**THE BRADLAUGH AND BESANT CASE.**

Yesterday, in the Queen’s Bench, before the Lord Chief Justice and Mr. Justice Mellor, the case of the Queen v. Bradlaugh and Besant was brought on. The defendant, it appears, had obtained a rule calling upon the prosecution to show cause why the judgment roll should not be completed by inserting the actual date when the interlocutory judgment was signed on the ………….., 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, and the application to the rule involved. The judgment in this case was in its form regular and was a recorded verdict. Their lordships had absolute power over all judgments in this court, and it would therefore he rush to say that they had no power to alter a recorded judgment. It was the first time that an affidavit had been made to make an alteration in a recorded judgment. Mrs. Besant and Mr. Bradlaugh urged that there has been an informality is not signing the interlocutory judgment, and that before they could proceed further or writ of error it was necessary that the record should be corrected. The argument were peculiarly technical. The court held that the proceedings were regular, and discharged the rule with costs.