**THE BRADLAUGH CASE**

In the Queen’s Bench Division, on Friday (before the Lord Chief Justice and Mr. Justice Meller), the case of the Queen v. Bradlaugh and Besant came on for hearing. In this case the defendant had obtained a rule calling upon the prosecution to show cause why the judgment roll herein should not be completed by inserting the actual date when the interlocutory judgment was signed on the postea and why the time for the defendants to transcribe the said judgment roll should not be enlarged, and why any further proceedings should not be stayed in the meantime.

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

Mrs. Besant and Mr. Bradlaugh urged that there had been an informality in not signing the interlocutory judgment, and that before they could proceed further on 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.