THE CONVICTION OF MR. BRADLAUGH AND MRS. BESANT

The Lord Chief Justice and Mr. Justice Mellor had before them on Thursday, in the Queen’s Bench Division, the case of the Queen v. Bradlaugh and Besant. The defendants had obtained a rule calling upon the prosecution to show cause why the judgement roll here in should not be completed by inserting the actual data when the interlocutory judgement was signed on the postea, and why the time for the defendants to transcribe the said judgement roll should not be stayed in the meantime.

The Solicitor-General, with whom was Mr. Mead, showed canes against the rule. He was not aware of any precedent for the application which the rule involved. The judgement in this case was in its form regular, and was a recorded judgment. Their lordships had absolute power over all judgments in their Court, and it would therefore be rash to say that they had no power to alter a recorded judgment. This was the first time that an effort had been made to make an alteration in a recorded judgement.

Mrs. Besant and Mr. Bradlaugh urged that there had been an informality in not signing he rule to arrest judgement, and that before they could proceed further on the writ of error it was necessary that the record should be corrected. The arguments were peculiarly technical.

The Court held that the proceedings were regular, and discharged the rule with costs.