# REPORTS

OF

# CASES ARGUED AND DETERMINED.

IN THE

High Court of Chancery,

FROM THE YEAR M DCC LXXXIX TO M DCCC XVII.

WITH A DIGESTED INDEX.

BY FRANCIS VESEY, JUN. ESQ. OF LINCOLN'S INN, BARRISTER AT LAW.

In Twenty Volumes.

M DCCC II. XLII. GEO. III.

FROM THE LAST LONDON EDITION, WITH THE NOTES OF FRANCIS VESEY, JUN. ESQ.

AND THE EXTENSIVE ANNOTATIONS OF JOHN E. HOVENDEN, ESQ.

OF GRAY'S INN, BARRISTER AT LAW.

THE WHOLE EDITED,

WITH NOTES AND REFERENCES TO AMERICAN LAW,

AND SUBSEQUENT ENGLISH DECISIONS,

BY

J. C. PERKINS, ESQ.

BOSTON:

CHARLES C. LITTLE AND JAMES BROWN.

M DCCC XLIV.

# LIBRARY OF THE LAW STARTORD, JR., UNIVERSITY LAW ESPERTMENT.

CHARLES C. LITTLE AND JAMES BROWN,

IN THE CLERK'S OFFICE OF THE DISTRICT COURT OF MASSACHUSETTS.

LELAND STANFORD JR. UNIVERSITS.

a.56393

JUL 23 1901

BOSTON: C. HICKLING'S STEAM-POWER PRESS, DEVONSHIRE STREET.

# TABLE

OF

## THE CASES REPORTED IN VOLUME SEVEN.

#### DOUBLY ARRANGED.

#### N. B .- " VERSUS" ALWAYS FOLLOWS THE NAME OF THE PLAINTIFF,

A		Bromley v. Holland .		PAGE 3
Аввот, Cary v		Broom, Longmore v	•	124
Adams, The Bishop of Here-	100	Brown v. Bigg	Ī	279
ford $v$	324	Brudenell v. Elwes .	•	382
" Lady Twysden v		Brummell v. M'Pherson	·	237
Alcock, Knollys v		Buckmaster v. Harrop .	•	341
Andrew v. The Master and	000	Buxton, Mott v	•	201
Wardens of the Merchant		Durton, Macter 1.	•	
Taylor's Company	223			
Andrews v. Emerson	420	$\mathbf{c}$		
Anonymous	222	_		
Arrowsmith, The Earl of Shaf-		Cary v. Abbot		490
tesbury v	480	Chambers v. Minchin .		186
Aylesbury (Countess of),		Clarke, Bastard v		489
Howe. v	137	Cockayne, Ex parte .		591
V		Coghill, Holmes v		499
		Collins, Robson v		130
В		<b>,</b>		
Bailey v. Ekins	319	D		
	590			
Barclay, Ex parte	597	Damon, White v		30
Bastard v. Clarke		Dann v. Spurrier		231
Bayne, Trimmer $v$		Dartmouth, Earl of, Howe	$\boldsymbol{v}.$	137
Beaumont v. Boultbee	<b>599</b>	Darwin, Ridgeway v		404
Bell v. Phyn		Dawson v. Dawson .	•	173
Bigg, Brown v	279	Day, Ex parte		301
Blunt, Scawen v		Denne, Osborne v		424
		Detillin v. Gale		583
Bott, Gibson v		Donlevy, Ex parte .		317
Branstrom v. Wilkinson v		Downes v. Thomas .		206

<b>E</b>	J
Edmonson, Exparte 3	03 Jackson v. Jackson 535
	19 Jervis v. White 413
	35 Jortin, Ex parte 340
	82
	on!
	K K
nicites v. narioc 4	<u>                                     </u>
•	Kemp v. Pryor 237
F	King, Ex parte 312
	" Urquhart v 225
Fauquier v. Tynte 29	Knollys v. Alcock 558
	87
Ford, Ex parte (the Case of	L L
	17
Diary Bane Theatre, . 0	Lambe, Thompson v 587
	Lance, Etches v
G	Lingham, Miles v
ď	19 -1
Gala Datillia a 50	
	S3 Longmore v. Broom 124
•	
Gibson v. Bott	89 M
	M
Н	M'Pherson, Brummell v 237
11	1 · ' ·
Hall Expanse 90	Mattheson, Pickard v 293 Matthews, Moody v 174
	60 Merchant Taylors' Company, 05 (Master and Wardens of)
	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,
	.
	Millet v. Rowse 419
Hereford, The Bishop of, v.	Minchin, Chambers v 186
Adams 3	24 Moggridge v. Thackwell . 36
	52 Moody v. Matthews 174
Hodgson, Newman v 4	$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$
	89 Morris v. Preston 547
Holland, Bromley v	3 " v. Stephenson 474
	99 Mott v. Buxton 201
	01
Howe v. Countess of Ayles-	N N
·	37
o. Dan of Dartinouth 10	Nannock $v$ . Horton 391
	Nowman w Hodgson 400
Hunter $v$ . Seton	Noysomhed, Case of the Da-
	nish Ship 593
_	
I	
<b></b>	0
Ilchester, Ex parte The Earl	
	18 Oldham v. Oldham 410
Iuggon - Ugrain 0	51 Ochovno a Donno 494

## TABLE

0F

## CASES CITED IN VOLUME SEVEN.

MANUSCRIPT, AND THOSE IN PRINT IMPEACHED, CORRECTED, OR OTHERWISE PARTICULARLY NOTICED.

THIS TABLE DOES NOT EMBRACE THE CASES CITED BY THE EDITORS.

#### A

Acherly v. Vernon, 108 Anderson, Edie v. 302 Att. Gen. v. Baxter, 76

" v. Downing, 108
" v. Doyley, 58

" v. Syderfin, 43
" v. Taylor, 424

v. Whorwood, 496

В

Bainton v. Ward, 503 to 507
Barthelomon v. Scholey, 142
Baxter, Attorney General v. 76
Bennet's Case, 436, 7
Bolt v. Stanway, 252 to 257
Bolton, Franco v. 19
Bonney v. Ridgard, 167
Brown v. Irvin, 258
Browne v. Yeall, 50
Brydges v. Landen, 210, 211
Burt v. Thomas, 321, 2, 3
Byne v. Potter, 4 to 28
"v. Vivian, 4 to 28

C

Champion's Case, 150 Chancey v. Rees, 142 Christopher v. Christopher, 354, 5 Clarke, Westley v. 195, 8 Cleaver, Powell v. 142 Cranch v. Cranch, 141 Creese v. Irwin, 258

D

Dagley v. Leake, 142
Dawes, Fearon v. 587, 8
Downing, Attorney Gen. v. 108
Doyley, Attorney General v. 58
" v. Doyley, 58
Draper', Smith v. 293

E

Edie v. Anderson, 302

F

Fearon v. Dawes, 587, 8 Finch v. Hattersley, 210, 211 Franco v. Bolton, 19

G

Gibson v. Patterson, 269 Gifford, Nugent v. 166 Gompertz, Isaac v. 61, 494 Gregson v. Riddle, 268, 270, 5 Grieve, Griffiths v. 142 Griffiths v. Grieve, 142

Н

Hattersley, Finch v. 210, 211 Hawes v. Wyatt, 358, 373, 4 Henderson, Ex parte, 137, n. Holder v. Holder, 146

I

Irvin, Brown v. 258
"Creese v. 258
Isaac v. Gompertz, 61, 494

J

Jewell, King v. 258

K

Kempton v. Packman, 176 King v. Jewell, 258

L

Landen, Brydges v. 210, 211
Latham, Ex parte, 35
Leake, Dagley v. 142
Lifford, Swannock v. 572 to 582
Lloyd, Vaughan v. 489
Lousado, Mocatta v. 423
Lovewell, Peppin v. 142

M

Mead v. Lord Orrery, 167 Mocatta v. Lousado, 423 Morley, Ex parte, 262, 3 Mould v. Williamson, 211, n.

N

Nugent v. Gifford, 166

O

O'Reily, Ex parte, (The Case of the Opera House), 617 Orrery (Lord), Mead v. 167 P

Packman, Kempton v. 176
Paris Mountain, Case of, 590
Patterson, Gibson v. 269
Peppin v. Lovewell, 142
Pinchard, Withers v. 475, 479
Potter, Byne v. 4 to 28
Powell v. Cleaver, 142

R

Radnor (Lady) v. Vandebendy, 572 to 582

Rees, Chancey v. 142 Riddle, Gregson v. 268, 270, 5 Ridgard, Bonney v. 167 Roebuck v. Roebuck, 172 Royal Circus, Case of, 617

S

Scholey, Barthelomon v. 142 Smith v. Draper, 293 Stanway, Bolt v. 252 to 257 Swannock v. Lifford, 572 to 582 Syderfin, Attorney General v. 43

Т

Taylor, Attorney General v. 424 Thomas, Burt v. 321, 2, 3

٧

Vandebendy, Lady Radnor v. 572 to 582

Vaughan v. Lloyd, 489 Vernon, Acherley v. 108 Vivian, Byne v. 4 to 28

W

Ward, Bainton v. 503 to 507 Westley v. Clarke, 195, 8 Whorwood, Attorney General v. 496 Williamson, Mould v. 211, n. Withers v. Pinchard, 475, 479 Wyatt, Hawes v. 358, 373, 4

Y

Yeall, Browne v. 50

## STATUTES CITED IN VOLUME SEVEN.

HENRY VIII.	GEORGE III.
21. c. 13. Farm Leases to Clergymen 547 to 557	17. c. 26. Annuities . 4 to 28
CHARLES II.	33. c. 66. Prize 594
12 c. 24. Guardian . 353 to 381 29 c. 3. Frauds and Perjuries 342 to 347  Estates pur auter vie 356 to 381 431 to 453	
GEORGE II.  14. c. 20. Estate pur auter vie 431 to 453	40. c. 56. Money to be laid out in land to be settled

LORD ELDON, Lord Chancellor.

SIR WILLIAM GRANT, KNT., Master of the Rolls.

HON. SPENCER PERCEVAL, Attorney General.

SIR THOMAS MANNERS SUTTON, KNT., Solicitor General.

#### MILLET v. ROWSE.

[1802, July 31.]

Upon marriage of a ward of the Court, under flagrant circumstances, the husband obtaining a license upon a false oath, that she was of age, the clergyman was ordered to attend, and reprimanded: the husband was committed, and ordered to be indicted. Being convicted and having suffered the punishment, upon his petition to be discharged on executing a settlement, the Lord Chancellor would not approve a proposal giving him any farther interest than, in case of his surviving and no children, under her appointment; requiring the fund to be transferred to the Accountant General: with a trust declared to pay the dividends to her separate use for life, from time to time, and not by way of anticipation: after her decease the capital among all her children by any marriage: if none, and he survives, according to her appointment by Will; if no appointment, to her next of kin; and if he survives, subject to her appointment, to her, her executors, &c.

No costs to the husband, [p. 419.]

James Thompson having been married to Maria Withers, a Ward of the Court of the age of fourteen, by license, to procure which he took the usual oath, a petition was presented; and the parties, and the clergyman (1), who performed the ceremony, attending in Court under an order for that purpose, and the young woman appearing evidently to be under age, Lord Rosslyn, then Lord Chancellor, severely reprimanded the clergyman; and, committing Thompson, directed, that he should be prosecuted. He was accordingly indicted; and convicted; and, having suffered the punishment of the pillory and imprisonment, he presented a petition; praying, that he may be discharged upon executing a settlement according to a proposal, approved by the Master. His proposal was, that the property, to which the infant was entitled, consisting of 1000l. stock, should be vested in trustees for the separate use of the infant for life; and after her decease for the children: if there should be no children. and she should survive, in trust for the infant, her executors, and administrators; and if he should survive, for him, his executors, &c.

A petition in opposition was presented by the mother of the infant; making a different proposal.

Mr. Roupell, for the Petitioner Thompson.—Mr. Pemberton, contra.

\*The Lord Chancellor [Eldon].—In a case flagrant, [\*420] as this is, I should have made all the alterations proposed by the petition of the mother. The only settlement I ever will approve is this. Instead of trustees the fund shall stand in the name of the Accountant General; where it will be always safe; and a trust shall be declared for the separate use of this infant for life, to be paid to her from time to time, and not by way of anticipation,



<sup>(1)</sup> See, ante, Priestley v. Lambe, vol. vi. 421; Warton v. Yorke, post, vol. xix. 451.

during her life: after her decease the capital to go among all her children by this or any other marriage (1): if she dies without any children in the life of Thompson, then according to her appointment by will; and, in case she makes no appointment, to her next of kin. In case he redeems himself by good behavior during her life, she may give it to him by will. If she does not, I never will let him touch a farthing of it. If she survives him, it shall go according to her appointment by deed or will, and if she makes no appointment, to her, her executors, &c.

When he shall have executed a settlement according to these directions, and not till then, let him be discharged. I shall give him no costs. The costs of the other parties must come out of the fund (2).

As to the consequences of a contempt incurred by marrying or assisting in improperly procuring the marriage of a ward of Court, see the note to *Priestley* v. *Lambe*, 6 V. 421, with the farther references there given; and also note 4 to *Nicholson* v. *Squire*, 16 V. 259.

#### ANDREWS v. EMERSON.

#### [1802, AUGUST 2.]

The rule, that an advance of 10 per cent. entitles the party to open biddings, not to prevail in future (a).

Mr. Stanley moved to open biddings upon a lot sold for 800l.; offering an advance of 80l.; exactly 10 per cent.

Lord Chancellor [Eldon].—That rule of 10 per cent.

[\* 421] was not a wise rule to \*establish. The consequence is, you never get more. I remember the time, when no such rule prevailed; and desire it to be observed, that in future there shall be no such rule (3).

Mr. Stanley then offering 100l. the order for opening the biddings

<sup>(1)</sup> Ante, Wells v. Price, vol. v. 398; Winch v. James, iv. 386. As to the extent to which the Court will go in providing for a subsequent marriage, see post, Bathurst v. Murray, vol. viii. 74; Halsey v. Halsey, ix. 47; Long v. Long, 2 Sim. & Stu. 119.

<sup>(2)</sup> Ante, Stevens v. Savage, vol. i. 154; and the note, 155.

<sup>(</sup>a) See as to opening biddings and the practice thereon, Anonymous, ante, 1 V. 453, note (a); Chetham v. Grugeon, ante, 5 V. 86, note (a); 1 Barbour, Ch. Pr. 537; 1 Sugden, Vend. & Purch. (6th Am. ed.) p. 86, [122], et seq., and notes of Mr. Hammond.

The English practice of opening biddings on an advance seems not to have been adopted in several of the States of this country. See, ante, 1 V. 453, note (a), above cited; Duncan v. Dodd, 2 Paige, 100; Collier v. Whipple, 13 Wendell, 224.

<sup>(3)</sup> While v. Wilson, post, vol. xiv. 151. See the note, ante, vol. ii. 55.