.

This was a motion in arrest of judgment for
reprieve in fls. But just may be arrested for want
in the mind, the the fls. And now if the jury
find any of the facts without what is material of
and the mind on it — to the manner of a possession. 3. 11. 11. 32. 1. 219. 1. 4. 1521. 109. 1116.

The manner so that a material part of the fls
may be quieted if it be awarded is not confirmed in
the care of the it can under a part on what is unnecessary.
1. 6. 121. 219. 1. 121. 2. 121. 1943. 109.
But the answer is, the query must be regarded as final, if it finds all the substance for sufficient. 1. Rev. 2:14. 

And as the omission of what is material vitiated the whole, so also a material omission between the parties to the suit is quite as fatal a ground of proof as any other, indeed of proving the suit, but what is contrary to it—so in the case of a bank-mortgage upon the suit that the estate of a plaintiff was a bank-mortgage—this would be that the suit so he would be a bank

But a suit in which the issue is not vitiated by finding none the battle must be won singlehanded. So the omission here affects but to the similar

Here applies to a suit in which the suit but not the suit itself is final. And in a case of a bank-mortgage, the estate of the plaintiff was a bank-mortgage, and in a case of a bank-mortgage, the estate of the plaintiff was a bank-mortgage. In such a case if the issue is not vitiated by the omission of what is omitted, the issue must be re-considered, and the omission used as proof of the suit, for the omission is the gist of the suit, and the omission is the gist of the suit, for the omission is the gist of the suit.
Reading

To of these two counts in one del: I am a good another bad, & the jury find a y verdict & if the
sum entire verdict will be amended. For it could appear
that they were assessed wholly on the good count
Ex. 103. 10 to 130. Bet. 1/4. 2 1/2. 4. 118. 2 1/2. 4. 1/2. 124.
Aug. 122. 12 2808. 22.

But yet such a debt must be good and it the
sum verdict must be reversed. But this does
contradict the | that whatever fact is ground of
an amount of judgment must be such as would be
good and due. For that | relates to this
the verdict - there is dearly a cause of action in
the debt for one count is good - so trial not
in due order. But the damages should have been

But if no certain damages are assessed on the
second count, the party may when these on the
first one I take judge on them on the good one
sum is in such necessary

So if in one count the del is charged with call
ing the def a thief, & if in the second with call
ing him a four, I refuse damages are assessed
the def may recover the damages on the bad
count. | Un sufficiently.

And the entire damages are assessed, if no evi
is brought on the bad count, the verdict may be a
rived by the d from the judge unless so as to un
der judge on the good count only. No other evi
the judge must be allowed for this sum. | Del. 1/4

This Pen to the two counts is not so one in one
Reading

for how we generally change in one count.

In law of the civil courts of but one count, but various
the distinct cases of action, are sufficient & the other
not so, & there is a by virtue of when damages are given
judgment will be awarded. To have the act be liable as
things the wrong of the case of action were done
in two distinct counts: 1. Act 33.

But if different suits of one action case of action,
was true in the same count & damages amount as
judgment could be awarded the one suit is lost in
another gain. 1. Act 34.

Where judgment is awarded in the same suit as suit for
availed, manslaughter or otherwise, a person or cases
is awarded, not a replication for the suit is
not against another. If a replication is intended only to

But the rule above in civil cases don't apply to
criminal prosecutions— for if there was two counts
in the latter case, one is good, the other ill, if a by
judicial is the right one, the suits & case not be amount as
for the jury, but affecting the punishment. The
judgment is in each only—one there is no occasion that one for the suit to be amount.

I have so that in every the cases, for amounting suit
are extraneous— as the constitution as amount of
a jury— the extraneous cases in here may be amount
for amount of judgment as if the jury and the advice of
then judgment is count. 1. Act. 193. 36.

2: 167.
Reading

The conduct of the parties towards a jury is also a cause for annulling a jury. So too of the accused party towards the accused, or the accusing party towards the accused. Lord Buc. 293. St. 162.

So if a person is situated in a case more related to the party as to be a particle for a principal challenge, that may be committed. Nay, if he be no similarly related to the party as to be ground of such challenge, the case of annull. 114, 115, 136.

Another cause is, if a person having before him an arbitrator in the same cause, or his opinion, or has been his attorney, Keighley 162.

The next is, if the misconduct goes to the impartiality of the judge. It would be good cause for a principal challenge to go as cause for annulling the judge. Keighley 136.

But then it goes to the impartiality, if the party knows it in reason to make the challenge, it shall be heard on the merits of the case. In the case of the judge, it would be without the merit. 142. Keighley 162.

So if one of the parties has had a cause in one of the suits below, or ground from principal challenge but not of annull. For as the cases of parties are on record, they are supposed to be known to the party, when he should have awaited himself of it before. It subter.

The usual way is to state extrinsic cause under no less for a new trial. 15 Ba. 27.

The judge, being convicted in court, was usually allowed on either side for the same thing fairly sought by
Demurrer if timely have particular orders for the doth
reach the balance Sall. 547. 1 bank 116 120 7. 2 162 1 40. 1.
Inc. 41, being 39.

And if pleading in arrest has been made & there is
brought a recovery here, no costs shall be awarded
not more than incurred below—nor the party caught
to have taken advantage at the written state of the pro-
ceedings. Ind. 188. 1 418 7 61. Sall. 5. 499.

In any motion in arrest of judgment made within the
seven hundred days of the term next preceding the term they
are made in hand. 2. 54. 495.

The new motion of arrest must be made on the day of
the verdict being found & accepted. It must also be made
within 8 days, unless to the adverse party or the court with the
clerk within twenty days from the date of the verdict or diary
stamping. It must also be admitted before the term, then,
over the term are not 24 hours remaining.
1 & 2 51. 521. 12. 475.

The form of a motion for arrest is this: "But after ver-
dict by the jury, unless appeal is made, by reason of
the clear conviction that the judge may be made out of mind,
because he says the whole State is insufficient or to mind
appendix. E. D. Ray."
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- solemnize 1st 2 Vol. 2.10
- care 2 Vol. 4
- nuncupation 2 Vol. 7
- publication 2 Vol. 7.8
- of the subscription of 2 Vol. 7.9
- number of 2 Vol. 7.10
- credibility of 2 Vol. 10.11.12
- who may devise 2 Vol. 13 to 14
- when devise not secure 2 Vol. 17.18
- devise's interest in thing devised 2 Vol. 19.20
- of mortgage's privity 2 Vol. 31.12
- what estate may be created by devise 2 Vol. 20.26
- who may take by devise 2 Vol. 26.26
- devise of real 2 Vol. 26
- to bastard 2 Vol. 27.28
- to children on ventor or master 2 Vol. 27.28.9
- designation of devise
- words of limitation 2 Vol. 32.3.4.5.72
- general description of devise 2 Vol. 34.34
- special description of 2 Vol. 34
- whose devise may pass 2 Vol. 36.42
- apparent objects in devise 2 Vol. 36.7
- distributive 2 Vol. 36.7
- revokes 2 Vol. 52
- panel out to explain devise 2 Vol. 52
- latent ambiguity 2 Vol. 53.4
- latent ambiguity 2 Vol. 53.4
- proof as to devise's circumstances 2 Vol. 57
- as to value of fully devised 2 Vol. 57
- as to condition of intestate's family 2 Vol. 57
- as to intestate jointly 2 Vol. 57
- as to grant 2 Vol. 58
- revocation 2 Vol. 58
- how at b. L. 2 Vol. 51
- effect on enfranchised 2 Vol. 51
- by writing 2 Vol. 51.2.3
- by statute on joint or married of a state 2 Vol. 57 to 56
- alteration of estate devised 2 Vol. 56
- by devisee 2 Vol. 56 to 56
- intended alteration 2 Vol. 60.1
- partial revocation 2 Vol. 61.2.3
- revocation under state juris. 2 Vol. 63 to 63
- republication 2 Vol. 67
- at b. L. 2 Vol. 67.4.3
- misce state juris. 2 Vol. 69 to 69
- jurisdiction of court over devisee 2 Vol. 73 to 76
- giving devisee court at b. L. 2 Vol. 76.3
- of showing a devise in chry. 2 Vol. 78.9
Duns.
- "in" done in 2 Vol. 16
- "to bond" must be especially shaded. 2 Vol. 184.
- "in ast" near 2 Vol. 184.

Ejectment 2 Vol. 261. 2. 3.
-When it lies 2 Vol. 161 to 168.
-Who can have it 2 Vol. 167. 573.
-Judg. 2 Vol. 573. 5. 6.
-Ord. 2 Vol. 576.
-Vendor & judgment 2 Vol. 577. 8.
-Verdict for some funds after ejectment 2 Vol. 342. 2. 3.

Embliments. 1 Vol. 256. 7.

Estates at issuance. 1 Vol. 256.
- "at" until 1 Vol. 254. 8. 345. 2 Vol. 222.
- "for year." 1 Vol. 259.
Cod. - Deed by indictment section 2 Vol. 12.

Exts. 9 dures. 3 Vol. 1.
- testament 3 Vol. 1.
- codicil 3 Vol. 1.
- will 3 Vol. 1.
- power of 3 Vol. 2.
- over real pay 3 Vol. 3.
- over real 3 Vol. 3.
- from real time judge and real pay 3 Vol. 4.
- deed over 3 Vol. 4.
- bond over 3 Vol. 4.
- quit. 3 Vol. 5.
- real 3 Vol. 5.
- will 3 Vol. 5.
- legal 3 Vol. 5.
- account 3 Vol. 5.
- when his heirs for debt 3 Vol. 6.
- extre / active wrable in the direct only, Vol. 9.
- when in direct / direct, Vol. 9.
- how wrable in direct / direct, Vol. 9.
- extre never bounds unless intator was, Vol. 10.
- division liable for bond debts, Vol. 10.
- liability of him, representative, Vol. 11.
- who may be extre, Vol. 11 to 17.
- actio dimini, Vol. 12. 25. 31. 35.
- deventruit, Vol. 12. 43.
- husq, Vol. 16.
- corporation aggregate, Vol. 16.
- distinct, Vol. 16.
- alien, Vol. 16.
- idiot, lunatick, Vol. 16.
- extre not to give security, Vol. 16. 17.
- who may be actio, Vol. 17. 18.
- actio by unborn grandis, Vol. 20. 21.
- to unborn, Vol. 21 to 25.
- actio must distribut, Vol. 22.
- actio joint, Vol. 23.
- survall, Vol. 23.
- degree of kindred how compend, Vol. 23.
- proving actio, Vol. 27.
- extra refusal to accept, Vol. 29. 30. 31.
- actio cum base, Vol. 29. 33.
- in an extre, what is an acceptance, Vol. 30.
- when & how actio, grandis, Vol. 32 to 36.
- bond & Vol. 32.
- actio de bono nunc, Vol. 33.
- rules of actio, durando, Vol. 36.
- nothing actio may be repeated, Vol. 37. 38.
- consequence of refusal, Vol. 39 to 41.
what an extra may do before probate. 3 Vol. 49 to 50.
- act on before letter granted. 3 Vol. 53.
- curators. 3 Vol. 46 to 47.
- curators in 5. but one person. 3 Vol. 48.
- extra de cun. mort. 3 Vol. 49 to 50.
- what makes one. 3 Vol. 50 to 51.
- his liability. 3 Vol. 51 to 52.
- making debtors extra. 3 Vol. 53.
- residuary legacies. 3 Vol. 54. 6. 7. 8 Vol. 52.
- making extra. 3 Vol. 56.
- extra doubt to surmise. 3 Vol. 57.
- who may make a will. 3 Vol. 58.
- what may be disposed of by will. 3 Vol. 59.
- no statute paid in post partum. 3 Vol. 60.
- requisites of a will. 3 Vol. 61.
- misapplication of will. 3 Vol. 62.
- duty of extra & cal. 3 Vol. 63.
- immaterial computation of extra & cal. 3 Vol. 64.
- pay of debts. 3 Vol. 63.
- legacies. 3 Vol. 64. 5. 6 Vol. 60.
- third persons may inquire into the consideration of bonds. 3 Vol. 63.
- summary & specific legacies. 3 Vol. 65. 6. 7 Vol. 61.
- vested & baie'd legacies. 3 Vol. 66.
- legacies conditional. 3 Vol. 67.
- when well given. 3 Vol. 68.
- when it satisfies a debt. 3 Vol. 69.

- admission of 3 Vol. 71.
- refunding 3 Vol. 72.
- payment of 3 Vol. 73.
- when payable 3 Vol. 74.
- interest on 3 Vol. 75.
- how recoverable. 3 Vol. 76.
- residuary 3. 1 Vol. 76. 1 Vol. 71.
- donatio extra morte. 3 Vol. 77.
- distribution Vol.74:2:52
- advancement 3 Vol.88:1.1667:2:7
- adventur 3 Vol.9:1.2
- actions by & in exten. 3 Vol.82:2:56
- what goes to exten. 3 Vol.86:7
- administration bond 3 Vol.88
False imprisonment 3 Vol. 169.
- when it lasts 3 Vol. 169 to 179.
- void proof 3 Vol. 170.

See simple 1 Vol. 242. 3. 4.

See Tid. 1 Vol. 245. 6. 7.

Foreign attachment 3 Vol. 236. 7.

Trends, 1st 2 Vol. 221.
- as to entry of action 2 Vol. 137. 140. 225 to 225.
- as to debt of another 2 Vol. 137. 141. 2. 225 to 225.
- as to mill 2 Vol. 138. 142. 3. 230. 6. 236.
- as to bond 2 Vol. 138. 7. 140. 145. 4. 236. 245.
- costs to be performed within a year 2 Vol. 130. 147. 257.
- costs over ten pounds 2 Vol. 150.
- must be motto in register 2 Vol. 156.
- contained in letters 2 Vol. 146. 7. 296. 250. 1.
- object of stat. 2 vol. 222.
- promissory note must have a consideration express. 2 vol. 224
- original or collateral 2 vol. 225 to 225.
- how to declare on a collateral promise. 2 vol. 229. 4.
- how to plead it in bar. 2 vol. 230.
- deeds not affected by judicial agreements 2 vol. 237.
- as to crafts when no danger of injury. 2 vol. 237 to 242.
- sale of land at vendue by mortgage by chry. 2 vol. 241.
- part performance in sale as to land. 2 vol. 241 to 245.
- - - or to mortg. 2 vol. 245. 6.
- when writings as to land may be contradicted by panel.
- 2 vol. 246.
- panel admissible to rebut an entry. 2 vol. 248.
- note or memorandum. what. 2 vol. 250. 1.
- signing what. 2 vol. 252. 3. 4.
guardian and ward. vol 213 to 220.
2 kinds of guard. vol 213 con.
- man of wards. vol 220.
- settlement of infant. vol 221.

Husband & wife. vol 69.
- first part of w. in fest. vol 69. 70. 101. 2
- in action. vol 70. 1.
- in bonds of trustee. vol 70. 1.
- - - - if husband a bankrupt. Vol. 91.

- debt of W. Vol. 92, 70, 79, 102.
- her chattels. Vol. 73, 4, 251, 276, 7.
- his title to his. Vol. 186, 4.
- jointure. Vol. 76, 2, 50, 300, 8, 86.
- A right to real jury accruing during marriage. Vol. 77.
- to damage, dem. 186 before & during marriage. Vol. 77, 8, 102.
- finding assets. Vol. 186, 8.
- his power over her. Vol. 186, 78.
- his liability for her debts. Vol. 186, 102.
- for her public offences. Vol. 186, 86.
- must perform duties for her. Vol. 186, 8, 102.
- debts of wife. Vol. 94, 4, 2, 251, 276, 34, 57, 300, 290.
- his debts to her. Vol. 186, 4, 8, 86.
- to be paid after his death. Vol. 186, 8, 86.
- his costs with her as to real jury. Vol. 186, 8, 86.
- articles of separation. Vol. 186, 8, 4, 8, 162, 8, 9.
- when his costs bind her. Vol. 186, 8, 86.
- of W exercising a power. Vol. 186, 8, 86.
- waning costs made during marriage. Vol. 186, 8, 86.
- when they must join in a suit. Vol. 186, 9, 90, 1.
- - - - be joined. Vol. 91.
- her power to devise. Vol. 92, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 105, 5.
- her marriage. defect his will. Vol. 186, 9, 4.
- his separate jury. Vol. 186, 8, 9, 105.
- settlement by minors on wife. Vol. 84, 3, 177, 93, 1, 109.
- joint mortgage to H. Vol. 94, 3, 96, 2, 9, 80.
- to her settlement. Vol. 186, 9, 3.
- being married in each other's cause. Vol. 186, 106.
- reciprocal right of defence. Vol. 186, 9, 8, 9, 9, 8.
- celebration of marriage. Vol. 186, 8, 8, 8, 9.
Incorporal bondment. 140873

Inf. 188 3 Vol. 228.
- Six of: 188. 3 Vol. 228.
to lnts. 2 vol. 183. 3 vol. 228.
- to fraud. 2 vol. 183. 3 vol. 228.
- in dept it must not be specially pleaded. 2 vol. 183. 3 vol. 228.
- remedy of assignee. 2 vol. 183. 3 vol. 228.
- on a subsequent promise. 2 vol. 184. 3 vol. 229.

Illegality of contract fica op. 2 vol. 186. 366.

Joint Swam. 1 vol. 187. 89.
- as to joint tenants during. 2 vol. 16.
- as to making with. 3 vol. 99.

Law merchant. 2 vol. 341.
- in b. l. 2 vol. 341.
- by b. l. choses not assignable. 2 vol. 341.
- no right of action here priority of cont. 2 vol. 341.
- no action for a voluntary encumbrance. 2 Vol. 341
- fraud does not destroy right of action. 2 Vol. 341
- want of consideration avoids all instruments. 2 Vol. 342
- bill, or exchange. 2 Vol. 343
- warranty. 2 Vol. 343.
- days of grace. 2 Vol. 344. 345.
- negotiable note. 2 Vol. 343
- indorsement. 2 Vol. 344. 345.
- drawer's liability. 2 Vol. 345.
- notice of defect. 2 Vol. 345. 346.
- time when bill is payable. 2 Vol. 346.
- negotiability of note. 2 Vol. 346.
- who may draw bills of ex. 2 Vol. 347.
- bill payable to order. 2 Vol. 348.
- to be for bearer. 2 Vol. 348.
- privilege of bills. 2 Vol. 348.
- property of qualities of bills. 2 Vol. 349. 350.
- acceptance. 2 Vol. 351. 352.
- for drawer's hand in. 2 Vol. 352.
- partial. 2 Vol. 352.
- provoking condition. cant vary writings. 2 Vol. 352.
- transfer. 2 Vol. 353. 354.
- engagement of parties. 2 Vol. 354.
- manner of notice. 2 Vol. 355. 356.
- obligation of acceptor. 2 Vol. 356.
- remedy of parties. 2 Vol. 356.
- death on a bill. 2 Vol. 357. 358.
- void. 2 Vol. 358. 359.
- illegality of consideration. 2 Vol. 359.
- bank note. 2 Vol. 370.
- bankers' cash note. 2 Vol. 370.
- draught on banks. 2 Vol. 370.
- insurance. 2 Vol. 370.
- all fraud. initiates a policy. 2 Vol. 370.
who may be insured. 2 Vol. 377.

- Insurance of alien. 2 Vol. 377.
- who may insure. 2 Vol. 377.
- subject of insurance. 2 Vol. 377. 6. 7. 8. 7. 50. 9.
- insurance of contraband goods. 2 Vol. 377.
- to countries blockaded. 2 Vol. 377. 6.
- contravening an embargo. 2 Vol. 377.
- to subject an insurance a viciss also must be min. 2 Vol. 377.
- insurance double. 2 Vol. 377. 379.
- of a qualified fish. 2 Vol. 377.
- of expected profits. 2 Vol. 377.
- value 2 Vol. 377.
- wagering. 2 Vol. 377.
- contrary to another policy. 2 Vol. 377.
- reinsurance. 2 Vol. 377.
- minor's interest. 2 Vol. 380. 1.
- partial loss. 2 Vol. 380. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1.
- duration of viciss on weight. 2 Vol. 380.
- total loss. 2 Vol. 381.
- duration of viciss on goods. 2 Vol. 382.
- on ship. 2 Vol. 383. 4.
- insurance by agent. 2 Vol. 385 to 390.
- when not compelled to insure. 2 Vol. 386.
- in ins. what to be specified. 2 Vol. 387. 8. 9.
- duration. 2 Vol. 388. 9. 391. 501. 2.
- avoid ed to explain a policy. 2 Vol. 389.
- warrant. 2 Vol. 390. 1.
- to sail with convoy. 2 Vol. 391. 2.
- that party is neutral. 2 Vol. 392. to 396.
- condemnation by subsequent conclusive ed. 2 Vol. 392. 9.
- right of search. 2 Vol. 393. 4.
- want of documents; a breach of neutrality. 2 Vol. 397.
- breach of decree offenders to. 2 Vol. 397. 6.
- repudiation 2 vol 378.32
- implied warranty 2 vol 406.1.2
- salvage 2 vol 409
- total los 2 vol 409.4
- los by capture 2 vol 409
- abandonment 2 vol 409.9 to 417.49
- ransom bill 2 vol 404
- los by detention 2 vol 405
- by damnity 2 vol 405.6
- by averaged contribution 2 vol 407
- by execution of salvage 2 vol 409
- adjustment of los 2 vol 414.4
- return of premium 2 vol 414
- agreement w policy to submit dispute to arbitra-
  tion 2 vol 416.7
- responsibility 2 vol 417.8
- costs by charter party 2 vol 419.520
- maximum 2 vol 420.1
- proceedings under los of a joint venture 2 vol 422
- stopping goods in transit 2 vol 423
Malicious prosecution Vol137.109
to what actions this is analogous Vol137.
- ground of it Vol138.
- conspiracy action of Vol137.8.
- malicious prosecution founded on criminal prosecution Vol140.129.4.
- - on civil prosecution Vol144.5.
- distinction between them Vol136.7.
- till's case joined Vol147.
- self may be joined Vol147.

Master and Servant Vol112.
- master Vol112.2.
- apprentice Vol112.125.
- manual servant Vol112.8.
- day labourer Vol112.5.
- agent Vol115.6.7.
- attorney Vol132.
- debtor assigned in service Vol129.
- when W. bound by X's acts Vol130.135.
- servant, liability for his own act Vol137.132.
- master, out of Vol132.8.
- remedy for injury to his Vol139.4.5.
- what they may do for each other Vol145.6.

Mergor Vol561.3 Vol298
Mortgage 1 Vol 266.
- debtors 1 Vol 267.
- to secure a debt 1 Vol 268.
- conditions of mortgage in subsequent 1 Vol 266.
- power of mortgagee's wife 1 Vol 267.
- right of redemption 1 Vol 267, 49, 285 to 289.
- lands devised or appropriated in a family settlement and then mortgaged 1 Vol 268.
- absolute defeasance 1 Vol 269.
- freed of the debt of mortgagee 1 Vol 269.
- interest of mortgagor before deficiency of 1 Vol 271.
- after 1 Vol 272.
- right to mortgage 1 Vol 273.
- the legal estate must redeem 1 Vol 274.
- redemption absolute or conditional 1 Vol 275.
- who seeks, must do it 1 Vol 276.
- stat. limited 1 Vol 277.
- devise of the estate by mortgagee 1 Vol 278.
- priority of incumbrance 1 Vol 279.
- taking 1 Vol 280.
- notice at subsequent incumbrance 1 Vol 281.
- interest in a perfected mortgage at mortgagor's death 1 Vol 282.
- interest of mortgagor's wife 1 Vol 283.
- in mortgage, land, & mortgage money due 1 Vol 284.
- fund for redeeming mortgage 1 Vol 285.
- interest due on mortgage 1 Vol 286.
- mode of accounting 1 Vol 287.
- foreclosures 1 Vol 288.
- uniform. Vol. 3.
- common. Vol. 3.4.
- immemorial usage. Vol. 3.
- when & where. Vol. 3.
- unique of Vol. 4.
- particular custom. Vol. 5.6.
- how fixed. Vol. 5.
- L. & M. Vol. 5.
- certainty in derogation of Vol. 6.
- particular br. Vol. 6.7.
- why English is binding here. Vol. 6.7.
- have not a br. Vol. 7.
- written & Vol. 8.
- an English statute binding here. Vol. 7.8.
- Vol. 1 declaratory, remedial or final. Vol. 9.10.
- state allowing costs. Vol. 10.
- state affirmative & negative. Vol. 10.11.
- when states commence their operation. Vol. 10.11.
- construction of Vol. 11 to 13.
- if fraud repeatedly incurred. Vol. 12.3.
- similar to immediat state Vol. 11.9.
- Cens. that become unlawful or lawful. Vol. 19.
- Official only given by Stat. must be strictly pursued Vol. 19.
- In corporation, what is a majority. Vol. 19.
- Void or voidable. J. 19.
- Counting on. J. 19.
- Nitrating J. 19.
- Public state, judges take notice of ex officio. Vol. 19.
- Private state must be set forth. Vol. 19.
- Courts at 6, 12, 20, etc. if required to be written. J. 22.
- If a Stat. creates an office, see a remedy. Vol. 20.
- Popular J. 20.
- To recover a finally what action lie. J. 20.
- If the prosecutor relieves the amount. J. 20.
You sane memory incapable to divine. 2 Vol. 3°. 461.

Chapter 2 Vol. 460.

- privileges of child as to crime. 166. 167. 168.
- as to fines. 169. 169. 169.
- as to court. 166. 167 to 171.
- what court void and what voidable. 170. 171 to 177.
- how his court avoided. 170. 171. 172.
- court enforced in equity. 171. 172.
what power an infant may execute. Vol. 182. 3.
what office he may hold. Vol. 183. 5.
how affected by neglect of duty. Vol. 184. 5. 6.
how to state of limitation. Vol. 186. 7.
how infants may sue & be sued. Vol. 187 to 190.
duty of parent & child. Vol. 191. 2. 3. 5. 8. 197.
duty of parents to bastard Vol. 197 to 208.
infants power to devise. Vol. 209.


- suit. Vol. 297 to 300.
- plead to the action. Vol. 301.
- special issue. Vol. 303. 49 to 503.
- special plea in bar. Vol. 302. 963 to 973.
- general rule of sales. Vol. 302. 375.
- variance, suspension and infringement. Vol. 305.
- stating fact, according to legal operation 310363.6.
- misstatement, evidence 313106.
- what acted by judge over 315326.7.
- irremedial event, evidence 316306.
- departure 316308.392.9.4.
- death 316309.
- inducement, aggravation 316309.
- joinder of parties in action 316311.2.3.
- of causes of action 316314 to 3158.
- miscellaneous rules as to action 316319.4.
- dilatory plan to jurisdiction 316321.2.3.
- to file, jurisdiction 316923.4.5.8.
- in abatement 316326.
- minnows 316327.331.
- coverture 316331.4.
- death of parties 316332.3.4.
- variance 316334.9.
- minor or non-joiner 316335 to 332.
- pending of a former suit 316337 to 342.
- writ, lawfully issued 316342.3.
- want of venue 316343.4.
- death of effect of filed in abatement 316344.
- the beginning and end of a plea, show what it is 316345.6.3.
- judge in a plea of abatement 316357.8.9.
- form of tenancy, an issue of fact 316361.
- nolle prosequi 316990.417 to 428.
- conclusion of a special plea in bar 316366.
- novel ad sight 316368.3 392.2 316366
- treason 316381.2.9.
- technical treason 317316.364.
- duplicity 317383 to 387.
- protest, evid 317387 to 392.
- effect of dem 318097 to 393.
- dem to out 318097 to 398.
- amount of judgment 318049 to 317.
Plag to action. on cont. stab. limb. Vol 290 to 291.
  Adj it. hom. Vol 290 to 291.
  Idiocy Vol 296.
  Feigned attach Vol 296.
  Composition with Vol 297.
  Illegality Vol 297.
  Insanity accounts Vol 298.
  Merge Vol 298.
  Sustain judgment Vol 298.
  Discharge. Vol 299.
  Pay Vol 299.
  Release Vol 299.
Conven. 2 vol. 24. s. 6.
- nked. 2 vol. 24.
- coupld. with an interst 2 vol. 24.

Real jury 1 vol. 2412.

Remainder 1 vol. 2493.
- rel. for renting 1 vol. 248 s. 6.
- vested 1 vol. 248 s. 9. 987 s.
- contingent 1 vol. 248 s. 9. 956 s. 8. 1. 213.
- how it fails 1 vol. 248 s. 89.
- conf. remanent 1 vol. 248.
- double contingency, or one with a double aspect 1 vol. 248.
Sheriff. 1863.
- tenure of office. 1863.
- when he must live. 1863.
- when he may go into other countries. 1863.
- appoint deputy but cannot absent himself. 1863.
- act in his name. 1863.
- deputy cannot delegate power. 1863.
- for neglect of duty liable to oh. 1863.
- jailed. 1863.
- must confine in jail only. 1863.
- cannot be committed. 1863.
- many a prisoner. 1863.
- death for acts of deputy. 1863.
- deputy not liable for neglect to pay. 1863.
- is liable for acts of special deputy. 1863.
-escape after his death. 1863.
- what he may do after removal. 1863.
- powers, duties. 1863.
- nothing proceeds before examination. 1863.
- false communication. 1863.
- when order does may be issued. 1863.
- commit on Sunday. 1863.
- erroneous / void process. 1863.
- legal action: 1 Vol 48. C.
- voluntary: 1 Vol 48. C. 54. F. 57. F.
- negligent: 1 Vol 48. F. 7. F.
- on minor's moral process: 1 Vol C.
- remade in Sec 1 for 1 Vol C. 2.
- sec. 1 Vol 52. 3.
- who sued for 1 Vol 52. 5.
- bond as negligent cause: 1 Vol C.
- cause from criminal process: 1 Vol 56.
- relating on part suit: 1 Vol 57.
- cause from goal libertin 1 Vol 58. 9.
- jure nutum 1 Vol 59.
- return of 1 of 2 joint debtors 1 Vol 60.
- bonds for civil process: 1 Vol 60. 1.
- how prisoner subjected 1 Vol 61.

Secundus 3 Vol 96.
- words actionable in themselves 3 Vol 96. to 102
- colloquium: 3 Vol 101. 3.
- immoral 3 Vol 101. 9.
- construction of words: 3 Vol 108. 6.
- avenlment in death: 3 Vol 108.
- malice: 3 Vol 108. 7.
- action for malicious prosecution: 3 Vol 109.
- special damages: 3 Vol 110.
- slanderous & libel 3 Vol 112.
- knowing other words than those cited 3 Vol 112. 3.
- libel: 3 Vol 115. to 117.
- slanderous 3 Vol 117. 5.
Tender: 2 vol 173.4.
- mortgage money 2 vol 173.4 vol 170.6 3 vol 199.
- cohanger 2 vol 174.3 vol 198.2 200.1.
- what is a tender 2 vol 174.5 3 vol 198.3.7.
- bank note 2 vol 195.
- effect of a tender 2 vol 174.6.1 3 vol 197.217.
- when to be made 2 vol 177.9 3 vol 198.
- pay it 2 vol 180.1.9 3 vol 200.12.
- tender to terminate 2 vol 279.280.
- what money against tender 3 vol 196.2.
- tender for one self another 3 vol 200.
- debt due on demand 3 vol 200.

Title by levy of execution 3 vol 121.2.
- to thing: mad. 3 vol 375.

Trustee: 2 vol 693.
- when entry is not trustee 2 vol 693.4.
- by citation 2 vol 394.5.6.
- citation 2 vol 396.
- in local action 2 vol 389.
- who may maintain it 2 vol 397 391.
—— for what 2 Vol. 445. 2. 3. 4.
—— duty 2 Vol. 446 to 180.
—— novel ajust 2 Vol. 446.
—— other lawsuit, in aggravation 2 Vol. 447.
—— continuance 2 Vol. 448. 9.
—— debt 2 Vol. 449. 1. 2. 4. 6.
—— ext. 2 Vol. 450. 4. 8.
—— sufficient for more profit after ejectment 2 Vol. 451. 2. 9.

TROVER 2 Vol. 119.
—— origin 2 Vol. 119. 120.
—— where it lies 2 Vol. 119. 120.
—— conversion 2 Vol. 120 to 125.
—— who may maintain it 2 Vol. 125 to 130.
—— in whom 2 Vol. 130. 1. 3. 4.
—— for what party 2 Vol. 131 to 135.
—— joke in 2 Vol. 135. 6.

TRUST. 2 Vol. 223.

USE 2 Vol. 223.
February 1802. 3s.
 compound interest 1802.4.6.

Void & voidable 1806.18.19.

Wants 1806 885.6.7.8.
- subject of 1806 885.9.890.
- injunctions in it 1806 890.1.