**THE QUEEN v. BRADLAUGH AND BESANT.**

**(By ELECTRIC TELEGRAPH.)**

In the High Court of Justice Queens Bench Division, to-day Friday, (Before the Lord Chief Justice and Mr. Justice Mellor), in the Queen v. Bradlaugh, the Solicitor General showed cause against the rule obstructed by Mr. Bradlaugh and Mrs. Besant, calling upon the prosecutor to show why the judgment roll should not be completed by inserting the actual date in the postea, and why the proceedings should not be stayed in the meantime. – The Solicitor General submitted that there was no precedent for this application, and there were thousands of persons who were now undergoing sentence without the formality required here having been complied with. – Mr. Bradlaugh thought that if this formality was complied with he would have an opportunity of re-arguing the case; but that was a mistake. – Mr. Justice Mellor: No, he would not. – The Lord Chief Justice: We should only be going through an idle ceremony of doing what we have already done. – Mrs. Besant said the Solicitor-General was under a misconception as to what they asked for in the rule. They had not asked that the judgment of the Court should be set aside, nor had they asked that a judgment once passed should be re-argued. They merely wanted a correct record to go to the Court of Error with, and she quoted a case in Barnewell and Adolphus to show that it may be necessary to have a postea in Court before sentence was pronounced. She reminded his Lordship that at the time she had expressed herself strongly as to the extreme carelessness in not having the postea there – a vital authority. – The Lord Chief Justice did not recollect it, and his Lordship refused to receive unverified shorthand notes of what they said. – Mr. Bradlaugh quoted authorities in support of his contention. – The Lord Chief Justice was very sorry that the time of the Court should have been taken up with such a trumpery application. He said it was a mere technical objection, and it would be a frustration of justice to go over the whole proceedings again. – Mr. Justice Mellor was of the same opinion, and the rule was discharged with costs.