Mr. Bradlaugh, accompanied by Mrs. Besant, appeared in the Queen’s Bench Division on Friday, and moved in person for a rule calling upon Mr. Frederick Cockburn, the Queen’s Coroner, and upon the solicitor for the prosecution, to show cause why he or they should not complete the judgment roll carried on herein, by inserting the actual date when the interlocutory judgment was signed on the postea, and also by reciting the several motions made by the defendants herein to quash the indictment for a new trial, and in arrest of judgment respectively, and the judgment of the Court on such motions, or why the recital of the interlocutory judgment on the said roll should not be struck out, and why the time for the defendants to transcribe the judgment should not be enlarged, and why in the meantime all further proceedings should not be stayed. Mr. Bradlaugh was about to enter on his motion, when the Lord Chief Justice asked, what was the purport of all this? Mr. Bradlaugh : The first point is that the judgment was not signed on the postea until after sentence was passed. It was necessary to show the proceedings on a writ of error. The matter was incorrectly stated on the roll. The judgment of the Court was not entered until after sentence. That point could only be raised on the record. Besides, the two American cases quoted by the Solicitor-General, which appeared at the time to influence the mind of the Court, were opposite to what he state them to be. The interlocutory judgment was not given until after the final judgment. It should have been before. The postea was not in Court at the time of the final judgment, but was brought in afterwards. Mr. Bradlaugh proceeded at some length to argue technically the points he proposed to raise by his rule, when the Lord Chief Justice said it appeared to him to be a waste of time discussing them they appeared to be all mere cobwebs. If it turned out that there had been any irregularity in the proceedings they could all be amended. The question was whether the applicant thought it worth his while to go on with his objection. Mr. Bradlaugh said he did. The Lord Chief Justice : You must not understand that by granting the rule, the result would be anything but setting aside the old proceedings and beginning again at a certain point. Mr. Bradlaugh said he should be content with that, because at present he could not proceed with his writ of error, the Attorney-General’s fiat for which he had obtained, or of appealing to the Court above. After some further remarks the application was directed to stand over, their lordships to consider in the meantime what should be done.